ADDENDUM #3

Date: April 24, 2014

To: All Vendors

From: Anne McCoy, CPPB
Purchasing Agent

Subject: Addendum #3 - Bid # RFP-14-042
Learning Management System

The following are modifications/clarifications to bid specifications, based on questions submitted by prospective bidders or other circumstances. This addendum should be added to and become a permanent part of the above referenced bid. The following is a recap of the Pre-Proposal conference questions and answers including a conference attendee list and questions submitted pre proposal and after proposal.

LMS/CMS RFP Vendor Question and Answer
Meeting Minutes
4/21/2014
1:00 P.M.

Introductions: Aaron Bochniak welcomed the steering committee members and vendors asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Attendees:
Aaron Bochniak - NERIC
Bill Murphy - NERIC
Amy Grogan - NERIC
Chase Campbell – Schalmont CSD
Jeff Rivenburg (video)– Duanesburg CSD
Steve Janover - NERIC
Sara Gavens - NERIC
Scott McDonald(Phone)- CR CSD
Lynn Macan (phone)- CR CSD
Lisa Rudd - NERIC
David Versocki - NERIC
Virginia Bond (Video)– Salmon River CSD
Patti Fisher (Video) – SLL BOCES
James Hoffman - Averill Park CSD
Susan Bell - NERIC
Dale Breault - NERIC
Mike Sylofski- NERIC

Not Present:
Overview of RFP goals

Aaron Bochniak gave a background of the RFP, explained how the steering committee was formed and reviewed the purpose of the pre-proposal conference.

Originally, NERIC developed a program called Connect, which aimed to create a singular place where teachers and administrators could access the tools they use on a daily basis, from any location, while supplying them with actionable information in order to improve instruction. The service was delivered in a SharePoint environment which many users found to be difficult to navigate, which eventually led to decreased usage within school districts. NERIC developed the LMS RFP as a way to find a partner with a similar desire to deliver these services to districts in an environment that users find intuitive.

Given the purpose of the RFP, it was only natural that the steering committee be comprised of various types of school district employees as well as NERIC staff. The steering committee features district administrators, building principals, teachers and technology staff.

The purpose of the pre-proposal conference is to discuss the goals and objectives of the RFP with all interested vendors and answer any and all questions that arrive in a single session instead of issuing multiple addendums over a lengthy period of time.

Pre-submitted vendor questions and new questions from vendors:

Greg (Pearson) – “How do districts get connect? Do district subscribe?”

*Connect was a service offered by NERIC which districts did subscribe to. There were 3 levels of Connect offered. The foundation level included the Data dashboard was offered at no cost. The other two levels did have a cost associated.*

Greg (Pearson) – What was the common flow “theme” of the data dashboard?

*The ODS normalizes sets of data from various programs using an ETL process.*
1. ERIE 1 BOCES went to RFP mid-way through 2013 for an LMS solution and selected a number of vendors to be added to their vendor of record. This was a state-wide contract vehicle allowing all BOCES to benefit from discounted pricing and existing terms and conditions. Is Capital Region in a position to leverage this existing contract?  
Yes, while Capital Region BOCES is in a position to leverage the current contract, additional criteria has been defined in this RFP which was not addressed in the RFP from ERIE 1 BOCES.

Dan (Schoology) - “How does it affect pricing? Do we have to be the same price as Erie 1 or can it be higher?”  
Mike- Vendors cannot go lower for the same service than the pricing on the Erie 1 contract.

2. Can you provide more detail around the quantity of students and faculty using the system in the initial deployment? These numbers would be used to help us draft an appropriate pricing model and understand initial implementation needs.  
NERIC provides support to 137 school districts in 7 BOCES regions across Northeastern New York with an average district size of 3000 students and an average student to faculty/staff ratio of 20:1. The selected product would be offered as a service to each district NERIC supports.

Doug (Engrade) - Is there any portion that BOCES licensed directly?  
We are looking to have a Master License agreement. Cap Region BOCES will hold the license, and districts would be allowed to sub-license under this agreement.

Doug (Engrade) – Is NERIC acting as a pass through?  
NERIC is not looking to be a pass through, but wants to enhance and add value to what the vendor has to offer. NERIC expects to offer professional development, training and support as it relates to the use of the software. As a result of these sets of services, combined with the potential for aggregate purchasing, we would also anticipate a lower price than if the district were to contract direct with the vendor.

Dave (Desire to Learn) – Are we looking for multiple vendors?  
Aaron and Chase (Schalmont) - Ideally we are looking for 1 vendor, but if 2 or 3 products are liked equally by districts we are willing to offer all.

3. For the quantity of users, what is the potential for an increase in adoption over time? Some details around how many districts and potential users will help us better understand a roll out model regarding pricing and implementation.  
NERIC understands that districts will most likely take a staggered approach, rolling out certain features with key staff members before moving to full implementation.

Dave (Desire to Learn) – What is the immediate demand for sizing? What is the quantity of current and possible customers?  
We don’t have a number of how many districts will immediately sign on. There is currently approximately 20 districts using NERIC Connect and more waiting to see what we come up with here.

Dave (Desire to Learn) – What are the quantity of current and possible districts?  
We would like to think that everyone will sign on once we have a good product to offer, but the number of districts that will sign on is unknown.

4. Criterion 2.1.7: We would like to better understand your use case regarding content libraries and content management. Is BOCES interested in a content management system for storing and sharing learning objects outside of courses? Or is the content upload functionality you’re looking for related to uploading content directly into courses?  
The content upload functionality desired should at a minimum allow for uploading content directly into courses. CRB/BOCES would consider a solution which utilizes a content management system and makes documents accessible to other courses as well. This could also extend to office automation functionality and include storage of files for faculty in the form of document libraries or interface with a commercially recognized cloud solution.
Dave (Desire to Learn) – is there a want to standardize the content across districts? Or within 1 district?

No, not across districts, however, there is a desire to upload and share content within a department, building and district.

5. Criterion 2.1.8: This criterion asks that “Users should be able to create their own accounts.” By “users,” do you mean all end users or is the intent that administrators are able to create user accounts without intervention from the vendor? If the intent is for end users to create their own accounts, can you provide a use case to scenario to help us better understand your requirement?

District users may already be part of an Active Directory within the district. This type of user account creation could be automated or managed by an administrator without vendor intervention. District users who may not be part of an Active Directory, such as parents, would require a method allowing them

Chase (Schalmont) – The committee recognizes the need and priority for a parent portal to be a strong component of the software.

6. Criterion 2.2.1: Can you expand on how BOCES uses Access Control Lists?

Active Control Lists are used by NERIC to allow certain users access to certain sets of information such as class lists or fields of information related to a student (i.e. Who is enrolled in the free/reduced lunch program).

7. Section 3, Requirement #26: How is SQL Server Reporting Services currently used?

SQL Server Reporting Services renders reports utilizing user defined criteria based on permissions set through Active Control Lists.

Dave (Desire to Learn) – Are there any other modalities being used today?

Yes, ASP, .net, SSRS, MS PowerPivot and Cognos.

Dave (Desire to Learn) – Is Cognos being used at the ODS level?

No. Cognos is only being used with the NYS Data Warehouse at Level 1 (RIC) and Level 2 (NYSED).

8. Section 3, Requirement #32: What system is currently in place as the Operational Data Store (ODS)? What data and services does it provide?

The ODS is a SQL database which normalizes data from disparate systems within a district using an ETL process. Reports are written using Microsoft tools such as SSRS, PowerPivot, ASP, etc. Currently, this is displayed in a SharePoint environment.

9. Do other systems currently connect with NERIC’s ODS? If so, what is the method of integration/connection?

NERIC currently utilizes a custom in-house application to reconcile user accounts between the ODS and the SharePoint application utilizing SAML. Other systems utilize an API or a web service, but NERIC is open to other possibilities.

10. Section 3, Requirement #45: Could you provide further context regarding Student Management System reports?

Is PowerSchool the SMS in place across schools? What type of interoperability/functionality are you looking for?

SchoolTool, eSchool Data and Power School are the Student Management Systems which have been adopted by districts throughout our region. The interoperability mentioned refers to the sharing of data between disparate systems. For example, teachers could access gradebook information or other key functionality with the Learning Management System as a conduit.

We only want the end user to enter their information once, not into multiple systems.

Districts using:

School Tool – 80  eSchoolData – 30  Power School - 15

11. Does BOCES have accessibility requirements/compliances that the selected system must meet?

Yes, pursuant to Federal and New York State guidelines relating to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
12. Do you have an expected implementation timeframe for initial schools or districts looking to adopt the system? When is the “go live” date and how many districts do you expect to be involved? How many students do these districts represent?

_The expected implementation timeframe would start in July 2014 with the “go live” date being the first day of school, which ranges from Sept. 1 to Sept. 3 depending on the district._

_Districts will most likely take a staggered approach to implementation, implementing modules over time. A “walk before your run” type of approach._

13. We have begun responding within the fillable form for Section 3.0, but have noticed some formatting anomalies that may make responses difficult to read. Will BOCES consider providing a Word version of the document? Or, will BOCES accept responses in vendor templates instead of the fillable form? Our template would repeat your questions and provide direct responses, including “Yes,” “No,” “Planned” ratings where asked.

Example of formatting anomaly in fillable form:

| 4. | What version(s) of Microsoft, Apple or Google Chrome operating systems can be used to access your system (be specific about Home vs. Pro versions of Operating Systems)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following operating systems are supported:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_BOCES will allow vendors to use their own template to submit responses._

14. Section 2.0 “Criteria for a Software Product Being Sought through this Search Process”: Does BOCES require responses to the criteria in this section, or is this provided as background information only?

_Section 2.0 is meant to provide information only and does not require answers._

15. Section F, page 13, outlines submittal format. Number 4 is listed as “Proposed Services, Learning Management System.” Can BOCES clarify which content should be placed in that section? For example, should responses to Sections 3.0 and 4.0 appear there?

_Vendor responses to Sections 3.0 and 4.0 should be submitted under the heading “Proposed Services: Learning Management System.”_

16. Exhibit A-F: Can BOCES confirm whether the Insurance Requirement Affidavit needs to be signed by our insurance agent at this time or if it can be submitted upon award?

_The Insurance Requirement Affidavit must be submitted with the proposal._

Dan (Schoology) – You stated that the product you are looking for would include elements of a CMS, LMS and Data Dashboards. How would you rank those bullets in priority, (which will primarily be used)? Who is the true end user?

_Chase – Content management ranks as least important. The true end user would be the teacher and to a lesser extent, the student with a push to be integrated for parents. The hope is to use this to look for at risk students in order to get interventions set._

_A.B. – Content management in regards to storage is the least important, but in terms of learning it is of high importance. Our largest base of end-users are teachers, but there is clearly a high emphasis on students, student-learning and parents, as well as administrators._

Greg (Pearson) – Does the RFP address online assessments?

_A.B. – The hope is that what we offer will integrate with other systems so that we don’t have to recreate the wheel. Currently low stakes common assessments are stored in programs such as_
eDoctrina, LinkIt or TestWiz for example. Accessing that assessment data is integral to what we want to achieve.

**Chase** – Accessing the assessment data from those programs is very important to districts. If you have another tool that allows the sharing and saving of assessments that would be something we would like to see. But either way, being able to see the scores from these assessments as benchmarks is important.

Greg (Pearson) – Does that go into the ODS?

*Only currently for majorly used and supported diagnostic assessments, not locally created measures.*

Doug (Engrade) – What do we want from other systems such as finance and HR systems?

*That isn’t a high priority. However, it would be beneficial for teachers to access their own paystubs, and for administrators to be able to run reports that might make correlations of the data held in each system (e.g. between student grades and a teachers attendance) as an example. These systems also tend to be the holder of APPR-related information, so interoperability is important.*

Bob (Safari Montage) – What’s the hosting Model?

*Mixed hosting model or to be hosted here at NERIC. If vendor hosting offers faster/easier delivery we are not opposed.*

Anglo (Safari Montage) – Should we assume for pricing model NERIC would be willing to host?

*No, do what is best for you. It could presented be both ways. You can give 2 options with 2 prices.*

Dave (Desire to Learn) – Is security a #1 driver? If it can be a secure cloud solution, would that be preferred over a locally hosted option?

*We expect the same high quality of security whether it’s in a cloud or locally. We don’t have a preference where it is hosted, but would like you to articulate the standards your hosting model follows.*

Doug (Engrade) – Pricing was 25% of rubric, will the pricing submitted by vendors be normalized. Such as if Vendor A has NERIC host and charges $1 for service and NERIC charges $1 equaling $2 for the combined service, and Vendor B charges $2 as the host will they both be considered equal?

*Yes, both will be considered equal. We will normalize pricing when deciding. There will be no mark up of vendor services by NERIC.*

Dan (Schoology) – How is Connect currently priced? Would we be open to simplifying the pricing structure?

*Connect pricing is based on RWADA for each district, in addition to the faculty/staff FTE used in calculating the MS SharePoint CAL, if the district isn’t an existing MS EES Agreement subscriber. We are looking to simplify our pricing structure, as our bills are considered overly complicated, even to the districts.*

Bob (Safari Montage) – Will the master license be held by NERIC?

*Capital Region BOCES will hold the master license agreement. The districts will purchase through us and pay a coordination fee for the services that NERIC provides. NERIC will create a cooperative service as a partnership with the vendor, adding value to their product.*
Doug (Engrade) – In the next five years how many districts do you think will adopt this new service?  
I would like to say everyone, but realistically not everyone. There are 220,000 students within all the districts we work with, so that would be our projected goal.

Chase - this is something that I see gaining momentum and I believe that this will be something that will be used by the teacher, but only if it is a good product.

Dan (Schoology) – Would this product be rebranded as Connect or be pushing a new product?  
No, we want the school district to be at the forefront. NERIC Connect was not called NERIC connect within the schools, but district connect. It was set to be an extension of the district.

Jim Hoffman – It was called school name connect, (i.e. Averill Park Connect).

What if BOCES is offering the product, but the districts want to go directly to the vendor?  
If the Districts want to go directly to the vendor, that is an option, but we hope that we offer a better value and enterprise for services. Generally going directly to the vendor is higher in price; however, districts can go directly to the vendor.

What if they just want to buy off the Erie 1 contract?  
Mike S. - Not all products offered on the Erie 1 contract are supported by NERIC. If districts purchase a Product off the Erie 1 contract that NERIC does not support they will need to get their support from the vendor or from a different RIC.

What if they want to only buy certain components?  
We would like to price the services so that the districts will have the option of buying just certain components.

Bob (Safari Montage) – If a district does not have a good bandwidth, would we install a local server and have them run it locally?  
That is possible, however it is not ideal.

Dave V.- We can increase bandwidth available to the district (at a cost) when the constant usage gets above 75% of the available bandwidth.

Angelo (Safari Montage) – Section 5.0 of the RFP, are those just guidelines if we are selected to come back?  
The written response will be used by the committee to do a first evaluation of vendors and make determinations as to which software packages we would like to invite for a live product review.

Angelo (Safari Montage) – Is there a written response needed for 5.0?  
A written response is not needed for 5.0.

Questions Submitted subsequent to the Pre-Proposal conference:

1. Page 15, Section D.1. What standard for acceptance applies under Section D.1? Is this to be determined in negotiation of final terms and conditions between BOCES and the successful respondent?  
In this instance, acceptance refers to receipt of the product and the ability of the product to accomplish what was advertised by the vendor.

2. Page 44, Section Exhibit A: Required Documents. We plan on submitting a proposal as per the submittal format indicated on page 13. We will include A-1 through A-8 as part of the Exhibit A but the other required documents listed on Page 44 will be submitted as per page 13. Is this correct?

Exhibit A is included in “5. Required Documents” on page 13 of the RFP. Any documents included in Exhibit A should be submitted under Section “5. Required Documents.”
3. Page 42, Section 5.0: Product Reviews Based on Migrated Sample Data. This section mentions an Implementation Plan. Is this required as part of the proposal submittal or is it only required if selected for Phase 2 – live product review?

*The implementation plan is only required of vendors who are selected for Phase 2.*