February 1st, 2019 (emailed to all proposers on this date)

ADDENDUM # 2
RFP 301902

CONDUCT AND CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Please note the following answers to questions that were asked prior to the deadline for inquiries date of January 28th, 2019 (3:00 PM., MST).

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

**Answer:** We are unable to contract with vendors that store ASU data outside the US.

Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

**Answer:** 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 conduct and case management solution.

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

**Answer:** 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 conduct and case management solution.

Can we submit the proposals via email?

**Answer:** No, please refer to section X - Form of Proposal / Special Instructions. Both hard and digital copies of your response are required.

Number of anticipated Users requiring access ("logging into") the system to perform functions

**Answer:** Estimate around 500-600 users. Please remember this is purely an estimate, and a more accurate number of users would need to be determined later in the evaluation process. If additional departments are onboarded to the enterprise system, there may be additional users.
Please confirm the language in Section V, page 12, referencing 2 separate instances' for Student conduct and Staff conduct. Is the University looking for both? 

**Answer:** No, staff conduct is not part of the scope of this RFP.

Integrations -- please confirm the number of integrations anticipated and the names of the systems (People Soft, etc.)

**Answer:** Integrations include but are not limited to PeopleSoft, our data warehouse, and other in-house applications through APIs. There is no specific number that we can provide at this time.

Page 7, Section IV Article 3 - you mention that documents should be "clearly marked to indicate they are printed on recycled content." Does this mark need to be placed on every page of the document, or is the first page sufficient?

**Answer:** Marking the first page of the response with this information should be sufficient.

Page 9, Section IV, Articles 19-21 – you mention that the other state universities (U of A or NAU), Maricopa County Community College District and/or Maricopa County, or the Cooperative Organizations can have access granted to any contract that results from the RFP. If the license is determined by predetermined items such as # of users, # of students managed, etc., can it be assumed that additional goods and/or services may be required that are outside of the scope of this RFP? If not, and future increases in pricing need to be called out specifically in the RFP, what figures should be use for determining pricing should these other parties be granted access to this contract?

**Answer:** Section IV #19-21 identifies the fact that our sister universities and co-operative organizations MAY utilize our RFP to help fulfill their procurement requirements. These entities can and should not be considered as part of the response you provide to ASU's RFP. They are separate organizations from ASU, and in the event that they wanted to utilize ASU's RFP at the end of the process, they would individually reach out to the awardee to develop their own pricing, contract, relationship, etc. This language simply identifies the fact that they have the ability to utilize ASU's RFP process to mirror that of their own procurement requirements.

Page 18, Section V, Transitions In/Out Plan – you mention that the finalized plan will be submitted after a contract in awarded. Does a draft need to be submitted as a part of this RFP? 

**Answer:** Yes, please submit a response to this question under the "Answer" portion of this section in the RFP.

The RFP mentions all faculty but we could not find specific numbers of users for the system. Is there an anticipated number of users by role? For example, service participants, case managers, business administrators?

**Answer:** We don’t have a specific number of users by role assigned at this time, but we are estimating around 500-600 users overall. If additional departments are onboarded to the enterprise system, there may be additional users. Please note that anyone (ASU faculty, staff, students or outside community) can report a case into the system. Additional information regarding ASU trend data for students and employees can be found here.
Does ASU have any workflow diagrams or process diagrams available for this Student Conduct process? An understanding of the actual work done helps us to develop a solution that tightly aligns to ASU's needs.

**Answer:** Every group has a different process, and there is no general workflow or diagram that can be shared at this time.

Much of the RFP language suggests a SaaS offering in mind. Our solutions can span the range of in-house hosted, in-house private cloud, or sole-instance commercial/government cloud. How many options is ASU interesting in evaluating?

**Answer:** We are open to many different types of solutions. Please propose your suggested solution type.

We may actually struggle a bit to find two organizations who have terminated projects with us. We found one today on our call. We're in use by more than 50 government, NGOs, and universities; if we can't meet that requirement will that be a problem?

**Answer:** Please detail this information in your response to the question. A minimum of two references is requested. If that is not feasible, please specifically address this in your response.

Please describe any shortcomings of or other areas of dissatisfaction with ASU's current software system for conduct and case management. If not, why is the University soliciting proposals for alternatives?

**Answer:** Our current provider’s application does not meet all of ASU security terms and conditions as listed in the RFP. Additionally, our departments use different software systems and/or manual processes to manage the student conduct data. For this reason, the University is looking for a single enterprise-wide solution that fits everyone's needs.

How much does ASU pay annually to the provider of its current software system for conduct and case management? Please itemize which portions of that total payment are specific to conduct and case management. Including any modules, add-ons, or payments for additional services necessitated in whole or in part by the University's conduct and case management needs. Please note and explain any discounts including but not limited to those made possible by the purchase of other services from the same provider (or associated providers) that may be factored in or otherwise impact the current amount paid. If there were specific costs related to the installation, implementation, or other non-recurring payments made in order to acquire the University's current software system for conduct and case management, please list those costs, the approximate date they were paid, and a description of what they covered.

**Answer:** In FY 19, with the information we have available, about $24,000 was spent with our current provider. Please note that our fiscal year runs from July 1 – June 30th so the current fiscal year is not yet complete. Please also note that this aggregate spend is only for select units across campus that have chosen to purchase from our current provider at this time. The intent is to consider going enterprise-wide with a conduct and case management solution. In regards to the additional requests, we do not have this information available at this time.
On page 6 of the RFP, ASU writes, "Further, we will assume that your failure to attend the pre-proposal conferences is an indication that you expect us to review your proposal as if you had taken advantage of the pre-proposal conference." On what logical basis does the University form that assumption?

**Answer:** All responses are reviewed as if respondents have attended the pre-proposal conference.

On page 19, in item #71, ASU states "Proposer should provide a brief summary of any other value-added services or programs which may contribute to the overall value of your proposal including but not limited to...f. Comment to provide significant financial and non-financial support for the University and its signature program." Is the University soliciting a bribe? How or how not?

**Answer:** No. This section provides an opportunity for suppliers to demonstrate and set forth any other value in their response that is outside the scope of work for the RFP.

How do ASU's efforts to "reduce the adverse environmental impact of [its] purchasing decisions," as expanded upon in Section VI of the RFP, comport with the RFP's requirements for printed copies of documentation that can - and also must - be transmitted electronically?

**Answer:** ASU maintains original, printed copies of all responses on file for public records.

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 & Business Services