October 29, 2018

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

ADDENDUM 4

RFP 341903 Open Source Learning Technologies Development Services

Please note the following answers to questions that were asked prior to the deadline for inquiries date of 10/19/18 at 3:00 P.M., MST.

Q1: Can proposals be mailed / overnight expressed vs. hand-delivered?  
A1: Proposals can be mailed. Please see the instructions for mailing of your proposal per Section I of the RFP.

Q2: Will more weighting be given to vendors who already have a contract in place with ASU and/or already do work with ASU departments? Or, does that just make # 4 of the evaluation criteria (Acknowledgment and Acceptance of ASU Terms and Conditions) a full 10%?  
A2: All proposals will be evaluated equally regardless of previous working experience with ASU. If a vendor has previous working experience with ASU, they should reference it in their proposal.

Q3: Other than what is listed in Section II 1. Intent, are there specific open source tools used by ASU that should be considered?  
A3: In section II - 1. There is specified broad areas where we currently apply or plan to apply open source tools / frameworks. The intention is not to restrict the responses to open source tools that we already use in these areas. ASU would like vendors to propose open source technology based applications, solutions and expertise that will allow ASU to expand its toolset.

Q4: How should we identify the submission, i.e. that it is made by our company? Is there any title page form that should be attached to the overall submission?  
A4: Please follow the instructions of Section I of the RFP. The contents of the proposal, including any title page, table of contents, etc. is left to the proposer to determine. ASU prefers clear and concise proposals that follow the instructions of the RFP for ease of evaluation.

Q5: 2. Which of the following can we enclose as part of proposal submission?  
(1) presentations and slide decks (illustrating services and offerings)  
(2) case studies  
(3) interactive examples and proof of concepts (such as html5/js examples on confidential flash drive)  
A5: All may be provided in your submission. Please note that the hard copy and the soft copy (i.e. digital flash drive or CD copy) of your proposal must be exact copies of each other. Do not submit the two copies of the proposal that differs in any way. If the proposal includes some interactive example for software that cannot be clearly communicated in the hard-copy proposal, the hard-copy proposal must call out in reference to a weblink or how the soft copy of the proposal directs the ASU evaluator to the interactive example. Note that ASU should not download any file application to ASU computers to evaluate said interactive example.

Q6: Please provide information on the platforms being used at ASU?  
List of LMS(s)
**CRM**
Internal communication tools
Student Information System
Scheduling/calendar tools
Data Exchange with the data-warehouse or ODS

**A6:** LMSs: Canvas, Coursera, OpenEdX, Blackboard, Moodle
**CRM:** SalesForce
**Internal Comm Tools:** RocketChat, Slack, Zoom
**SIS:** Peoplesoft, Salesforce
**Scheduling/Calendar:** Outlook, Google Calendar, Jira, Trello
**Data Exchange/ODS:** Microsoft BI Stack, Redshift

---

**Q7:** We understand that ASU is moving to Canvas LMS. Can you let us know how this decision will be impacting edPlus? Is there a need for tools that automate the migration of legacy courses to Canvas or services to support this migration?

**A7:** Canvas has built-in capability to import Blackboard courses. However, we are interested in CMS solutions that promote re-use of learning content and assets that will ease future migrations. CMS systems like learning object repositories that index content with metadata and allow searching, versioning, analytics and seamless integration with LMSs.

---

**Q8:** Do you use HEDA (community-driven data architecture) as part of your existing technology stack? If not HEDA, what data architecture are you leveraging?

**A8:** We leverage HEDA architecture in our Salesforce CRM. Salesforce integrates data from our SIS, marketing, enrollment and success coaching operations with automated communication logic, triggers and visualizations focussed on student success.

---

**Q9:** We understand that ASU is looking for Accessibility enhancements and remediation to meet Section 508 and WCAG guidelines. Can you specify the level of WCAG compliance ASU is looking for?

**A9:** Please see Addendum 3 of this RFP that addresses the updated VPAT Version 2.2 and that also addresses the level WCAG compliance per this question.

---

**Q10:** What other cloud platforms does the university want to deploy the Learning Tools and Learning tools development applications on (beyond AWS)? We understand that ASU wants to enable learning credential generation as needed (e.g. certificates and badges for students).

**A10:** AWS is the preferred cloud platform. ASU does have applications deployed on the Google Cloud Platform (GCP) as well. AS is interested in credential portability across all projects and looking to leverage the universal learning record standard (IMS-Global) towards that goal. ASU has leveraged the built-in certificate generation capability of Open edX and currently use Open Badges Initiative (OBI) standard badging platforms like Badgr and Acclaim that have seamless LMS integration.

---

**Q11:** Does ASU currently utilize any service for micro-credentials or certificate generation? Does ASU intend to leverage the recent Badger integrations provided via Canvas?

**A11:** This RFP is for multiple projects including those that do not use Canvas. Badger is one tool that has been considered by ASU. OpenEdX has its own certificate and badge tools as well that we use.

---

**Q12:** Does integration with external data sources for the sake of transmitting Caliper/xAPI events imply that ASU already has a Learning Record Store (LRS) or can we suggest our LRS solution as part of the LT? Are there any plans to use the learning events stored in an LRS?

**A12:** ASU does not have an LRS. ASU does collect and store learning event data in Redshift for ad hoc analyses and research. However, current data collection is via periodic data dumps from LMSs. ASU currently doesn’t have any tooling for streaming data collection. This effort is in its early stages and we would be interested in tools and tech that would help streamline event data collection and storage.
Q13: Kindly elaborate on any pre-existing data-warehousing capabilities within ASU?
A13: ASU data warehouse is currently being migrated to AWS with Redshift being used as the primary data store.

Q14: Would it be appropriate for us to include products and tools developed in the AR/VR space, considering ASU's intention of embracing Daydream-based headsets?
A14: Yes, and please do not limit offerings to Daydream.

Q15: Does ASU utilize any tools (other than edX) for the development and delivery of assessments, courses or simulations? Kindly provide the applicable technology stacks.
A15: Custom built simulations (Single Page Apps) are generally built using Vue.js with Firebase. We have a custom built assessment platform (LTI provider) built on a MEAN stack. We use H5P and Knowbly for simple interactive content.

Q16: Does ASU's existing Content Management System (CMS) reside in the cloud? Kindly elaborate on the existing asset/content classification mechanisms in place. Are any open standards and/or services used by the CMS for the purposes of classification, metadata generation, and automatic tagging?
A16: ASU is currently onboarding a DAM (Digital Asset Management) system that will host, tag, version and distribute the media assets used in courses such as images, videos etc. However, ASU would be interested in a Learning Object Repository/CMS for more granular assets that has the features that you describe.

Q17: Our products make use of LTI integrations with external tools. Does ASU use LTI or any other interop mechanism across it's LMS, CRM and internal tools (such as calendars)?
A17: LTI is the primary integration mechanism that ASU uses. ASU leverages LMS specific integrations as well (e.g. Canvas API integration, Open edX JSInput, Coursera Plugin architecture).

Q18: Can we provide addendums to the proposal to provide a detailed description of the products/services since there is a restriction on the number of pages to the response for Section 5 and 7? Alternatively, can we add new Sections to sections 5 and 7 to describe the solution/response?
A18: Addendums to the proposal that relate to Section V or Section VII will be included in the overall page amount related to your proposal's response to those sections. The proposer may add new sections to the RFP to describe the solution/response that must be added under Section 5.10.1 (Value-Added Services): "The proposer may use this section to provide any other additional detail or information that may benefit the overall evaluation of their proposal, including the consideration of the criteria in 5.10 Value-Added Services. The proposer should provide their response to this section in the space below."

Q19: Does the restriction on the number of pages of the response documents (Section V and VII) refer to pages or folios?
A19: Pages.

Q20: 5.7.2 - Selected vendors will need to perform staging builds off the developed content for ASU.
Q: Can you clarify what this means and how it would apply to a company providing a software license?
A20: This statement doesn't apply to software license option. Some of the requirements are only for the development side. Although ASU does expect that, where necessary, software is integrated into ASU systems or platforms.
Q21: The proposer shall present evidence that the firm or its officers have been engaged for at least the past five (5) years in providing services as listed in this Request for Proposal.

Q: The InScribe platform has not been in market for 5 years, however the officers of the company have been engaged in building and delivering similar solutions for more than 20 years. Can we speak to this?

Q: What constitutes “evidence” to support our past and current work?
A21: Yes. Evidence can include a summary of previous projects.

Q22: The proposer must provide a minimum of three (3) references, a description of recent project and/or experience in providing similar services as described in this RFP, including institution size. References should be verifiable and able to comment on the firm’s experience, with a preference for references receiving services similar to those described in this Proposal. Include the name, title, telephone number, and email address of the individual at the organization most familiar with the Proposer.

Q: ASU has been using our product for more than 2 years for a particular project. Can we include an ASU employee as a reference?
A22: Yes.

Please remember that Proposals are to be mailed or delivered to Arizona State University Purchasing and Business Services 1551 S. Rural Rd. Tempe, AZ 85281, no later than 3:00 P.M., MST, 11/01/18.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please contact me at 480-965-3849 or Lorenzo.Espinoza@asu.edu. You may also find RFP 341903 and any updates at http://www.asu.edu/purchasing/bids/index.html