Addendum #1
RFP #301905

Curriculum and Catalog Management Software and Other Related Services

Please note the following answers are to questions that were asked prior to the deadline for inquiries date of June 27th, 2019 (3 P.M., MST).

1. From my initial review of the RFP the most obvious omission was in respect to ASU’s timeline:
   a. For making a decision after all proposals are received and reviewed (and probable intermediate steps such as selection of a "short list", on-site demos/presentations from "short listed" vendors, target date for final decision, target windows for board approval -- if required, etc.)

   At this time, ASU is unable to share a timeline with respect to the Evaluation steps and processes. Please note that there are several stakeholders in this process and that the evaluation requires input from each of them. Formal notices regarding the final award will be shared with the RFP’s respondents.

   b. For the implementation itself (i.e. a target start date for the implementation with the successful bidder, the target for implementation completion, etc.)

   At this time, ASU is unable to share a timeline with respect to the Evaluation steps and processes. Please note that there are several stakeholders in this process and that the evaluation requires input from each of them. Formal notices regarding the final award will be shared with the RFP’s respondents.

2. In Section 2 Background Information, the RFP states that ASU is comprised of 4 differentiated campuses. Are all 4 of these campuses "in scope" for the Curriculum & Catalog initiative? How many Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) do these 4 campuses (or the individual campus/campuses that are in scope) represent?

   ASU operates as a single entity, and each of its four campuses qualify as potential parties that can partake in the purchasing of software and related services that may be offered through this RFP. Statistics regarding campus representation and other ASU facts can be found at: https://www.asu.edu/facts/#/
3. In Section 3 Term of Contract mention is made of the contract being available for use by "other University Departments". Can you provide clarity on what "other" departments would not be included in the initial scope and thus, eligible to adopt under this contract subsequently?

ASU operates as a single entity, and all units, departments, and campuses qualify as potential parties that can adopt the software and related services that may be offered through this RFP.

4. In Section IV, Item 21 a mention is made of various Co-operative organizations ASU is a member of and for whom the contract is applicable. Can you please provide a complete list of these Co-operative organizations?

By definition, ASU has to ability to share RFPs with any entities as listed in A. R.S. sections 11-952 and 41-2632.

5. ASU has included Section XIV - Security Review. Are we correct in concluding that this has been provided for informational use only, so that all bidders are aware of the fact that such a review will be done by the ASU project team upon selection? Put another way, is it correct that there is no need to complete this review and provide it as part of a bidder's proposal?

Correct. The Security Review within Section XIV has been included for informational purposes only so respondents are aware of what is expected for the evaluation and award process. Before final award, ASU expects a final negotiated contract, completed security review, and approved Certificate of Insurance to be in place.

6. ASU has also included Reference document #2 to Section XIV. Can you confirm that there is no requirement to submit the Security Architecture Diagram as part of a bidder's proposal?

The Security Architecture Diagram within Section XIV has been included for informational purposes only so respondents are aware of what is expected for the evaluation and award process. Before final award, ASU expects a final negotiated contract, completed security review, and approved Certificate of Insurance to be in place.

7. Connects curriculum proposals with associated proposals for prefixes, courses (new, modified etc.), multiple internal approval levels, and fees allowing curriculum packages to move through the approval process together. Can ASU provide more insight into this requirement with a specific use case or two?

A new undergraduate degree proposal may include:
i. The degree proposal itself
ii. A new course prefix proposal
iii. New course proposals (in the new prefix being requested or existing prefixes)
iv. Modify proposals for existing courses (for example the course title, number of credits, prerequisites etc.)

Each of these items currently represents a different form with a different routing path for approval. We would want them to travel through the governance process as a package and move forward to implementation together. For example, we wouldn’t want to implement a new prefix for a degree that ultimately doesn’t get approved.

8. What is the source of the data to be used and is it structured?

Currently all of our academic data is in PeopleSoft. It is structured. PeopleSoft still needs to serve as the system of record. Data will need to be pushed into and pulled out of PeopleSoft.

9. Is the data complete i.e. is all the data required to implement the project requirements currently available in a structured format?

Yes, the data is all available. However, it is not centralized and is in multiple systems. It is the goal of this RFP to implement a single system to store data in a structured format.

10. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

Yes, but we are unable to contract with vendors that store ASU data outside the US.

11. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

The process moving forward is yet to be determined. No meetings are expected prior to your response. After your response is submitted, onsite demonstrations may be considered. If this question is in regards to meetings between ASU and the potential awardee, please propose your suggestions when it comes to meetings needed for the implementation process and the relationship moving forward to onboard and provide ASU with a successful curriculum and catalog management solution.

12. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

We are open to accepting proposals from anyone. If this question is in regards to meetings between ASU and the potential awardees, please propose your suggestions when it comes to meetings needed for the implementation process and the relationship moving forward to onboard and provide ASU with a successful curriculum and catalog management solution.
13. Can we submit the proposals via email?

No, please refer to Section X – Form of Proposal / Special Instructions. Both hard and digital copies of your response are required.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please contact me at allyson.taylor@asu.edu

Thank you,

Allyson Taylor
Buyer
Arizona State University Purchasing and Business Services