



# UMUC

DATE: April 12, 2017

TO: All Prospective Proposers

FROM: Amy Kisloski  
Director, Technology Procurement  
301-985-7707

Eric Pfister  
Senior Buyer, Technology Procurement  
301-985-7095

RE: Solicitation # 91496 – Faculty Administrative Process Improvements  
Addendum #1 dated 4/12/2017

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

The due date and time for the Technical Proposal REMAINS as Wednesday, April 19, 2017, on or before 2:00 PM. Technical Proposals are to be submitted electronically, attached to an email in PDF format (see Section I, 5.1. of the solicitation document for more information). Late proposals cannot be accepted.

### Questions from Potential Proposing Firms:

1. *"Will financial statements that are prepared by [a proposer's] CPA firm satisfy the requirement for the firm's financial statements in section 2.4 of the solicitation?"*

UMUC Response
Yes.

2. *"Will UMUC consider a cloud based [S]olution that is hosted by a vendor?"*

UMUC Response
Yes.

3. *“Can [UMUC] provide information on the current state as it pertains to processes?”*

**UMUC Response**

Current State processes are very manual (centered around email and spreadsheets) with minimal to no workflows. Further detail is provided in the RFP, Section II, subsection 2.1 (starting on page 7).

4. *“Can [UMUC] provide sample[s] of the forms/reports used for each of the systems?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC does not utilize standardized forms/reports in the current state.

5. *“Can [UMUC] provide the specific data [UMUC] want[s] to store in the new system that originates from all current data sources and systems listed in the RFP?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC’s intent is that all data would continue to reside in its systems of origin. Only data generated by/for the new Solution would be stored in the new system.

6. *“The RFP specifies various requirements that often exist in multiple systems. Can [UMUC] please rank the prioritization of requirements? Key elements to prioritize include: 1. Managing staffing assignments 2. Tracking and reporting on faculty credentials and activities (e.g. teaching, research, and service) 3. Automating faculty review processes (e.g. annual reviews, promotion, tenure).”*

**UMUC Response**

All three of these are of equal importance. Faculty staffing and promotion are of primary importance, but the information needed to support those processes are what make up the faculty profile. All mandatory requirements are listed in the RFP, Section II, subsection 2.3 (starting on page 8).

7. *“Which functionality and services are required such that if a vendor could not provide it/them, the vendor would be disqualified?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC has included the requirements in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Section II. Scope of Work in the RFP. It is the University’s desire to award a firm that can provide a Solution that meets all of those requirements however, it is at the University’s sole discretion to determine whether a proposed Solution that provides less than 100% of the required functionality will still be acceptable to the University.

8. *“Do[es] [UMUC] require the new system to assist with determining which courses need to be assigned each term?”*

**UMUC Response**

No.

9. *“How is the list of courses to be assigned generated?”*

**UMUC Response**

The list of courses is created and maintained in PeopleSoft and would be an output from there. UMUC requires the future Solution to maintain a list of approved courses each faculty member can teach (within the faculty record). The new Solution will provide a single view to Program Chairs, to include their courses and the approved faculty members available to teach them. The Solution should allow Program Chairs to assign faculty to a course and kickoff the workflow for acceptance of the assignment and issuance of the teaching contract.

10. *“There is a very tight window from the time [a proposer] receive[s] these responses to the date which the responses are due. Can [UMUC] provide additional time to thoroughly respond to the questions?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC intends to maintain the current Solicitation Schedule.

11. *“What IT resources are available from UMUC for this project?”*

**UMUC Response**

IT resources have not been assigned to support this project at this time. The need for IT resources will be reassessed depending on the selected Solution.

12. *“Can [a proposer] have an opportunity to talk with UMUC to discuss details or requirements to ensure [a proposer] adequately understand the use case and expected end-user experience?”*

**UMUC Response**

In accordance with Section III, Article 2, at page 17 of the RFP, UMUC will review of the Technical Proposals and then will invite the firms that remain shortlisted to attend Vendor Discussion Sessions at UMUC’s Largo, Maryland facility. The discussion phase of the procurement will allow vendors a chance to present their Solution in person and to ask additional questions that will help refine responses to possible future technical phases of the procurement. All communications during this procurement must be directed through the University’s Issuing Office.

13. *“Due to the length and technical nature of the RFP, the resources it requires to complete, and the limited time between receiving responses to initial questions and the required submission date, will UMUC provide additional time to submit the final RFP response?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC intends to maintain the current Solicitation Schedule.

14. *“Regarding SSO requirement - Is there an existing SSO implementation [a proposer] would authenticate against, or would building a SSO solution available to other applications be part of this project?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC provides an SSO implementation that is SAML based for user authentication.

15. *“Should [a proposer] assume for the purposes of scoping this project, that the data residing in 3<sup>rd</sup> party applications such as PeopleSoft, Workday, D2L, Saba and Edwards will ... be available through APIs that already exist?”*

**UMUC Response**

Yes, this information will be available through APIs. UMUC would need to know what information is needed before it can be determined if the APIs currently exist or would need to be created.

16. *“With your existing home grown application Web Staffer, should [a proposer] assume an API exists in order to access data stored here, or is building an API to share this data part of the project?”*

**UMUC Response**

A specific API does not exist for WebStaffer, but any programming language that connects with MySQL could be used to easily accomplish what was needed. Preferably, the new Solution would replace the WebStaffer tool completely.

17. *“Would [UMUC] prefer a [S]olution to be hosted on premise at your facilities or [is] [UMUC] open to hosting through cloud-based environments such as Amazon Web Service (AWS)?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC is open to both options. Proposals must meet the requirements listed on the RFP to be susceptible for award.

18. *“Do[es] [UMUC] have [a] core technology stack [that UMUC] prefer[s] a [S]olution built upon, or front end development frameworks that [UMUC] would prefer based on internal resource skillsets to support the application?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC has no preference, as long as the Solution meets the functional requirements listed in the RFP. Section II, subsection 3.5 (page 13) contains the support requirements.

19. *“Is there a preference as to whether the end [S]olution is a custom application or an implementation of a COTS tool/platform?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC has no preference. Proposals must meet the requirements listed on the RFP to be susceptible for award.

20. *“Which of these applications in place will remain after the [S]olution is installed?”*

**UMUC Response**

All current technology tools (PeopleSoft, Workday, D2L, etc...) will stay in place following installation of any new Solution, with the exception of Web Staffer. UMUC would prefer the new Solution to replace Web Staffer.

21. *“What will the faculty be able to do after the system is completed that [the faculty] can’t do or struggle with now?”*

**UMUC Response**

Section II, subsection 2.3 (page 8), contains the list of actions/activities the new system needs to support. These actions/activities are those that faculty cannot perform or struggle with in the current state.

22. *“Is there a budget [UMUC] can share?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC will not share this information with proposing vendors.

23. *“How many users will this system support?”*

**UMUC Response**

The system would need to support 3,000 to 5,000 users.

24. *“Training - assume audience is both student and faculty/administrators? Blended learning ok or preference for delivery? (Blended means a mix of delivery vary, for example, face to face, E-learning, webinar, video, articles, etc.”*

**UMUC Response**

Please provide your standard training options including but not limited to: train-the-trainer, video/webinar, and e-learning.

25. *“Will there be limited time available for training, example, faculty can only be in class 2 hours a week?”*

**UMUC Response**

UMUC intends to use train-the-trainer or in-person training for a very limited group of faculty/administrators. All other users would require self-paced training options.

26. *“Is there a deadline for the security questionnaire? There are several detailed questions there, assuming all of it needs to be completed as a new vendor.”*

**UMUC Response**

In accordance with Appendix A-3 at page 30 of the RFP, completed questionnaires will be requested via addendum from all remaining shortlisted firms following the Oral Presentations/Vendor Discussions phase of this procurement. UMUC usually allows one (1) week for all shortlisted vendors to return the questionnaires. All questions must be answered or comments provided.

27. *“[Will] UMUC will consider Cloud based [S]olutions for this RFP?”*

**UMUC Response**

Yes.

28. *“How many concurrent users (Program Chairs, admin users and Faculty) will expected to access the system?”*

**UMUC Response**

Potentially a few hundred concurrent users will be expected to access the system. This is an estimate for the purposes of this RFP. UMUC does not have any data around this.

29. “[Will] [c]onsolidating or moving any of the existing data sources data or Systems to the proposed [S]olution ... be considered?”

UMUC Response
No.



**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA FORM**

**Solicitation:** UMUC Solicitation #91496 – Faculty Administrative Process Improvements

**TECHNICAL PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** Wednesday, April 19, 2017 at 2:00 PM

**NAME OF PROPOSER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA**

The undersigned, hereby acknowledges the receipt of the following addenda:

Addendum No. <u>  1  </u>	dated <u>04/12/2017</u>
Addendum No. <u>      </u>	dated <u>      </u>
Addendum No. <u>      </u>	dated <u>      </u>
Addendum No. <u>      </u>	dated <u>      </u>
Addendum No. <u>      </u>	dated <u>      </u>

As stated in the solicitation documents, this form is included in our Technical Proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name Printed

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title