

Addendum 1

RFP - Academic Management Platform - DSU260714- ACADEMICMG

Questions and Answers

The work/ clarification/ answers listed in this addendum shall be considered part of the Bid/ RFP document for the referenced project/ product/ services, etc.

Below are questions and answers regarding subject RFP. All questions are written in black color font and the **answers are provided in red color font.**

Section Number: I – Overview / Introduction

Paragraph Number: Schedule of Events

Page Number: 4

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Projected Contract Start Date September 1, 2026

1. **Question:** Can the University provide the desired implementation timeline, including required milestones, go-live dates, or phased deployment expectations? **Answer:** The University expects the selected solution to be fully implemented and operational no later than October 1, 2026. Recognizing that implementation approaches may vary based on the functionality and capabilities of the proposed solution, the University expects each vendor to provide a detailed project plan that includes key milestones, implementation phases, configuration activities, integrations, data migration, testing, training, and go-live readiness activities. Vendors should demonstrate their ability to meet the University's implementation timeline and provide sufficient project management resources to ensure a successful deployment.

Section Number: II – Scope of Work

Paragraph Number: General Scope

Page Number: 5

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Vendor shall provide all equipment, materials, software, and labor...

2. **Question:** Will the University accept SaaS solutions hosted in commercially available cloud environments, or is a private-hosted/on-premises deployment preferred? **Answer:** The University will accept SaaS solutions hosted in commercially available cloud environments, provided they meet all University requirements related to security, compliance, data protection, availability, and integration. Vendors should clearly describe their hosting model and any associated infrastructure requirements. The University will evaluate all proposed solutions based on their ability to meet the needs of the institution.

Section Number: Appendix A

Paragraph Number: Technical Requirements

Page Number: 44

Text of Passage Being Questioned: LMS, SIS, HR, Azure AD integrations

3. **Question:** Can the University identify the current SIS, LMS, HR, and identity management platforms currently in use? **Answer:** The University currently utilizes enterprise systems supporting student information, learning management, human resources, identity management, curriculum management, assessment, and accreditation-related functions. To maintain flexibility and ensure a fair and competitive procurement process, the University is not disclosing detailed information regarding its current enterprise application portfolio as part of this solicitation. Vendors should describe their experience integrating with commonly used higher education systems, including Student Information Systems (SIS), Learning Management Systems (LMS), Human Resources (HR) systems, and identity management platforms such as Microsoft Entra ID (formerly Azure Active Directory). Vendors should also identify any existing integrations, available APIs, data exchange methods, and implementation requirements associated with their proposed solution. Additional system-specific information necessary for implementation and integration planning will be provided to the selected

vendor following contract award and during project discovery and implementation activities. The University expects the proposed solution to support industry-standard integration methods and to operate effectively within a modern higher education technology environment.

Section Number: Appendix A

Paragraph Number: Technical Requirements

Page Number: 44

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Integrations

4. **Question:** What integration methods are currently available (REST APIs, SOAP, SFTP, database views, etc.)? **Answer:** The University utilizes standard higher-education integration methods and expects the proposed solution to support modern integration capabilities. Vendors should describe their supported integration methods and experience integrating with common SIS, LMS, HR, and identity management platforms. Detailed integration requirements will be discussed with the selected vendor during implementation.

Section Number: Appendix A

Paragraph Number: Project Overview

Page Number: 43

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Comprehensive software solution

5. **Question:** Approximately how many students, faculty, staff, administrators, and external reviewers will use the system? How many distinct roles and permissions are needed to meet expectations? **Answer:** Delaware State University currently serves approximately 4,800 students and expects the solution to support faculty, staff, administrators, and authorized external reviewers as needed. Because system usage may vary by module and business process, the University is not prescribing a specific number of users, roles, or permission levels. Vendors should propose a scalable solution capable of supporting role-based access controls and a broad range of user types commonly found in higher education assessment, accreditation, fieldwork, and academic management environments. The University expects the selected solution to allow for the creation and

management of multiple user roles and permissions to meet institutional needs.

Section Number: Appendix A

Paragraph Number: Accreditation

Page Number: 43

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Accreditation reporting

6. **Question:** Which institutional and programmatic accreditation agencies must the solution support? **Answer:** Delaware State University requires a flexible solution capable of supporting institutional accreditation through the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) as well as various programmatic accreditation agencies across academic disciplines. Vendors should describe their accreditation-management capabilities, available templates, evidence-management tools, reporting functionality, and ability to adapt to changing accreditation requirements.

Section Number: Appendix A

Paragraph Number: Deliverables

Page Number: 44

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Data Migration

7. **Question:** Will historical data migration be required? If so, what is the incumbent platform(s) and approximate data volume? **Answer:** Yes, the University anticipates that historical data migration will be required. The current platform is Watermark. Historical assessment, accreditation, planning, fieldwork, and related records may need to be migrated to the new solution. Vendors should describe their migration methodology and experience migrating data from Watermark or similar higher education assessment and accreditation platforms. Specific data volumes and migration requirements will be reviewed during implementation planning.

Section Number: Appendix A

Paragraph Number: Vendor Support

Page Number: 44

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Experience with similar institutions

8. **Question:** Is a fully remote implementation acceptable, or are on-site resources expected? **Answer:** The University will consider fully remote, hybrid, and on-site implementation approaches. Vendors should propose the implementation model they believe will best support the successful deployment, training, adoption, and ongoing support of the solution. If remote implementation is proposed, vendors should describe their project management methodology, communication plan, training approach, and strategies for stakeholder engagement. The University reserves the right to work with the selected vendor to determine the most appropriate implementation approach during project planning.

Section Number: V – Proposal Evaluation

Paragraph Number: Oral Presentations

Page Number: 15

Text of Passage Being Questioned: Oral Presentations

9. **Question:** Will shortlisted vendors be required to provide a scripted demonstration, and will demonstration scenarios be supplied in advance? **Answer:** The University may invite shortlisted vendors to participate in product demonstrations and oral presentations as part of the evaluation process. At this time, the University has not established a requirement for a scripted demonstration. If demonstrations are requested, the University will provide participating vendors with any applicable instructions, expectations, evaluation criteria, and demonstration scenarios in advance of the presentation. The University reserves the right to determine the format and content of demonstrations based on the needs of the evaluation process.

Section Number: Appendix B

Paragraph Number: Cyber Responsibilities

Page Number: 45

Text of Passage Being Questioned: HECVAT

10. **Question:** Does the University require HECVAT Full, HECVAT Lite, or another

cybersecurity assessment? Is there a period that pentesting will be required? **Answer:** The University requires submission of cybersecurity and compliance documentation as identified in the RFP, including a HECVAT, VPAT, API documentation, and applicable MSA/SLA documentation. Vendors may submit the HECVAT version that most appropriately reflects their solution and risk profile. The University reserves the right to request additional cybersecurity documentation, clarifications, or assessments during the evaluation process or prior to contract execution.

Section Number: V. Proposal Evaluation

Paragraph Number: Vendor Support & Experience

Page Number: 14

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

Support SLAs, upgrade cycle, experience with similar institutions, references.

- 11. Question:** Will the University consider the relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed key personnel and project team, including experience obtained while employed by previous organizations, when evaluating Vendor Support & Experience?
- Answer:** Yes. The University may consider the relevant experience, qualifications, and expertise of the proposed key personnel and project team, including experience gained while employed by previous organizations, when evaluating Vendor Support & Experience. Vendors should clearly identify proposed team members, their roles and responsibilities, and their experience implementing and supporting similar solutions in higher education environments. The University will evaluate the overall qualifications of the vendor and its proposed team in determining the vendor's ability to successfully perform the required services.

Section Number: Attachment 4

Paragraph Number: Business References

Page Number: 31

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

List a minimum of three business references.

12. **Question:** For a newly established company, will the University accept references based on projects successfully performed by the proposed key personnel while employed by previous organizations, provided the individual's role and responsibilities are clearly identified? **Answer:** Yes. For newly established companies, the University will accept references based on projects successfully performed by proposed key personnel while employed by previous organizations, provided the individual's role, responsibilities, and level of involvement in the referenced project are clearly identified and documented. Vendors should clearly distinguish between organizational experience and the experience of individual team members. The University will consider such references as part of its overall evaluation of the vendor's qualifications, experience, and ability to successfully perform the services required under this RFP.

Section Number: Attachment 7

Paragraph Number: Financial Statements & Condition

Page Number: 36

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

Audited financial statements (most recent fiscal year).

13. **Question:** If an Offeror is a newly established business and audited financial statements are not yet available, what alternative documentation will the University accept to demonstrate financial responsibility and the ability to successfully perform the contract? **Answer:** If an Offeror is a newly established business and audited financial statements are not available, the University may, at its discretion, accept alternative financial documentation demonstrating the Offeror's financial responsibility and capacity to successfully perform the contract. Such documentation may include reviewed or compiled financial statements, internal financial statements, bank references, lines of credit, parent company guarantees, evidence of financial backing, or other information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial stability and ability to meet contractual obligations. Vendors should provide the most complete and current financial information available and clearly explain any circumstances related to the unavailability of audited financial statements. The University reserves the right to request additional documentation and to determine whether the information provided demonstrates adequate financial responsibility for the scope of the project.

Section Number: V. Proposal Evaluation

Paragraph Number: Implementation Approach

Page Number: 14

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

Configuration plan, timeline, training, change management, data migration, ongoing support.

14. **Question:** When evaluating the Implementation Approach, will the University place greater emphasis on the demonstrated experience of the proposed implementation team and project methodology than on the operating history of the Offeror? **Answer:** The University will evaluate the Implementation Approach based on the overall quality, feasibility, and likelihood of success of the proposed implementation plan, including project methodology, timeline, staffing, training, change management, data migration, and ongoing support. As part of this evaluation, the University may consider the demonstrated experience and qualifications of the proposed implementation team, including experience delivering similar projects in higher education environments. The University will evaluate each proposal holistically and will not assign greater weight to any specific factor beyond the criteria identified in the RFP. The University reserves the right to determine the relative strengths of each proposal and the solution that is most advantageous to the University's needs.

Section Number: V. Proposal Evaluation

Paragraph Number: Proposal Selection Criteria

Page Number: 13-14

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

The University reserves full discretion to determine the competence and responsibility, professionally and/or financially, of vendors.

15. **Question:** For newly formed businesses, what factors will the University consider when determining professional competence and financial responsibility beyond corporate operating history, such as experience of key personnel, subcontractor qualifications, strategic partnerships, financial backing, or other supporting documentation? **Answer:**

For newly formed businesses, the University's determination of professional competence and financial responsibility will not be based solely on corporate operating history. The University reserves the right to request information as needed to determine, in its sole discretion, whether an Offeror has demonstrated sufficient professional competence and financial responsibility to perform the work contemplated under this RFP

Section Number: Appendix A – Scope of Work

Paragraph Number: 1. Project Overview

Page Number: 43

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

"The institution seeks a comprehensive software solution supporting student learning & licensure, fieldwork tracking, assessment management, accreditation reporting, and institutional planning."

- 16. Question:** Could the University clarify whether it intends to procure a single platform that natively delivers all listed functional areas, or whether solutions that integrate with existing institutional systems to satisfy portions of these requirements will be considered responsive? **Answer:** The University is seeking a comprehensive Academic Management Platform capable of supporting the functional requirements identified in the RFP. The University will consider solutions that provide these capabilities through a single integrated platform, as well as solutions that leverage integration with existing institutional systems, provided the overall solution meets the University's functional, technical, security, reporting, and user experience requirements. Vendors should clearly describe which capabilities are delivered natively within their solution, which capabilities are provided through integrations, and any dependencies on third-party products or services. The University will evaluate the proposed solution based on its ability to satisfy the requirements of the RFP, provide a seamless user experience, minimize administrative complexity, and meet the institution's operational needs.

Section Number: Appendix A – Scope of Work

Paragraph Number: 2.A – ePortfolio and Fieldwork

Page Number: 43

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

"ePortfolio and Fieldwork – SIS/LMS integration, standards-aligned assessments and reporting,

program requirement tracking and licensure progress, fieldwork coordination, dispositions and edTPA support, ePortfolios, juried assessments."

- 17. Question:** Does the University currently utilize any existing solutions supporting ePortfolio, fieldwork management, assessment management, or licensure tracking that the selected solution will be expected to integrate with, or is the expectation that the awarded solution will replace these existing systems? **Answer:** The University currently utilizes systems and processes that support various aspects of assessment, accreditation, fieldwork, and academic program management. The University is seeking a solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP and has not prescribed a specific implementation model regarding the retention or replacement of existing systems. Vendors should describe how their proposed solution would support the University's requirements, including any capabilities provided natively within the platform and any integrations with existing institutional systems that may be required. If the proposed solution relies on integration with existing third-party applications, vendors should clearly identify those dependencies and explain how the integrated solution will satisfy the functional requirements of the RFP. The University will evaluate proposals based on their ability to provide a comprehensive, efficient, and sustainable solution that best meets institutional needs. Specific decisions regarding system replacement, coexistence, or integration will be finalized during implementation planning with the selected vendor.

Section Number: Appendix A – Scope of Work

Paragraph Number: 2.B – Accreditation and Assessment

Page Number: 43–44

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

"Assessment planning with goals, outcomes, and real-time reporting; longitudinal data and dashboards; curriculum mapping; role-based access controls; accreditation templates and evidence management; collaborative workflows and project management; program review and strategic planning tools."

- 18. Question:** Could the University clarify whether native functionality for assessment planning, student learning outcomes management, evidence collection, accreditation reporting, and continuous improvement is required, or whether these processes may be supported through workflow automation, reporting, and integration with existing institutional systems? **Answer:** The University seeks a comprehensive solution that

supports assessment planning, student learning outcomes management, evidence collection, accreditation reporting, and continuous improvement processes. The University will consider solutions that provide these capabilities through native functionality, as well as solutions that leverage workflow automation, reporting tools, and integration with existing institutional systems, provided the overall solution effectively meets the functional requirements outlined in the RFP. Vendors should clearly identify which capabilities are delivered natively within their platform, which are supported through integrations or third-party components, and how the proposed solution will provide a cohesive user experience. The University will evaluate proposals based on their ability to satisfy the requirements of the RFP, support institutional effectiveness and accreditation activities, minimize administrative burden, and meet the University's operational and strategic objectives.

Section Number: Appendix A – Scope of Work

Paragraph Number: 2.C – Technical Requirements

Page Number: 44

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

"LMS, SIS, HR, Azure AD integrations."

- 19. Question:** To assist vendors in proposing appropriate integration approaches, could the University identify its current enterprise systems, including Student Information System, Learning Management System, Human Resources system, Identity Management platform, and any existing curriculum, assessment, or accreditation management solutions currently in use? **Answer:** The University currently utilizes enterprise systems supporting student information, learning management, human resources, identity management, curriculum management, assessment, and accreditation-related functions. To maintain flexibility and ensure a fair and competitive procurement process, the University is not disclosing detailed information regarding its current enterprise application portfolio as part of this solicitation. Vendors should describe their experience integrating with commonly used higher education systems, including Student Information Systems (SIS), Learning Management Systems (LMS), Human Resources (HR) systems, and identity management platforms such as Microsoft Entra ID (formerly Azure Active Directory). Vendors should also identify any existing integrations, available APIs, data exchange methods, and implementation requirements associated with their proposed solution.

Additional system-specific information necessary for implementation and integration planning will be provided to the selected vendor following contract award and during project discovery and implementation activities. The University expects the proposed solution to support industry-standard integration methods and to operate effectively within a modern higher education technology environment.

Section Number: V. Proposal Evaluation

Paragraph Number: Proposal Selection Criteria

Page Number: 14

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

"Functional Fit – Student Learning & Licensure; Planning & Self-Study Capabilities; Technical Requirements; Vendor Support & Experience; Implementation Approach; Compliance Documentation; Cost Proposal."

- 20. Question:** Are all functional areas identified within the evaluation criteria considered mandatory requirements for responsiveness, or will the University consider solutions that satisfy the majority of the functional requirements while integrating with existing institutional systems for specialized capabilities? **Answer:** The functional areas identified in the RFP and evaluation criteria represent the University's desired capabilities for the Academic Management Platform. The University recognizes that vendors may deliver these capabilities through a combination of native functionality and integration with existing institutional systems. Proposals will not be evaluated solely on whether every capability is provided natively within a single platform. However, vendors should demonstrate how their proposed solution satisfies the functional, technical, reporting, security, and operational requirements of the RFP. Where capabilities are supported through integrations, vendors should clearly identify those integrations, any third-party dependencies, and how the overall solution will provide a seamless and effective user experience. The University will evaluate proposals based on their overall ability to meet institutional needs, support academic management and accreditation processes, minimize administrative complexity, and provide the most advantageous solution to the University. Solutions that meet the majority of the functional requirements and effectively leverage integrations to address specialized capabilities may be considered responsive, provided the proposal clearly demonstrates how all required business needs will be supported.
-

Section Number: Attachment 6 – Bid/Pricing Sheet

Paragraph Number: Pricing Sheet – Multi-Year (3-Year Base + 2 Optional Extensions)

Page Number: 33

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

"Accreditation and Assessment Software Licensing"

"ePortfolios and Fieldwork Software Licensing"

- 21. Question:** If a proposed solution addresses portions of these functional areas through existing platform capabilities or through integration with third-party applications, how would the University prefer vendors present pricing within the required pricing schedule?
- Answer:** The University requests that vendors complete the pricing schedule in a manner that clearly reflects the total cost of delivering the proposed solution and all services necessary to meet the requirements of the RFP. If a proposed solution includes functionality delivered through existing platform capabilities, third-party applications, or integrations, vendors should clearly identify those components and include all associated costs in the applicable pricing categories. The University's preference is for pricing to be presented in a transparent and comprehensive manner that allows evaluators to understand the total cost of ownership and the relationship between solution components. Any functionality required to satisfy the scope of work, whether provided natively or through integrated third-party solutions, should be included in the vendor's proposed pricing. Vendors should clearly explain any pricing assumptions and dependencies associated with their proposed solution.

Section Number: General

Paragraph Number: N/A

Page Number: N/A

Text of Passage Being Questioned:

N/A

- 22. Question:** Could the University clarify whether this solicitation represents a continuation of the previous procurement, a revised scope of work, or a new procurement initiative? Additionally, have the University's functional priorities or project objectives changed since the earlier solicitation?
- Answer:** This solicitation represents the University's current procurement for an Academic Management Platform and reflects the University's present assessment of its institutional needs and requirements. Vendors should rely on the requirements, scope of work, evaluation criteria, and other information contained in

this RFP and any associated addenda when preparing their proposals. The University is seeking a solution that supports student learning and licensure, fieldwork management, assessment and accreditation activities, institutional effectiveness, and strategic planning as described in the current solicitation. The University reserves the right to evaluate proposals based solely on the requirements and objectives outlined in this RFP and will not rely on requirements, assumptions, or information associated with any prior solicitation. Vendors are encouraged to respond to the functional, technical, implementation, and support requirements identified in the current RFP and to demonstrate how their proposed solution will meet the University's present operational and strategic objectives.