
Systems Replacement Project

RFP# 22871: Student Management System Evaluation Team Short-Listing Recommendations

Prepared by:	Project Administrator
Approved by	Chair SMS Evaluation Panel
Prepared for:	Chair Business Evaluation Team
Process:	To record the process and Evaluation Team recommendations
Date:	4 November 2008
Version:	Version 1.4
Status:	Final

1. Name of Tender

The name of the tender as published is: *Systems Replacement Project . Request for Proposal Student Management System.*

2. Evaluation Team The Members of the Student Management System

Functional Evaluation Team are:

- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]

All of the members attended the meeting of the Evaluation Team on 17 October 2008, except for [Redacted] and [Redacted], to discuss the responses and to determine whether it was possible to complete and agree upon an aggregate evaluation. All members attended the second meeting on 30 October 2008 except for [Redacted], [Redacted], [Redacted], and [Redacted]; however, [Redacted], [Redacted], [Redacted] and [Redacted] had scored the proposal.

Probity advice and administrative support to the SMS Functional Evaluation Team was provided by [Redacted], Project Manager, Systems Replacement Project and [Redacted], Project Administrator. Also in attendance at both meetings was [Redacted], a Probity Advisor from Ernst and Young.

3. Type of Tender

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was posted on GETS on 12 August 2008. Proposals in response to the RFP were due by 4pm 15 September 2008.

On 12 September 2008 a notice was placed on GETS to advise respondents that it was now sufficient for a copy of their proposal to be e-mailed to edmrfp@correspondence.school.nz or to_smsrfp@correspondence.school.govt.nz by 4pm 15 September 2008 provided that the full hardcopy and CD in the original RFP documentation were received within a reasonable time but no later than 4pm Friday 19 September 2008.

The GETS reference number is 22871.

4. Approximate Value

The approximate value of the LMS tender is [REDACTED].

5. RFP Responses

Responses to the RFP were due by 4pm 15 September 2008 and were opened by the Systems Replacement Project Manager in the presence of a Probity Auditor from Ernst and Young [REDACTED] on 18 September 2008. Two hard copies of responses were received; one from Integrated Tertiary Software and the other from [REDACTED], which was not compliant with the required RFP process.

6. Management of Non Compliant Response

After the completion of the inventory of responses and prior to the commencement of the evaluation process a decision was made, by the Chief Executive, that non-compliant responses to the three RFPs would only be considered if a determination was made by the Evaluation Teams that the compliant responses had failed to adequately meet the evaluation criteria.

7. Action Register

Date	Action
12 August 2008	RFP released on GETS
15 September	Closing date for proposal submissions
18 September	Responses opened by Systems Replacement Project Manager, in the presence of the Probity Auditor from Ernst and Young.
18 September	Inventory of responses prepared
Week commencing 22 September	Précis of responses prepared and distributed to Evaluation Team Members along with copies of the evaluation sheets, Evaluation Guidelines and copies of responses relevant to the SMS Evaluation Team.
23 September to 16 October	Members of the SMS Evaluation Team individually score and rank responses.
17 October	Meeting of SMS Evaluation Team meet to discuss individual scores and rankings, to determine aggregate scores and rankings and to prepare a shortlist of vendors for presentation/proof of concept before the TCS Selection Panel.
21 October	Minutes of 17 October meeting circulated amongst members of the Evaluation Team.
30 October	Second meeting of SMS Evaluation Team.

30 October	Revised score sheet correcting the aggregate numerator circulated to members of the Project Team for review.
31 October	Draft Minutes circulated for comment.

8. Conflict of Interest

Conflict of Interest Declarations were completed by all members of the SMS Functional Evaluation Team, the Systems Replacement Project Manager and the Project Administrator prior to the Evaluation Team meeting on 17 October 2008. Prior to the commencement of the meeting of 30 October a probity check list was provided to all members. The self check probity check list asked members whether they had been contacted by any of the vendors; whether they had discussed the responses with anyone other than Team Members and whether as a result of their review of the responses they had identified any conflicts of interest. Any positive responses to these questions were to be reported to the Chair. No declarations were made.

9. Evaluation Process

The evaluation process was conducted in accordance with '*Systems Replacement Project Stage 2 Processes: Evaluation Guidelines*', '*Systems Replacement Project Stage 2 Processes: Procurement Plan*' and the RFP rules relating to non compliant responses which are set out on page 15 in Section 4.2.2 of the RFP document. This section states that '*any non-conforming proposal, including, without limit, any late proposal, may be excluded from or accepted for consideration by TCS at its sole discretion*'.

At the evaluation meeting of 17 October the responses from [REDACTED] and Integrated Tertiary Solutions Ltd (I.T.S.) were discussed. As some members of the Evaluation Team had not had the opportunity of reviewing the responses and completing their individual assessments it was not possible to complete the assessment process at this meeting. The SMS Evaluation Team did however agree that in view of the non compliant response from [REDACTED] and the approaching end of year that there was sufficient information in the response from Integrated Tertiary Solutions Ltd to recommend to the Business Evaluation Team that an immediate invitation to I.T.S. to present their proposal to the Selection Team be issued.

It was further agreed that it would be necessary to schedule a further meeting of the Functional Evaluation Team before this presentation to agree aggregate scores. This meeting was held on 30 October 2008.

Subsequent to the meeting of 17 October probity advice was received from Ernst and Young that an assessment process should be completed prior to the issue of the invitation to Integrated Tertiary Solutions Ltd to determine whether the response was of sufficient merit to warrant an invitation to present their proposal and proof of concept.

10. Summary

Attached to this report are the Minutes of the 17 October meeting, Minutes of the 30 October meeting, a list of issues/questions to be put to I.T.S. at the presentation, a copy of the probity self check list, and a copy of the aggregate score sheets.

The evaluation process requires that the common and specific criteria be assessed against a maximum score, which ranges between 10 and 95. The individual ratings for each criterion would then be aggregated and summed to determine the aggregate score for each response. One of the ten score sheet responses included a qualitative assessment (based on an earlier draft of the Evaluation Guidelines) against the 'specific' criterion rather than a numeric assessment; this response was translated in to a numeric value to enable a uniform methodology to be applied. The translation process was consistent with the translation process used for aggregation of the similarly assessed scores for the OTLE RFP.

The individual scores were aggregated and from a possible score of 630 the proposal from I.T.S. Ltd was assessed as 416.6 out of a maximum of 630. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] felt that they did not have sufficient technical knowledge to evaluate the technical and general user requirements. As the maximum possible score for these two categories is 100 the non-scoring has the effect of distorting the overall aggregate score. If the scores for these two members are not included in the aggregate assessment the modified score would be 482.9 out of 630.

Recommendations

The SMS Functional Evaluation Team recommends to the Business Evaluation Team that it

1. Agrees that Integrated Tertiary Systems Ltd be invited to present their proposal to TCS selection staff and that the issues/further questions identified by the Evaluation Team be put to the vendors by the Selection Staff;
2. Notes the comments set out in the Minutes of the Meetings of 17 and 30 October 2008;
3. Notes that Integrated Tertiary Systems received an aggregate score of 416.6 or of an adjusted 482.9 out of a possible maximum score of 630; and

4. Agrees that a letter be prepared to [REDACTED] advising that their response was not compliant and in terms of the RFP rules was not considered by the SMS Evaluation Team.

Name: [REDACTED]

Position: Chair SMS Evaluation Team

Date: 2 November 2008

Notes from SMS Functional Evaluation Team Meeting

Date: 17 October 2008

Time: 10:00 – 11:00

Venue: Tawa Room, Hobson Street

Members Present: [redacted] (Chair), [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]

Apologies: [redacted], [redacted]

Absent: [redacted]

Observers: [redacted], [redacted], [redacted] (Probity Advisor, Ernst and Young)

Notes

1. There are two responses to the RFP, one from ITS which is compliant with the tender requirements and the other from [redacted] which is not compliant. The objective of the meeting was to decide whether to invite I.T.S. to provide a presentation/proof of concept and whether to exclude [redacted].
2. Noted that one member had not read the responses and that other members felt that more time was necessary to read and digest the information before assigning scores.
3. At the request of a Panel Member the term “open source” used in the [redacted] response was explained.
4. Noted that some members felt that it was hard to numerically rate the responses without observing the software in operation.
5. Noted that TCS had looked at I.T.S.’s product previously (2007) but had not proceeded to purchase. Members of the previous Evaluation Panel were not advised as to why, leading to concern that the present evaluation might be destined for a similar fate. It is believed that the earlier procurement was halted over process concerns, rather than any identified short-coming of the product itself.
6. Noted that the evaluators should focus on system functionality not technical aspects of the vendor’s response.
7. Noted concerns around the provision of ongoing support from I.T.S. given that they are based in South Africa.
8. Noted that [redacted] has been identified by the vendors as a reference site. There is a protocol to be observed, but it

should be possible to pose such questions as the last (concerning vendor responsiveness) to them. Additionally, the Evaluation Team could expect to be offered a demonstration of the [REDACTED] system later in the process, assuming it proceeds that far.

9. Noted that the response from I.T.S. provides no quantification of 'speed of use'. The Project Manager noted that this was not uncommon in responses from vendors because of the number of variables. Noted that information on operational performance can be gauged from that available at comparable reference sites (having a similar size and IT infrastructure). Noted also that performance cannot be permitted to erode over time (e.g. under increased load).
10. Noted the view that I.T.S. does not seem to understand the range of functions of TCS, especially with respect to measures of assessment and the transfer of data with NZQA. (References to assessment in the proposal are largely framed in the paradigms and vocabulary of the tertiary sector.) Some concern whether they could make the necessary adaptations.
11. Noted the need to ensure that all required functionality is explicitly identified and addressed. Whereas some functions may be forthcoming from the other system being considered (the OTLE), this cannot be taken for granted.
12. Noted concern about the quality of some data to be migrated to the new system and the need to give some thought about the transfer of this data. Experience with the implementation of ākōna was referenced as an example where the conversion process went well but the quality of the imported data, particular that concerned with rubrics, was poor. Noted that this issue exists irrespective of any choice of SMS.
13. Noted that I.T.S. may not understand the difference between the types of students enrolled with TCS. Noted issues around their proposals for the allocation of incoming work which does not mention work coming in electronically or the need to refer all work to the responsible teacher. Noted that this was an area identified by ITS in 2007 as requiring particular attention.
14. Noted concern that technical specifications for end-user software could cause difficulties for students and external school staff whose technology may be older than that at TCS (e.g. the requirement to support the SSL security protocol). Noted that the requirements for external users appear to be relatively low (e.g. Internet Explorer v4.0) and that IRG can provide expert advice to the panel.
15. Noted the need to clarify whether the ITS system can deal with students working on multiple levels over multiple years and the need to avoid reentering enrollment data each year.
16. Noted the need to clarify how easily the ITS system can be adapted to cope with future changes.

17. Noted the need to clarify the interface with Navision.

Where to from here?

18. Agreed, in view of the approaching end of year hiatus to invite I.T.S. to present their proposal to the Selection Team.

19. Agreed that it would be necessary to schedule a further meeting of the Functional Evaluation Team before the I.T.S. presentation to agree aggregate scores and decide whether or not the [REDACTED] proposal should be advanced.

20. Agreed that further questions for the next meeting be referred to [REDACTED] for consolidation.

21. Agreed that the Minutes be circulated.

Notes from SMS Functional Evaluation Team Meeting

Date: 30 October 2008

Time: 3.00 to 4.00

Venue: Tawa Room, Hobson Street

Members Present: [redacted] Chair), [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]

Apologies: [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]

Absent: [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]

Observers: [redacted], [redacted], [redacted] (Probity Advisor, Ernst and Young)

Prior to the commencement of the meeting a probity check list was distributed which asked attendees to disclose whether they had been contacted by any of the vendors, whether they had discussed their individual assessments with anyone other than a fellow Panel Member, and whether as a result of the review of the responses they had become aware of any conflicts of interest. Any positive answers were to be referred to the Chair of the Evaluation Team. No declarations were made.

Copies of the Minutes of the 17 October meeting and a copy of the aggregate score sheet was tabled. The score sheet shows an aggregate score of 417 out of a possible of 630. It was noted that there was some distortion to the scoring as two members of the Evaluation Team had been unable to assess two technical criteria categories which had a combined possible maximum score of 100. If these scores were omitted the aggregate score increases from 417 to 483 out of a possible 630.

The Chair summed up the purpose of the meeting, which was to discuss and agree the aggregate scoring and to make a decision on whether ITS should be invited to present their proposal and demonstrate their product to a TCS Selection Team.

There was a general discussion on whether the Evaluation Team felt comfortable with the aggregate score as a true reflection of the earlier discussion which focused on qualitative factors and whether the Team had confidence in ITS, and if not should TCS go back to the market to identify other vendors and other solutions. It was:

- Noted that there was some variation between individuals scores and that there were some issues around the aggregate numerator, especially in those technical criteria where some members of the Evaluation Team had entered a zero score to reflect that they felt unable to assess that particular criteria.

- Agreed to review the aggregate spreadsheet so that the aggregates for each category of criteria reflected the number of scores.
- Agreed that TCS should first invite ITS to present their proposal.
- Agreed that the Chair will review the information sent to the SMS RFP respondents to identify any gaps and will arrange to provide any necessary additional or clarifying information.
- Noted that while ITS has previously responded to TCS tenders and already has some knowledge of the School and its operations, there is still concern to ensure that they have sufficient information about TCS business processes and methodologies to present properly.
- Agreed that, in view of the above, that ITS should have access to Evaluation Team Members and other appropriate TCS staff prior to the presentation in order to fully inform themselves of the TCS ways of working and special requirements.
- Agreed that TCS staff prepare a range of scenarios which reflect the wide range of business undertaken by the School, that these scenarios be referred to [REDACTED] by 14 November 2008, for collating.
- Noted that [REDACTED] is available to assist Evaluation Team members prepare the scenarios.
- Noted that questions, issues and scenarios will be referred to ITS prior to the presentation, and that ITS be offered detailed briefing on matters raised by the Evaluation Team, so that their presentation can be more fully informed.
- A number of such areas were identified in the meeting, and will be included. They included:
 1. assessments
 2. allocation of work to teaching staff
 3. conduct of the project alongside BAU, and how cut-over of the new system will be managed
 4. clarification of the meaning of certain risks identified in the response document, particularly that relating to the School's 'culture'
- Agreed Noted that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will brief members of the Evaluation Team who were unable to attend the meeting on the outcomes and the need to prepare scenarios.

- Agreed that ITS be asked to provide historic issues lists for one or two comparable clients, (a) as they stood immediately upon going live with the application, and (b) following a reasonable period (in the order of a year), to help determine the effectiveness of the System, its implementation and whether any additional unforeseen capital investment was required to remedy the issues.
- Noted that the ideal timeline would be to have all issues clarified by ITS and ITS having presented before the Christmas break, to enable the commencement of work as early as possible in 2009.

Questions for I.T.S. at Presentation

1. Is data (like a teacher in-putting marks and ordering work) transferred in real time and permanently stored or is it batch transferred later? Not doing it in real time has the potential to lose data when something goes wrong and teachers are left not knowing whether something has actually been ordered or not.
2. Have any of the ITS systems been hacked into?
3. Can names of actual students be found from a 'sounds like' search function? This is useful when trying to decipher student or supervisor messages from an answer phone!
4. Can cohorts be automatically updated if that is a chosen parameter? E.g. Can a cohort of SC150 Full time Maori students be kept as a cohort if those criteria are used to create the cohort in the first place or is it only a manual cohort like ākōna?
5. What are the organisational culture risks referred to in the RFP response and how do they see these impacting on the roll out of the new system?

Probity Checklist (Self-Check)

Action	Yes	No
Have you read all of the vendor's responses to the RFP? <i>(If no, please advise the Chair of the Evaluation Panel)</i>		
Have you read The Evaluation Guidelines? <i>(If no, please advise the Chair of the Evaluation Panel)</i>		
Have you completed your individual assessment of each response? <i>(If no, please advise the Chair of the Evaluation Panel)</i>		
Have any of the vendors contacted you? <i>(If yes provide details below and copy to Chair of Evaluation Panel)</i>		
Have you discussed the responses with anyone other than other Panel Members? <i>(If yes provide details below and copy to Chair of Evaluation Panel)</i>		
Have you discussed your individual assessments with anyone other than Panel Members? <i>(If yes provide details below and copy to Chair of Evaluation Panel)</i>		
As a result of your review and assessment of the responses are you now aware of any potential conflict of interest? <i>If yes provide details below and copy to Chair of Evaluation Panel)</i>		
Notes:		

Name:

Date: 30 October 2008

Summary of RFP Responses

Respondent (Address & contact details)	Response Compliant	Contract Price	Aggregate Score	Presentation Recommended	Comments
<p>Integrated Tertiary Software (Pty) Ltd Head Office: PO Box 25168, Monument Park, 0105, South Africa Tel: 00 27 12 4255600 Web: www.its.co.za Email: marketing@its.co.za</p>	Yes	<p>Between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Million for the high level phases of the project depending upon licensing model options. These costs do not include the cost of TCS backfilling and third party costs which will bring the total to [REDACTED] or more.</p>	483	Yes	<p>The Integrated Tertiary Software (ITS) solution includes functionality to support student, financial, human resources, payroll and library management business processes. While modular, the system is claimed to be fully integrated. ITS will integrate the solution with other TCS software. One of the core strengths is the management of assessments, linking distributed staff resources to students, bar coded resource handling and distribution of study material through the warehousing function.</p> <p>The delivery model that forms the basis for this proposal (though not necessarily their ideal delivery model) is based in the system being installed on servers of TCS (and based at TCS). ITS offers three Licensing models and TCS can opt for any one of the models. Pricing for all three models has been provided. ITS can also supply all the required Oracle Database products to host the system. A hosted solution cannot be provided at this stage. ITS has entered into discussions with [REDACTED] regarding the hosting of the ITS Integrator system for TCS. This option will be more cost effective and that this should, although pricing</p>

Respondent (Address & contact details)	Response Compliant	Contract Price	Aggregate Score	Presentation Recommended	Comments
					<p>has not been provided be seriously considered by TCS.</p> <p>ITS has recently implemented a Student Management Systems at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] ITS systems have also been implemented with over 40 tertiary institutions in 12 countries.</p>
[REDACTED]	No	[REDACTED]	0	No	<p>This proposal is not compliant with the RFP process, which [REDACTED] have acknowledged in their response document. [REDACTED] state that they decided to submit a non-compliant response to stimulate discussion. [REDACTED] does not have an out-of the-box system but is interested in conducting an evaluation of open source Student Management Systems and to then develop a strategy to extend one of these or create a new open source package. This evaluation would cost around \$20,000.</p>

Functional - Common Criteria

Maximum Score											Average Score	
1 Quality of the Proposal	10	9.5		7.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	7.5	6.0	9.0	10.0	7.8
2 Product Capability and Potential	40	38.0		27.0	20.0	33.0	32.0	30.0	25.0	35.0	38.0	30.9
3 Proposed Implementation Plan	60	55.0		45.0	20.0	53.0	47.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	57.0	45.2
4 Product Quality Control	50	46.0		40.0	40.0	45.0	40.0	40.0	25.0	42.0	50.0	40.9
5 Proposed Resourcing	40	35.0		27.0	10.0	35.0	20.0	30.0	15.0	35.0	37.0	27.1
6 Proposed Delivery Model	30	25.0		20.0		25.0	22.0	22.0	20.0	26.0	28.0	23.5
7 Post-Project Support and Maintenance	40	35.0		27.0		38.0	32.0	30.0	20.0	35.0	39.0	32.0
Total	270	243.5		193.0	95.0	237.0	201.0	209.5	141.0	232.0	259.0	201.2

Functional Specific Criteria

Enrolment - General

Maximum Score											Average Score	
1 Student Enrolment	30	28.0	25.0	22.0	20.0	27.0	18.0	25.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	24.5
1 Student Records	30	28.0	15.0	20.0	20.0	28.0	20.0	25.0	18.0	30.0	29.0	23.3
1 Course Management	30	25.0	10.0	18.0	15.0	25.0	21.0	20.0	10.0	15.0	30.0	18.9
1 Teaching Management	15	10.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	12.0	8.0	9.0	12.0	7.5	14.0	9.6
2 Management of Student Resources	35	30.0	20.0	20.0		30.0	24.0	29.0	12.0	35.0	33.0	25.9
Total	140	121.0	80.0	88.0	60.0	122.0	91.0	108.0	72.0	117.5	136.0	99.6

Reporting

Maximum Score											Average Score	
2 Common Reporting Needs	20	17.0	10.0	12.0	15.0	18.0	12.0	15.0	15.0	20.0	19.0	15.3

2 Specialised Reporting	35	28.0	15.0	20.0		30.0	20.0	25.0	10.0	17.5	33.0	22.1
2 Import and Export Data for Reports	10	8.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	7.5	4.0	10.0	10.0	7.1
2 Producing Reports	15	12.0	5.0	11.0	10.0	13.0	10.0	12.0	12.0	15.0	15.0	11.5
Total	80	65.0	33.0	50.0	30.0	70.0	49.0	59.5	41.0	62.5	77.0	53.7

Finance

	Maximum Score											Average Score
3 Finance	40	32.0		30.0		35.0	18.0	30.0		20.0	38.0	29.0
Total	40	32.0		30.0		35.0	18.0	30.0		20.0	38.0	29.0

Technical Requirements

	Maximum Score											Average Score
4 Technical Compliance	5	4.0		3.0		4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	4.1
4 Information Repository (Database)	15	13.0		13.0		15.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	15.0	15.0	13.1
4 Non-functional Requirements	15	13.0		14.0		13.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	15.0	15.0	13.3
4 Security	5	4.5		4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Total	40	34.5		34.0	5.0	37.0	28.0	32.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	31.2

General User Requirements

	Maximum Score											Average Score
5 On-line Access	5	5.0		4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.3
5 Usability/User Interface	10	8.0		7.0		9.0	6.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	7.5
5 Searchable	5	2.5		2.0		5.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.5	5.0	2.6
5 Support	5	4.5		4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	4.1
6 Training	5	4.5		4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.2

6 Workflow	15	13.0		10.0		13.0	8.0	10.0		7.5	15.0	10.9
6 Interoperability	15	13.0		11.0		14.0	5.0	12.0	5.0	7.5	14.0	10.2
Total	60	50.5		42.0		55.0	32.0	43.0	17.0	42.5	57.0	42.4

<i>Total Scores - All Participants</i>		Maximum Score									Average Score	
Functional Common Criteria	270	243.5		193.0	95.0	237.0	201.0	209.5	141.0	232.0	259.0	201.2
Functional Specific Criteria	360	303.0	113.0	244.0	95.0	319.0	218.0	272.5	160.0	282.5	348.0	235.5
Grand Total	630	546.5	113.0	437.0	190.0	556.0	419.0	482.0	301.0	514.5	607.0	416.6

66%

<i>Total Scores - Excluding Partial Scores</i>		Maximum Score									Average Score	
Functional Common Criteria	270	243.5		193.0		237.0	201.0	209.5	141.0	232.0	259.0	214.5
Functional Specific Criteria	360	303.0		244.0		319.0	218.0	272.5	160.0	282.5	348.0	268.4
Grand Total	630	546.5		437.0		556.0	419.0	482.0	301.0	514.5	607.0	482.9

77%

Notes: The blank scores given by panel members reflect that they feel that they have insufficient technical knowledge to be able to rate these criteria rather than being a rating of the quality of the response. Scoring by Pamela Linton was on a 0, 1, 2 scale. As with earlier evaluations, these values have been scaled to 0, 50% of maximum score, and 100% of maximum score, respectively.