

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

**Clarification Questions for Lamar CISD  
RFP #05-2009 Instruction Management System  
November 19, 2008**

**INFORMATION FROM DISTRICT:**

- I. **CHANGE:** Deadline for receipt of responses to RFP #05-2009 has been extended to 2:00 pm on **December 18, 2008**.
- II. Process Review Summaries are available at <http://www.eps4.com/LCISDProcessReview.zip> .
- III. LCISD is planning to use site visits during the best and final assessment process. This is an information only item in that the vendor is not responsible for these visits.

**QUESTIONS FROM VENDORS:**

1. **SE14 refers to a bio system for security – does the district currently have a specific system identified?**  
A: No.
2. **On page 6 it states the district would require for the vendor to provide all hardware which would normally void the warranty of any major manufacturer. Would the district purchase the hardware directly if specifications were provided?**  
A: Yes.
3. **On page 6 it states that the vendor would need a full time project manager. Would the district require the project manager to be solely assigned to this project, and if so would they have to be on site?**  
A: No, the project manager does not have to be solely assigned to this project. The project manager does not have to be on site to deliver the service if the PM model supports remote management.
4. **On page 13 it is stated that the student information system includes the grade book program, but there are 84 objectives for a grade book program. Is the district looking to acquire a second grade book program?**  
A: The district is planning to evaluate grade book programs including the current grade book program within the SMS. The district will evaluate if any grade book proposals are more closely integrated into the instruction and assessment processes and if this integration brings more benefits than the SMS and grade book integration that currently exist.
5. **Page 19, can you elaborate on the national organizations and standards that are mentioned?**  
A: The proposed solution should support alignment of the District's curriculum, instruction and assessment to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). See the Curriculum Process Review Document for additional information. Currently the District indirectly aligns to federal standards through the TEKS; however, if the proposed solution supports other standards alignment it should be documented.

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

6. T4 - “Ability for the state and district to define which standard and local test are to be recorded.” Which department at TEA would we need to contact for their clarification? A: Can the proposed solution support changes required by the state in standards and test reporting. Please elaborate from the district’s perspective on the possible test that would be used.

A: Current test are taken within the district include, but are not limited to, SAT, RPTE, TPRI, SDAA, PSAT, ACT, DRA, EDL, PSP, TABS, AP, IOWA, UNIT, RIAS, RIST and ITBS.

LCISD uses NAEP as a baseline

**Local** - Proficiency test done by district. Benchmarking by district.

**State** – TAKS, EOC (End Of Course) Testing, State Testing program data;

**Federal** – Advanced Placement

SAT - <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SAT>

ACT - **American College Testing Program**

Developmental Reading Assessment (**DRA**) ;

TPRI – Formative - Texas Primary Reading Inventory (**TPRI**).

Dyslexia Testing

Special Education Testing

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements

PSAT (Preliminary SAT) – 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade

NMSQT - National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test

7. On page 72, RA 22 refers to aligning with ISAT (Illinois Standard Achievement Test). Has the district already aligned the Texas standards to the Illinois standards or would the vendor be responsible for this task.

A: This is an error. The application must align to the Texas standards.

8. PD75, If this system is hosted outside the district’s network, would the district consider any hosting besides Avatar?

A: The district will evaluate all hosting solutions and has no pre-conditioned preference to a hosting solution vendor.

9. SM 11 refers to the state being interested in the number of staff available for telephone support. Who at TEA would contact so we could ask for clarification of this requirement?

A: Replace “The state” with “the district”.

10. The RFP does not specifically address the number of copies that are required for submission (other than for the cost portion as outlined on p. 32). What are LCISD’s submission requirements?

A: See Section 5. Respondent will submit one (1) original and three (3) complete copies of the proposal.

11. On the RFP Response Sheets worksheet and the Specifications worksheet in the LCIMS Bid Response WS, there are several places where it says “Yes/No. RFP reference.” Just to be clear, does “RFP reference” mean that responders are to put together a narrative response to accompany the spreadsheet response and that we are to put in the page number within the narrative that goes with each “Yes/No” answer?

A: The responders should answer Yes or No if the proposed solution supports the process. If the answer is yes, the responders should reference the page in the RFP that describes the application support for the process. The responder

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

does not have to write a specific narrative to accompany the spreadsheet if the product documentation provides the information.

- 12. In the “Reference” worksheet in the LCIMS Bid Response WS, the first two reference areas seem to have specifications that the responder have references from a specific type of Texas-based client; however the RFP itself states on p.10 that vendors who do not currently have a Texas-based client can still respond and be evaluated. Given this, can the District please provide guidance on how to complete the references worksheet for references number 1 and 2?**

**A:** Answer section 200 accurately. For non Texas references see lines 222-228. You may add two additional references at the bottom of the worksheet with the requested information for each reference.

- 13. The RFP includes professional development management capabilities for LCISD and (on page 13, item 3.1.3) indicates that the “proposed solution will be required to integrate data from the existing management systems of the district through automated procedures”; what systems are currently in place to meet the professional development requirements outlined in the RFP? What professional development data integration will be required from existing systems to the new system (please describe detailed information about the type and scope of data)?**

**A:** See Section 3.1.3 for existing systems. The system should integrate any data that is originated and maintained in another management system rather than duplicating data entry. For example, the Human Resource System is the System of Record for employee information, teacher assignments and highly qualified recording. The Student Management System is the System of Record for teacher schedules. It is expected that the Professional Development System would be System of Record for district course registration, course completion, professional development scheduling, etc. The respondent should describe the ability of the system to integrate data from and to other system including the technical methods available, including but not limited to, the following examples:

- Command Line Scripts
- Delimited Text
- DSML
- Java Messaging Services (JMS) and IBM WebSphere MQ
- Identity Manager Driver for RSA - (Partner Developed Driver)
- Pulsen Snapshot - (3rd Party Driver)
- Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)
- SOAP
- SPML
- LDAP

The District is evaluating the use of Novell Identity Manager. If the responder has an IDM driver, or supports an existing IDM driver, or has integrated data before using IDM, the responder should document this within the response. Information about Novell Identify Manager is included at the end of this addendum.

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

- 14. Per p. 6, the RFP indicates that the goal of the project is to “stage the implementation of the system(s) throughout the 2009-2010 instructional year” and then later on, p. 15 – item 3.1.7 indicates that the system will be implemented over a two year window. Which timeline should vendors use to develop a proposed project plan? What staging is envisioned by the District? Which areas does the District intend to address first?**

**A:** The school years of 2008 and 2009 will be used for implementation with the objective of having all available systems available by 2010. The District will implement the program in a systematic method that will provide the required modeling, training, support, change management and testing. It is envisioned that Systems such as Grade Book, Assessment Reporting and Professional Development could be implemented in phase I. Providers who have a comprehensive system should provide a recommendation with the proposed implementation calendar.

- 15. Related to above question, what integrations (description, type, size) may be required between the overall IMS and the professional development area?**

**A:** The integration of the IMS and PD system will depend upon the system capabilities. If data is required within the PD system that is originally “keyed-in” in other systems, it would be required that the information be transferred between systems rather than double data entry.

- 16. Pages 15 to 16 – Item 3.2 indicates that “Details on current practice are available upon request” for the current and planned best practice processes within LCISD; we would like to request those details on current practice, with a particular focus on the professional development management area.**

**A:** Included as additional documents provided with this addendum.

- 17. Per p. 18 – item 3.3, we would like to request the Process Assessment Report Summary.**

**A:** Included as additional documents with this addendum

- 18. Page 25 – Item 3.4.1 outlines the feature and functional areas; page 26 – Item 3.4.2 outlines the technical and system specifications. In reviewing the specific requirements found in Appendix E, it seems that if a vendor were only going to respond with a Professional Development Management capability, that many of the Technical and System Specifications would be outside of the scope of that single capability. Can LCISD please clarify how a vendor should respond to the Technical and System Specifications if they are going to bid only on the Professional Development Management capability?**

**A:** List any exceptions that do not apply to your response in the Bid Response WS or within the RFP response with a reference in the Bid Response WS.

- 19. On p. 26 – Item 3.4.2, the RFP states that “Single-point data entry of all data is a requirement.” Can LCISD say more about this requirement? If a vendor is going to respond only to the Professional Data Management area, how would this requirement apply?**

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

A: It is envisioned that data will be entered into the System of Record and will be integrated as needed through secured data transfer between management systems and it will not require double entry of the same data into the systems.

- 20. On p. 29-30 – item 4.2.1, the RFP outlines five license options; are vendors to choose one option for their response?**

A: The Vendor can propose multiple license options and cost.

- 21. On p. 30 – item 4.3, the RFP outlines three different options for the Systems Delivery Platform; are vendors to choose one option for their response?**

A: The Vendors can propose a single or multiple system delivery platform solutions if the solutions has multiple options to evaluate.

- 22. On p. 34 – item 5.0, a campus cost breakdown is included; are vendors required to fill out that form? Our assumption is that all campuses will use the professional development management component of the system and data on teachers by school location is not available in Appendix A.**

A: No. if the vendor proposes a district solution and is priced accordingly, then campus pricing breakout is not required. The number of teachers per campus is available upon request.

- 23. Will the professional development management area need to integrate with eSchool Solutions SEMS? It is not listed as a requirement. If integration is desired, would this be considered a Value-Add to the project? Can the District please describe the hoped-for functionality of the integration?**

A: The response should reflect any integration that has been previously done with any of the existing systems within the district and the technical capabilities to exchange data with other systems.

- 24. On p. 52 – item PS.34, does LCISD envision the links to professional development and teacher training programs as being managed by the professional development management capacity outlined in the RFP? How does the District envision this flowing and working? We have the same question for item CM.11 on p. 60.**

A: The Instructional Management System to provide a link to courses that are available to support instruction (of a learning objective or on a teaching strategy, etc.). The PD system would support the courses to be aligned to standards, teaching strategies, programs and other variables.

- 25. On p. 62 – item PD.4, the District has included a requirement for a “Personal portfolio...”; can the District say more about what function the personal portfolio serves and how it envisions the portfolio working?**

A: The ability for an employee to see and manage the training and courses that have been completed, what needs to be completed, along with other certificates and relevant information to support the Professional Development initiatives of the employee, the district or by regulations.

- 26. On p. 62 – item PD.10, the District indicates that it wants registration process by “blocks” – what are blocks?**

A: The ability to enroll a group of people into a course.

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

**27. On p. 63 – item PD.18, the RFP indicates that the proposed solution should “Massively upload historical CEU credit records for participants.” Can the District describe this requirement in more detail? Is this a one-time upload of historical information when the system is being set up or some type of ongoing data upload required? Assuming the former, approximately how many records are included in the historical data and in what format is the data? Will District staff be made available to work to put the data into a vendor-defined format or will the vendor need to complete that work?**

**A:** Yes. One time upload. If the vendor has a record limitation for upload, this limit should be identified and communication within the RFP. The vendor will be required to define the format, data elements, field characteristics, and process to the District. The District's data specialist or district staff will organize the data in the required format.

**28. On p. 63 – items PD.20 and PD.21, call for the management of “regular,” “Continued Education,” and “Gifted and Talented” credit hours, requirements, and achievement. Can the District please provide further background info on these different categories, how these categories are used, etc.?**

**A:** The management system will be able to categorize credit hours towards a program.

**29. On p. 63 – item PD.30, asks for “Scheduling in time” and “Automatic Registration” options; can the District clarify the requirements for these areas?**

**A:** The systems should provide features that support the scheduling, registration, pre-requisites and notification of participants. . The vendor should be prepared to discuss the process support that the proposed system provides.

**30. On p. 63 – item PD.31, asks for “Control the entries on the course registration list for all participants”; can the District clarify the requirements for this area?**

**31. A:** The systems should provide features that support the scheduling, registration, pre-requisites and notification of participants. . The vendor should be prepared to discuss the process support that the proposed system provides.

**32. On p. 63 – item PD.32, asks for “Workflow manager for catalog publishing.” Is this for new courses that need to be approved or for something else?**

**A:** Yes, support new course approval.

**33. On p. 63 – item PD.41 calls for “Broadcast Pop-up messages configured by Administrators” and then item PD. 45 calls for “Broadcast Pop-up message windows”; are these the same requirement?**

**A:** Yes.

**34. On p. 63 – item PD.46 calls for “Flexible content organization”; can the District please clarify this requirement?**

**A:** The ability for the system to manage the course information and provide registration and access to the courses, not necessarily housing the content.

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

- 35. The Professional Development Management requirements imply that the District is seeking a content management system for the creation of online courses; what is the District currently using to meet this need?**  
A: The District uses Moodle for online course management.
- 36. On p. 64 – item PD.74 requests “fully customizable”; can the District clarify this requirement?**  
A: Customize the use of the system to meet the District’s needs.
- 37. On p. 64 – item PD.75 requests “Hosted by Client or hosting services available through Avatar – does this mean the District prefers an Avatar solution for the professional development management portion of the project? Can an alternate vendor recommend ASP hosting for its services?**  
A: The district will evaluate all hosting solutions and has no pre-conditioned preference to a hosting solution vendor.
- 38. On p. 67, the RFP indicates that the “District needs access to Teacher certification information.” Is this part of the Professional Development Management area? A: Yes, it is envisioned that the PD Management could integrate certification information for an employee. Where does this data reside? A: Within Human Resources. How is certification information currently derived, tracked and managed? A: Employees are responsible for management of information. Employees provide Human Resources copies of certification as required.**
- 39. On p. 75 – item ST.5, the RFP indicates the “Ability for system to customize to state coding standards.” Can the District please clarify this requirement?**  
A: The system should support the TEKS numbering and organization structure.
- 40. On p.77, is there an item SM.10 that is missing?**  
A: No SM.10 was deleted.
- 41. On p. 83 – Item UI.40 – does this apply to the Professional Development Management area?**  
A: Automating notifications could be a value in all systems.
- 42. Are proposing vendors to sign and submit the insurance forms ending on p. 96 or will those documents be signed only by the contracting vendors?**  
A: The General Terms and Conditions Signature Page and the Contractual Terms and Conditions Signature Page must be signed prior to acceptance for best and final evaluation and it is the preference of the District to have them signed upon delivery; however, the RFP will be accepted under the conditions that the Terms and Conditions are under review by the respondent.
- 43. In section 3.1.3 it talks about integrating data from the existing management systems, the following questions refer to this section.**  
a. **How many systems will need to exchange data with the Professional Development Management System (PDMS).and what type of data will be exchanged?**  
A: The Human Resource System as a minimum and employee data information.

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

b. In Attachment C, which of those systems need to exchange data with the PDMS? What type of data will be exchanged?

A: The Human Resource System as a minimum and employee data information.

c. Will the data being exchanged be one way data exchange or two way?

A: Two way. Employee Data and Certification Completion.

d. Can data be exchanged in batch mode at a set time interval or will it need to be real-time?

A: Batch mode would be acceptable.

e. Will the vendor need to be able to write scripts on the unknown 3<sup>rd</sup> party system? If so, what scripting languages will the vendor need to be able to support?

A: The vendor should describe the integration methods available with their system.

44. In the VendorQuals tab of the Bid Response Worksheet, the following information is requested: Centralized Master Bidders List Number, Catalog Info Systems Vendor Number, and Service Provider Identification Number. Are these required numbers? How does a vendor go about acquiring these numbers?

A: No. These identification numbers are not required to respond and will not be used in the evaluation process. The RFP process negates the need to use these prequalified procurement tools.

45. The Bid Response Worksheet does not provide a line-by-line format for responding to the Product Specification Requirements outlined in Appendix E. Does the District have a preferred format for response to those requirements (i.e., descriptive information for each requirement in a tabular format vs. more general narrative about product capabilities)?

A: The vendor should designate within the Bid Response WS the areas that are being addressed within the response and be prepared to address in detail to the selection committee through a demonstration and presentation of the solution the proposed systems capabilities in the specification areas. The priority on evaluation will be the system ability to support the processes within the district and what features and functions are utilized to provide that support.

46. We have noted an error in our prior questions. Our question number 6 stated the following: "Related to question #3, what integrations (description, type, size) may be required between the overall IMS and the professional development area?" However, we should have referred to question #4, so that the question would read the following: "Related to question #4, what integrations (description, type, size) may be required between the overall IMS and the professional development area?" Our apologies!

A: (Reference Number 13 above)



# LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD

## ADDENDUM #1

### Identity Manager Drivers - Connected Systems

Identity Manager solves the problem of inconsistencies in common data within a network. Identity Manager is a data-sharing service that leverages eDirectory™ to distribute new and updated information across designated directories and applications on an enterprise network and partner system outside the firewall. A unique application connector, called a "driver," is required to enable Identity Manager to communicate with each specific application or directory.

To facilitate the deployment of Identity Manager solutions, Novell provides Identity Manager drivers that interface with popular business applications, and resources for developing other, custom drivers. With a complete Identity Manager solution, you can eliminate the barriers between your network applications that inhibit eBusiness success.

Identity Manager drivers connect to a variety of systems and are packaged as distinct integration modules. Get all the details on Identity Manager packaging and pricing. +

Need to develop a custom driver? Check out Novell's driver development resources. +

### Applications

---

- o Baan
- o Google Apps Drivers:
  - o CosmosKey - Google Apps Driver
  - o Concensus - Google Apps Driver
- o HP Service Desk (Partner Developed Driver)
- o J.D.Edwards
- o Lawson
- o Oracle
- o PeopleSoft
- o SAP HR
- o SAP R/3 4.6 and SAP Enterprise Systems (BASIS)
- o SAP Web Application Server (Web AS) 6.20
- o Siebel
- o SugarCRM (Partner Developed Driver)

### Databases

---

- o IBM DB2
- o Informix
- o Microsoft SQL Server
- o MySQL
- o Oracle
- o Sybase
- o JDBC

### Directories

---

- o Critical Path InJoin Directory
- o IBM Directory Server (SecureWay)
- o iPlanet Directory Server
- o Microsoft Active Directory
- o Netscape Directory Server
- o NIS
- o NIS +

# LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD ADDENDUM #1

Novell eDirectory  
Oracle Internet Directory  
Sun ONE Directory Server  
LDAP

## E-mail systems

---

Microsoft Exchange 2000/2003/2007  
Microsoft Exchange 5.5  
Novell GroupWise®  
Lotus Notes

## Mainframe

---

RACF  
ACF2  
Top Secret

## Midrange

---

i5OS (OS/400)

## Operating Systems

---

SUSE® Linux Enterprise  
Debian Linux  
FreeBSD  
HP-UX  
IBM AIX  
Microsoft Windows NT Domain  
Red Hat AS and ES  
Red Hat Linux  
Solaris  
UNIX Files - /etc/passwd

## PBX

---

Avaya PBX  
Asterisk - (Partner Developed Driver)  
VoiceRD - (Partner Developed Driver)

## Other

---

Command Line Scripts  
Delimited Text  
Health Level 7 (HL7) - (Partner Developed Driver)  
DSML  
Java Messaging Services (JMS) and IBM WebSphere MQ  
Identity Manager Driver for RSA - (Partner Developed Driver)  
Pulsen Snapshot - (3rd Party Driver)  
Remedy (for Help Desk)  
Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)

**LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD  
ADDENDUM #1**

SOAP  
SPML  
EJBCA Certificate Driver-(3rd Party Driver)

---

---

**NOTE:**  
Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing and dating this page and include a copy with your proposals.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_