DATE: January 29, 2015

TO: All Prospective Proposers

FROM: Alicia Hopkins
Senior Buyer, IT Procurement
301-985-7223

RE: RFP 91269 – Predictive Forecasting Consultative Services
Addendum #1 dated 01/29/2015

The following amends the above-referenced RFP documents. Receipt of this addendum is to be acknowledged by completing the enclosed "Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda Form" and including it in the Technical Proposal.

1. Due to a typographical error, the Price Proposal Due Date listed under the Significant Milestones section on page 1 of the RFP documents is incorrect. The correct due date for Price Proposals is March 9, 2015 by 2:00 PM EST.

2. Questions from Potential Proposing Firms:

   A. Section III. Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 2. Technical Evaluation Process, paragraph 3. **Oral Presentations/Discussion Sessions** at page 15 of the RFP “refers to the Oral Presentations. Is there an option to break the presentations up into smaller groups in order to create an in-depth experience for the various types of stakeholders?”

   **UMUC Response**

   Pursuant to the guidelines provided in the RFP, one (1) session, approximately 60 minutes in length, will be allowed for each Shortlisted Vendor’s Oral Presentation/Discussion Session. Format of the presentation should be designed to include all University stakeholders and facilitate an interactive discussion between the University stakeholders and the Offeror.
B. “We appreciate that the pricing will be discussed after the oral presentations but has a budget been already established for the scope of this project?”

UMUC Response

Yes; a budget has been established for the scope of this project. Specific budget information cannot be shared.

C. “Has UMUC made any steps towards Predictive Forecasting so far? If so, please describe these.”

UMUC Response

UMUC conducted a pilot study in Fall 2014 using a manual (spreadsheet-based) process to predict course seat needs. The pilot was successful in that it allowed UMUC to reduce course cancellations; however; it did not provide UMUC the ability to gauge any concomitant impact on student progress toward degree because a) UMUC lacks the tools to conduct such an analysis and b) UMUC expects that student progress toward degree would be impacted over a longer term, not subject to a one-time application of the method. Although this manual method showed some impact in reducing course cancellations, it was not scalable.

D. “How much of a driver, for this project, is price control?”

UMUC Response

Please refer to Section III. Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 4. Final Evaluation, Ranking and Selection, Paragraph 2. Final Ranking and Selection, 2.2 Basis for Award: at page 19 of the RFP which states “technical merit will have a greater weight than cost in the final ranking.” The “driver” for this project is the ability to meet the technical criteria listed in Section III. Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 1. Technical Proposal Requirements, Paragraph 2. Initial Technical Requirements, subparagraphs 2.1 through 2.9, at pages 12 through 14 of the RFP.
E. [Section II. Scope of Work, Paragraph 2. Business Need., at page 7 of the RFP] “references a more data-driven approach. Please describe what improvements UMUC has taken.”

**UMUC Response**

UMUC’s attempts at a more data-driven approach primarily include using historical course data variables to drive class schedule decisions instead of basing schedules on an arbitrary percentage increase. The pilot study described above in our response to Question 3. is one of the improvements UMUC has made. This study consisted of ranking classes using a rubric system and scheduling course sections based on the scores assigned to each class. The rubric used various measures including how many sections had run previously, the rate of cancellation, and average class size. UMUC took the classes that scored higher and made a decision to offer these courses every term. Alternatively, classes that scored mid-range or lower were not offered as often. We also merged the online scheduling system for the United States, Europe and Asia locations and now have one global online class schedule.

F. [Section III. Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 2. Technical Evaluation Process, Paragraph 3. Oral Presentations/Discussion Sessions, subparagraph 3.1.A. at page 15 of the RFP] states “UMUC may provide Offeror the opportunity to demonstrate its product” however; it is unclear from deliverables what product this refers to. Can you please specify?”

**UMUC Response**

“Product,” in this instance, refers to the Offeror’s proposed solution. In this case, Offerors will be expected to demonstrate their ability to provide the Deliverables outlined in Section II. Scope of Work, Paragraph 4. Scope and Deliverables. at page 9 of the RFP.
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