ADDENDUM 1   May 2, 2017

SPRING BRANCH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Dr. Scott R. Muri, Ed.D. Superintendent of Schools

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
1031 Witte Road, Building T-1A, Houston, Texas 77055-6016
Phone 713/251-1100   Fax 713/251-1115

Date: May 2, 2017

BARBARA A. ROBILLARD
Director of Purchasing and Contracts

NOTICE TO OFFERORS

ADDENDUM TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

DATE: May 2, 2017

This Addendum forms a part of and modifies the original Proposal Document, issued by the Spring Branch Independent School District.

Invitation to Proposal entitled: ANNUAL CONTRACT FOR District Instructional Software

Proposal Opening Date & Time: **May 11, 2017 @ 2:00 PM**

ADDENDUM NO.   1

PROPOSAL NO.   11572

Please make the following additions, revisions, and/or deletions to the Proposal Document:

See Questions and Answers below

The offeror shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the Proposal Form.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #1:

We filled out all of our vendor registration information, but I was under the impression that we would not have to submit an RFP because Spring Branch was going to piggyback off our awarded District Instructional Software RFP from Houston ISD. Is this part of that process, or is it a separate bid?

Answer #1:

Both will expired August 31, 2017 (approximately). (Adaptive Software, Digital resources and Inter-local HISD)

SBISD is soliciting its own RFP for possible 3 years contract for an internal independent market place of Instructional Software.

Question #2:

Can you let us know what you are looking for? We have the RFP but quite unsure why you are sending it to us?   What are you looking to purchase?

Answer #2:

Annual Contract for District Instructional Software, see item #1.

Question #3:

Just checking to see if you are a member of Choice Partners Purchasing Coop. Our contract with them is #13/1062D6-34.

Answer #3:

See item #1   Seek both or submit attachment

If you are a member of a Purchasing Cooperative. Please see Attachment C of RFP for Cooperative Vendor instructions.

Question #4:

This bid states "Instructional Software". Would this include World Book's reference databases, eBooks and Early World of Learning (stories in English and Spanish, plus activities for PK-2nd graders) or is there a different bid for this? Please let us know. Thank you!

Answer #4:

Yes

Question #5:

What product are you looking to purchase?

Answer #5:

Snagit, Camtasia, see their website. Looking for all Instructional software your company may offer. SBISD is building a market place.

Question #6:

We have a question related to the type of software that you are looking for. The RFP states materials for the "global graduate"

Are you primarily looking for digital learning resources for district employees and students. I have read through the doc, but wanted to confirm. Please let me know when you can.

Answer #6:

See item #1, seeking Instructional Software/ See answer item #5.

Question #7:

Spring Branch ISD has been purchasing Eduphoria software since 2009. I want to make sure that we fall under the category of District Instructional Software so we know if we should respond to this bid or not.

Answer #7:

SBISD is seeking Instructional Software. If Eduphoria is not Instructional Software no additional response is warranted.

Question #8:

Received, but are you really asking us to review and complete a 53 page legal document in order for the district to renew for 1/6/2018 - 1/6/2019??

Answer #8:

Yes, if your company has any instructional software to offer to the district and possible become an approved vendor for the market place the district is building for SBISD.

It is critical that all responding vendors read/become familiar with all Terms and Conditions of the RFP document. Vendors are required to respond to applicable pages which warrant a response.

Question #9:

- TEKS aligned content - We are working on aligning all our content but it is not done as of yet (You already purchased the Nearpod platform without content so that could be an alternative here)

- Work with CLEVER - We do not house student data (no student accounts) except reports from our lessons so we do not integrate with Clever which is requested in this RFP.

I am asking you about this because these RFP's take a lot of resources which are limited on to fill out. We want to truly be apart of this but want to make sure these bullet points would not automatically exclude us. I appreciate any insight you can provide here.

Answer #9:

When appropriate TEKS aligned content (or applicable standards) is mandatory. However, if you have a product that can be used independently of any curriculum, then alignment to standards would not be applicable. If you want to include your curriculum component, then a timeline of completion to TEKS alignment could inform the ability to bring on that component in future years.

Since you do not roster students, the integration with Clever would also be an N/A.

Question #10:

A question on the types of instructional resources for the current RFP. I see the RFP says the following. I am wondering

1. if formative assessments in the scope? We can add them easily but there is an additional cost involved
2. if you prefer we include only included/free simulations, or should we include higher quality ones that are additional cost?

Answer #10:

SBISD is interested in receiving all deliverables, costs and fees your organization provides.

Question # 11:

We need to ask a question in order to know if we hit all of the mandatory requirements of the RFP that you sent over. Here is what my legal department forwarded over to ask:

On page 30, Section 7.2, Mandatory Requirements, 3rd bullet it says, "All resources, as appropriate, should be device agnostic and platform neutral, incorporate accessibility and universal design principles, and comply with IMS Global interoperability standards."

Our question is in regards to "as appropriate" and the 508 exception from the Government that states: The Rosetta Stone Products and Rosetta Stone's software is subject to exemption under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. Rosetta Stone's language learning program is based on a unique method to teach a foreign language. The method relies on the use of visual images, text and audio in the target language to create lessons, and replaces translation as is typically found in most language learning products. The program includes carefully chosen sequences and combinations of images to convey meaning.

Lessons are made up of activities that teach all language skills – listening, reading, writing and speaking.

The Rosetta Stone method may or may not work for an individual with a disability, depending upon the nature and seriousness of the disability. For example, individuals with hearing or speech impairments, for the most part, should be able to use the product. Since the foundation of the Rosetta Stone pedagogy is the immersion method which requires a carefully chosen sequence and combination of images, text and audio cues, making the software usable by visually impaired learners would cause a "fundamental alteration" in the nature of our language learning product and is exempt according to Section 1194.3 (e) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 508. [36 C.F.R. § 1194.3(e)].   Specifically, modifying the Rosetta Stone program to accommodate visually impaired persons would require the inclusion of translated descriptions associated with all the images in the program. This "fundamental alteration" would run directly counter to the Rosetta Stone immersion method of teaching languages through immersion without translation.

Would this 508 US Government exemption apply to this RFP or would the District need the solution to comply to the District's own accessibility standards?

Answer #11:

Since SBISD said "as appropriate" the exemption should apply.

Further conversation may be warranted if contract is awarded.

Question #12:
We here at Seesaw are considering responding to the RFP, but I don't quite understand the purpose / background on it.

Is it a general effort by the district to "see what's out there"? Is there a specific initiative or funding thing (e.g. a bond initiative that is being allocated to fast-tracking district instructional technology implementation)?

In other words, is the district actually looking to purchase qualified/desired products for next school year? Or just collecting data on what's out there for future unspecified consideration?

As you know, responding to an RFP is no walk in the park, and we want to make sure we understand the purpose behind this request.

Answer #12:

See item #1

Question #13:

I wanted to reach out with two questions:

1) We currently work with one school in SBISD. Is this RFP necessary only to go over a certain dollar amount, or to do any business selling software products to SBISD schools moving forward?

2) We are a behavior and rewards tracking program for schools. I do not see an area that we clearly fit into in the RFP. Should we go ahead and apply anyway under the 'other' category?

Answer #13:

SBSID encourages vendors to complete this RFP, see item #1 and item #7.

Question #14:

What is the preferred HUB sub-consultant fee % desired by the district?

Answer #14:

The use of Federal Funds requires the District reach out to vendor(s) (due diligence) with Historically Underutilized Business Questionnaire.

Question #15:

NWEA products are included in the Interlocal Agreement within the Central Texas Purchasing Alliance. Will this adequately provide for purchasing guidelines for the district's MAP renewal for 2017-18?

Answer #15:

While the Interlocal agreement will be adequate for the 17-18 school year, the RFP ensures vendor the opportunity to do business with SBISD for possible 3 years. Additionally, we are collecting all paperwork required in advance to lessen the burden at a later date for campus and purchasing personnel.

Question #16:

I have the following question for Proposal #11572, on Page 41, Attachment D, in the Pricing Section:

Are we able to submit more than one Proposal/Pricing form for our two pricing models?

Answer #16:

Yes. Please add as many pricing options as you want as long as they don't conflict with each other.

Question #17:

On page 39, Section 8.0 is has a list of cooperatives. We will be responding to this specific RFP in its entirety. Do you still want us to make 'yes' the cooperatives section noting that we do belong to those specific coops?

Answer #17:

No

Question #18:

On attachment D it is listed to provide that attachment with each product being submitted. Do you also want Attachment E to be specific for each product?

Answer #18:

"Yes" SBISD wants vendors to complete for each product.

Question #19:

Do you want the responses separated in a binder with specific tabs? If you want specific information would you further define how you would like the information listed.

Answer #19:

Follow the sequence on the RFP of 7.0, 8.0 and the attachments

Question #20:

We currently work with one school in SBISD. Is this RFP necessary only to go over a certain dollar amount, or to do any business selling software products to SBISD schools moving forward?

Answer #20:

See item #1, seeking Instructional Software/ See item #5

Question #21:

We are a behavior and rewards tracking program for schools. I do not see an area that we clearly fit into in the RFP. Should we go ahead and apply anyway under the 'other' category?

Answer #21:

Yes please

Question #22:

Per the RFP, page 7, Section 3.5.0, "PROPOSALS SHALL BE SUBMITTED ON THESE FORMS. Deviations to any Conditions and/or Specifications shall be conspicuously noted in writing by the Proposer and shall be included with the proposal." The forms included are in PDF and are not fillable. Is there a word version (or fillable PDF) of the attachments for us to submit our proposal on? Or will re-creating the attachments in word on our end suffice?

Answer # 22:

Writable version currently available on SBISD website. Please Do Not recreate the attachments.

Question #23:

Per the RFP, page 10, Section 3.29.0, are performance and payment bonds applicable to this RFP?

Answer #23:

No

Question #24:

Per the RFP, page 12, Section 4.2.0, "Provide a matrix that will allow SBISD to readily appraise the Vendor's products and/or services offering versus other Vendors, if available." Are we required to provide this matrix? Is there a preferred layout/format for said matrix?

Answer #24:

See answer #19

Question #25:

Per the RFP, page 23, Section 5.40.0, are we required to submit with our proposal copies of certificates of insurance, naming SBISD as additional insured's for Texas Workers Compensation and General Liability Insurance? Or can this be done upon contract award?

Answer #25:

No, not at this time. Only required if "awarded vendor (s)".

Question #26:

Per the RFP, page 24, within the table different categories are listed for types of providers. Our company is a Vendor of educational software solutions. Based on your table, which category would we respond to for insurance purposes? Indicating that we are a Vendors triggers the Proposal Bond, Payment Bond, and Performance bonds. Is there another, more appropriate category since Vendor seems more descriptive of "Construction, Repair, Maintenance, Service?" Please advise.

Answer #26:

Category: Professional Services Providers- Consultants, Trainers, Attorneys, CPAs, etc.

See item # 25

Question #27:

Per the RFP, page 33, Section 8.10.0, "For the District to award a contract, the District must have on file the completed Conflict of Interest Questionnaire. The Conflict of Interest Questionnaire must be complete with Company Name, Signature and Date even if company has no conflict of interest." Are we required to submit the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire with our proposal or is this required only after an award is made?.

Answer #27:

Yes, CIQ must be completed and submitted with the proposal.

Question #28:

Per the RFP, page 33, Section 8.12.0, SBISD requires that award vendor(s) complete a "Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification W-9, before payment(s) will be processed." Are we required to submit the Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification W-9 with our proposal or after award? The ** at the end of the section relate to "required only of awarded vendors" language at the bottom of page 33. However, Attachment O notes "Submit copy of Bidder's/Proposer's current W-9 Form." Please advise.

Answer #28:

See item #25.

Question #29:

Per the RFP, page 39, Attachment C, "Note: If your firm answers 'YES' to being in a Cooperative and you want to be considered for an award via the Cooperative, please complete attachments A-D and F. In addition, submit your contract award information with the application Cooperative in a sealed envelope/box." Is this information that we need to submit separately from the proposal after we are awarded or along with our proposal submission? If after award, who would we send this information to?

Answer #29:

Please send information with your proposal submission.

Question #30:

Our pricing offers additional breaks based upon enrollment or usage numbers. Can the district provide an estimated amount of enrollment of students it anticipates will use the platform? Is the district looking for single courses or to enroll each student in up to 4 or up to 8 courses?

Answer #30:

SBISD is a district of approximately 35,200 students and over 40 campuses. SBISD allows a great deal of autonomy to our campuses. Provide as many options for purchase as you feel comfortable with.

Question #31:

Will the content be used in a blended learning setting? Will the content be used for initial credit or credit recovery?

Answer #31:

Yes, blended learning is our current model for K12 classrooms.

Question #32:

How many students may be logged in and working in the platform at any given time?

Answer #32:

It could range from 100 to 30,000. It would depend on the popularity/outcomes of your content/platform.

Question #33:

Will the district require any teaching services to be provided by Connections Education?

Answer #33:

No, but there could be training of your product. SBISD's goal is to provide additional digital resources to teachers for their instructional program.

Question #34:

Can the district confirm that the utilization of the content and platforms is for grades K-12?

Answer #34:

Between grades PreK – 12. Not in totality.

Question #35:

We are offering online research databases only. Could they site please clarify how to answer the following points regarding this type of content or if they are not applicable:
1. Comply with IMS Global interoperability standards.
2. Reflects a respect for diversity
3. Is accurate, current, dynamic, and reflective of best practice(s)
4. Encourages engagement, application, exploration and the "4 C's"
5. Facilitates differentiated and adaptive instruction

Answers #35:

1. Can your online databases provide an LTI link so students can access the content without having to go out of the platform to sign in?
2. Multicultural perspective on resources
3. Probably not applicable.
4. Probably not applicable.
5. Probably not applicable.

Question #36:

Per the RFP, page 30, Section 7.3, "All resources, as appropriate, should: (Refer to Attachment O)." How is this section relevant to Attachment O – Signature Page? Is there something missing here?

Answers #36:

"Typo" should read **(Refer to Attachment E)**