# Addendum #1

# RFP RG-17-2663

## Vendor Questions and Answers

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Has funding been approved for this? If so, what amount was approved? | **Yes. The University does not disclose that information prior to contract award.** |
| 2 | Is the current LMS system vendor operated? If so, who is the incumbent and when does their contract expire? | **The current LMS is an on premise installation of Desire2Learn’s LMS software.** |
| 3 | Per section 1.5 of the RFP, can you please confirm that if we have exceptions to the terms and conditions, we are able to include these in our Proposal? | **Confirmed. However, the University is not obligated to accept exceptions requested by proposers. Proposers’ exceptions may cause the University to reject the proposal, or the University may, at its sole discretion, elect to agree to an exception or attempt to negotiate a mutually acceptable alternative.** |
| 4 | 7.1 Performance Audits:  We hold certifications including ISO 27001 and can provide SSAE 16 SOC I and II reports.  Would it be acceptable to provide these, and/or complete a questionnaire if necessary, in lieu of submitting to an audit? | **Should we enter into negotiations with you, this can be discussed.** |
| 5 | 7.2 Termination for Convenience:  Because we price our offering based on the expectation that the entire term be completed, can this requirement please be removed? | **Should we enter into negotiations with you, this can be discussed.** |
| 6 | 7.6 Executed Contract to Constitute Entire Agreement:  We would request that a negotiated, signed agreement would take priority over any other documents – would this be acceptable? | **Should we enter into negotiations with you, this can be discussed.** |
| 7 | Would you consider our standard services agreement as a basis for negotiation, if it includes the other documents referenced in this section 7.6?  Alternatively, would you consider leveraging an existing agreement? | **Should we enter into negotiations with you, this can be discussed.** |
| 8 | For section 2.4 (page 7) what format are the demonstration videos to be created in? | **MP4.** |
| 9 | For section 1.1.7 Scenario #5, is the student completing an online quiz assessment? Or just completing a quiz? | **Assume it is an online quiz assignment.** |
| 10 | For section 3.4 (page 10) The evaluation committee must award at least 60% of all available points for the functional, technical, and training elements prior to having the cost proposal scored.  A proposal that receives less than 60% of the available points on functional, technical, and training elements will be ineligible for further consideration. Please clarify, what is at "least 60% of all available points for the functional, technical, and training elements"  mean: 60% of the 70% (functional, technical, and training) , or 60% of the 80% / 100%?  In other words, what is the denominator referred to by the phrase: "all available points”. | **60% of the 70%** |
| 11 | What is the total student count and the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count that should be used for licensing purposes? | **Please see #18 (below).** |
| 12 | Page 3 - Section 1.2 (Scope of the project)  Since the awarded vendor's solution will be used by a central administrative unit and all campuses of the University of Wisconsin System except UW-Madison, would UW-Madison's current LMS selection be considered in the RFP selection process? If so, what is this LMS? | **No.** |
| 13 | Page 12 - Section 4.1.3 (Mandatory Requirements)  In order to provide the full support options potentially required by UWS (requirement section, 1.2.3.3), may the vendor distribute parts of the support services to international locations? Would such support arrangement violate the requirement of performing the service in the United States clause (Wis Stats 16.705 (1r)? | **Possibly. Generally, where primary services are performed in the United States, incidental support services will be evaluated on the totality of the proposal as a whole. The University would seek a legal opinion regarding a particular proposal of this sort if needed.** |
| 14 | Page 14 - Section 1.1.3 (Requirement Section - Scenario #1)  In order to support the course replication and modification process, will a separate authoring environment (which includes its own workflow management for faculty, librarian, instruction designer and administrator, and its own Learning Object Repository (LOR), and which is accessible but separate from the LMS core) be considered as part of an overall viable solution to support this scenario? | **Vendor should propose the best solution to meet the needs of UWS.** |
| 15 | Page 17 - Section 1.2.3 (Requirements Section - Availability)  For question 1.2.3.1., does the historical data about incidents/downtime or service degradation apply to any non-cloud parts of the system? Will UWS consider any on-premise solution, especially for the hub portion of the digital learning environment? | **Yes, the historical data applies to all components of the solution whether cloud or non-cloud based.**  **The University prefers a cloud based solution; however, it will consider solutions proposed including cloud, on premise or a combination.** |
| 16 | Page 22 - Section 1.2.9 (System Integration)  1.2.9.2 - Is the SIS used by UW restricted to Oracle/Peoplesoft Campus Solutions? If yes, what is the minimum version release for these SIS systems? | **No. The University also uses SalesForce.**  **It should be expected that the majority of UW institutions will be using Oracle/PeopleSoft Campus Solutions 9.x (version varies by campus) at the time of a potential implementation. PeopleSoft Tools and Bundle versions also vary by campus.** |
| 17 | Page 25 - Section 1.2.14 (User Management)  If the learning environment needs to support guest users outside of the UW SIS/HR/SEG systems, what would the integration source be? Can the vendor assume such users are already provisioned and registered on the campus-wide directory systems before the services are rendered? | **Yes, the University anticipates the use of the learning management system by “Guests” outside of the UW System (e.g., guest speaker,” “industry project/assignment reviewer,” “outside content expert,” etc. Proposer should detail how the guest could be given access to the solution if the guest does not have a UW System account. The vendor should not assume such users are already provisioned by UW System in some way prior to services being rendered.** |
| 18 | In Section 1.2, Scope of the project, the RFP states: "The results of this RFP will be used by a central administrative unit and all campuses of the University of Wisconsin System except UW-Madison."  Question: Can UWS provide the full-time equivalent (FTE) count for the central administration unit and the UWS campuses, as identified in Appendix A, that will be using the DLE? | **The University of Wisconsin’s Fall, 2015 IPEDS metrics are below. Fall, 2016 IPEDS metrics are not yet available.**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | University of Wisconsin System | | | | | IPEDS **Student Headcount** Fall 2015 | | | | |  |  |  |  | |  | **Full-time** | **Part-time** | **Total** | | MILWAUKEE | 20,964 | 5,762 | 26,726 | | EAU CLAIRE | 9,360 | 1,232 | 10,592 | | GREEN BAY | 4,084 | 2,700 | 6,784 | | LA CROSSE | 9,623 | 867 | 10,490 | | OSHKOSH | 8,919 | 5,132 | 14,051 | | PARKSIDE | 3,301 | 1,111 | 4,412 | | PLATTEVILLE | 7,196 | 1,749 | 8,945 | | RIVER FALLS | 5,087 | 862 | 5,949 | | STEVENS POINT | 8,275 | 990 | 9,265 | | STOUT | 7,155 | 2,399 | 9,554 | | SUPERIOR | 1,929 | 568 | 2,497 | | WHITEWATER | 10,400 | 1,960 | 12,360 | | COLLEGES | 6,633 | 6,821 | 13,454 |   \*Graduate Assistants are included in student headcounts.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  | | IPEDS Fall 2015 **Employee Headcount** | | | | | | Excludes Graduate Assistants**\***, Skilled Tradespersons and Maintenance Workers | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  | |  | | **Full-time** | **Part-time** | **Total** | | **MILWAUKEE** | **Faculty** | 1,080 | 491 | 1,571 | | **Staff** | 1,557 | 231 | 1,788 | | **EAU CLAIRE** | **Faculty** | 449 | 60 | 509 | | **Staff** | 430 | 84 | 514 | | **GREEN BAY** | **Faculty** | 186 | 82 | 268 | | **Staff** | 286 | 51 | 337 | | **LA CROSSE** | **Faculty** | 517 | 66 | 583 | | **Staff** | 420 | 97 | 517 | | **OSHKOSH** | **Faculty** | 427 | 175 | 602 | | **Staff** | 581 | 114 | 695 | | **PARKSIDE** | **Faculty** | 160 | 56 | 216 | | **Staff** | 211 | 30 | 241 | | **PLATTEVILLE** | **Faculty** | 331 | 73 | 404 | | **Staff** | 408 | 36 | 444 | | **RIVER FALLS** | **Faculty** | 219 | 125 | 344 | | **Staff** | 262 | 41 | 303 | | **STEVENS POINT** | **Faculty** | 363 | 89 | 452 | | **Staff** | 488 | 61 | 549 | | **STOUT** | **Faculty** | 339 | 148 | 487 | | **Staff** | 442 | 76 | 518 | | **SUPERIOR** | **Faculty** | 125 | 33 | 158 | | **Staff** | 184 | 49 | 233 | | **WHITEWATER** | **Faculty** | 472 | 117 | 589 | | **Staff** | 463 | 53 | 516 | | **COLLEGES** | **Faculty** | 320 | 313 | 633 | | **Staff** | 271 | 115 | 386 | | **Extension** | **Faculty** | 317 | 46 | 363 | | **Staff** | 613 | 126 | 739 | | **System Administration** | **Faculty**  **Staff** | 262 | 17 | 279 | |
| 19 | In Section 4.1.1, the RFP states: "Proposer must be able to provide a separate account for each UWS Institution listed in Appendix A."  Question: Will institutions need to cross-list courses and enable students to exist at multiple campuses simultaneously? | **Yes, institutions need the ability to cross-list courses. Yes, students may exist at multiple campuses simultaneously.** |
| 20 | Section 2.5 states “No mention of the cost proposal may be made in the response to the Functional, Technical or Service requirements of this Request for Proposal.” If a particular tool or feature pertaining to a functional/technical/service requirement is available but not included in the proposed solution, is it acceptable to note it as an option available at additional cost (without reference to the cost proposal document or dollar value)? Is there any specific preferred language for doing so? | **Yes, it is acceptable to note it as an option available at additional cost.** |
| 21 | Clarification is requested on the timeframe for provision of a sandbox environment—is it expected within 7 days or 2 weeks? Is the “demonstration site” for UW evaluators in section 2.8 the same as the “sandbox” referenced in section 2.4.2?   1. Section 2.4.2: “Access to the “sandbox” as well as any licenses, waivers, nondisclosure agreements, or other releases that proposers may require in order for these members of the Evaluation team to **access the “sandbox” as described must be provided within seven (7) days of notification of proposer’s finalist standing,** at no cost to the University.” 2. Section 2.8: “Top-scoring vendor(s) may be required to install and demonstrate the proposed product(s) and/or service(s) at a UW site, or to provide guest access to a fully functional demonstration site so UW evaluators can review and test the proposed product(s).  This may include usability and accessibility testing of any kind, as deemed necessary by the University. **Product(s) being demonstrated must be available and ready for UW evaluators’ use upon two (2) weeks’ notice**.” | **Correction to section 2.8:**  **Product(s) being demonstrated must be available and ready for UW evaluators’ use upon one (1) weeks’ notice**.” |
| 22 | Will the information asked for in section 4.2.3 (past cancelled contracts) be kept private and confidential? | **Yes. Please designate it as a Trade Secret on the form provided.** |
| 23 | Can you describe how this is being done today (with IMS LIS 2.0 or some other method)? Does Salesforce support LIS (we do not believe it does but want to clarify)? Have you created a custom plugin for Salesforce?   * 5.2.9.2.      Describe how the solution integrates with Student Information Systems (SIS).  The UW uses multiple PeopleSoft SIS’s and a Salesforce Student Engagement System (SEG).  At a minimum, integration with the solution will include the automated daily bulk extract, transform, transmission and import of student, instructor, course, enrollment, and role data from the SIS/SEG.  The UW prefers the IMS LIS 2.0 standard for integration with Student Information Systems.  If selected as a finalist, be prepared to demonstrate how this integration is accomplished. * 5.2.9.3 Describe the process for automatic transmission of final course grade data from the solution directly to the SIS. | **For final grade transmission from a functional viewpoint, there is a solution maintained by UW System. The instructor initiates an export of grades from the LMS grade roster to a server in Madison. Each campus that is using the import feature picks up the file via a secure FTP process. The instructor is notified that their grades have been imported via an email. The instructor opens the class roster in Campus Solutions and clicks an Import Grades button on the grade roster which populates the grades. The Instructor then reviews and corrects any grade errors in the grades in campus solutions, and then approves the grades for posting in Campus Solutions.** |
| 24 | Will instructor be able to access previous year content besides copying previous year content to the next year? If Yes, will it be read only or editable | **Please include in your proposal how this will work or what you recommend as a “best practice” using your proposed solution.** |
| 25 | Will student be able to access previous year content? | **Please include in your proposal how this will work or what you recommend as a “best practice” using your proposed solution.** |
| 26 | Who will have access to create groups? Instructor or Admin or both? | **Both** |
| 27 | Will instructor have access of reports? | **Please include in your proposal how this will work or what you recommend as a “best practice” using your proposed solution.** |
| 28 | Will student be allowed to post any content on group? Or there will be an approval process where content will be first checked by the instructor and then it will go on wall | **Please include in your proposal how these will work or what you recommend as “best practices” using your proposed solution.** |
| 29 | Will there be a third party tool for content? or will it be created manually by the administrator or Instructor? | **Please include in your proposal how these will work or what you recommend as “best practices” using your proposed solution.** |
| 30 | Please elaborate scenario #8. Administrative Needs for Data Generated in the Learning Environment | **We believe scenario #8 is clear as stated.** |
| 31 | Need to know the existing third party tools that are used by the university which will be integrated with the software | **See #32 below.** |
| 32 | Does scope covers all these integrations with the LMS (5.2.9.4.)  - Remote proctoring solutions (Examity, etc.) - Textbook publishers (Pearson, Macmillan, McGraw-Hill, Cengage) - Content Authoring (SoftChalk) - Test Generators (Respondus) - Media management solution (Kaltura) - Plagiarism detection solution (Turnitin) - Audience Response Systems (iClickers, Turning Technologies) | **UWS seeks a learning environment that is flexible and will accommodate these integrations as well as future third-party integrations that are not yet known. Vendor should detail their plans/roadmap for accommodating new to market third-party tools that require integration with the learning environment.** |