



**Maine Community College System
323 State Street
Augusta, ME 04330**

**Competitive Bid
Request For Proposal
This is NOT an order.**

Learning Management System

Issue Date:	February 25, 2019
Questions from Bidders Due On:	March 5, 2019
Response Due Date:	March 15, 2019
Return Proposal To:	Martin Gang Chief Information & Technology Officer Maine Community College System 323 State Street Augusta, ME 04330
	207.629.4014 mgang@mccs.me.edu

Table of Contents

1.0 Background & Introduction.....	4
2.0 Schedule & Deadlines.....	5
3.0 Examination of Specification and Schedule.....	5
4.0 Submission Instructions	5
4.1 Proposal Transmission.....	5
4.2 Modification or Withdrawal of Offers	6
4.3 Pricing	6
4.4 References	7
4.5 Reference Site Visits	7
4.6 Evaluation Environment	7
4.7 Vendor Presentations.....	8
4.8 Pre-Award Discussions	8
4.9 Proposal Requirements.....	8
5.0 BUSINESS PROPOSAL	9
5.1 General (optional).....	9
5.2 Respondent’s Company Structure	9
5.3 Company Financial Information.....	9
5.4 Contract.....	10
5.5 References	10
5.6 Authorizing Document	10
5.6 Subcontractors	10
5.7 General Information.....	11
5.8 Experience Serving Higher Education Institutions	11
5.9 Experience Serving Similar Clients	11
5.10 Value Added Offerings	11
6.0 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.....	11
6.1.0 Functional Section	12
6.1.1 Technical Section	13
6. 2 Security.....	13
6. 3 Special Considerations	13
7.0 TRAINING PROPOSAL	13
8.0 COST PROPOSAL	14

9.0 Interpretation of Contract Documents	14
10.0 Taxation and Compliance	14
11.0 Evaluation and Scoring	15
12.0 Terms and Conditions	15
Technical Proposal	16
Attachment A – Functional Case Studies	16
6.1.1 Case Study #1 – LMS Transition	16
6.1.2 Case Study #2 – Multiple Sections	17
6.1.3 Case Study #3 – Usability	19
6.1.4 Case Study #4 – Accreditation	20
6.1.5 Case Study #5 – Group Work	21
6.1.6 Case Study #6 – Grading	22
6.1.7 Case Study #7 – Course Calendar	23
6.1.8 Case Study #8 – Day-to-Day Academic Support	24
6.1.9 Case Study #9 – Content Accessibility	25
Attachment B – Technical Case Studies	26
6.1.11 Case Study #1 – Getting Data In	26
6.1.12 Case Study #2 – Getting Data Out	27
6.1.13 Case Study #3 – Day-to-Day Technical Support	28
6.1.14 Case Study #4 – System Updates	29
6.1.15 Case Study #5 – Third Party Integrations	30
Attachment C – Security Section	31
Attachment D – Contract Terms and Conditions	41

1.0 Background & Introduction

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued by the Maine Community College System (MCCS) and is a state-wide request for the planning, configuration, implementation, training, and ongoing support of a hosted Learning Management System (LMS) to be made available as the primary learning platform to be used by most of the colleges within the system.

MCCS is made up of the seven accredited community colleges across the state of Maine. Over 16,000 students were enrolled in credit course in Fall 2018, with two-thirds of the students being enrolled in career and occupational programs. In addition to the degree programs, the colleges also provide an extensive array of Continuing Education and Workforce Development training to individuals across the state. The mission of MCCS is to provide associate degree, diploma and certificate programs directed at the educational, career and technical needs of the State's citizens and the workforce needs of the State's employers. The primary goals of the System are to create an educated, skilled and adaptable labor force that is responsive to the changing needs of the economy of the State and to promote local, regional and statewide economic development.

The purpose of this RFP is to provide interested parties with information to enable them to prepare and submit proposals for a comprehensive enterprise Learning Management System, including a hosted environment and all other requested services and support. MCCS intends to use the results of this RFP to award a contract for these products and services.

Respondents to this RFP should propose services and systems which:

1. Facilitate the teaching and learning functionality described in the use cases herein;
2. Provide course and content migration from all current local and hosted instances of Blackboard and local instances of Jenzabar eLearning;
3. Integrate with other academic and administrative technologies used across MCCS;
4. Provide user training to the targeted groups of faculty, instructional coordinators, instructional administrators, and technical support staff; and
5. Provides the colleges with a student-centered mobile and online learning platform with state-of-the-art functional and technical capabilities.

This document outlines pertinent background information, describes the goals and specific objectives for the LMS, describes desired functionality through specifications and use cases, and specifies requirements and instructions for all submitted proposals.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be three (3) one-year renewals for a total of seven (7) years at the option of MCCS.

A detailed explanation of the scope and specifications is contained in Section 7.0, Scope of Services with Case Studies contained in Appendix A & B. Preference will be given to proposals conforming to the specifications provided; however, alternate recommendations may be considered. If a vendor chooses to make inquiries on the specifications provided, the rules set forth in **Section 8.0, Interpretation of Contract Documents** apply. MCCS reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the proposals received, in part or in whole.

Additionally, please refer to **Enclosure 1: Standard Terms and Conditions Applicable to All MCCS Contracts**.

2.0 Schedule & Deadlines

Event	Date and time
MCCS issues RFP	February 19, 2019
Questions from Bidders Due	March 5, 2019 – 4 PM EST
RFP Due Date	March 15, 2018 - 4 PM EST
Selected Vendor Presentations	April 16 – April 18, 2019
Recommendation Submitted to Executive Committee	April 25, 2019 – 4 PM EST
Notification of Award	May 10, 2019
Contract Start Date	TBD

Please note: MCCS retains the right to change any dates and times.

3.0 Examination of Specification and Schedule

Each bidder or his or her authorized agent is expected to examine the bid specifications, contract documents, and all other instructions pertaining to this RFP. Failure to do so will be at the bidder's own risk, and the bidder cannot secure relief on the plea of error in the bid. MCCS reserves the right to accept or reject any and all bids in part or in whole.

4.0 Submission Instructions

4.1 Proposal Transmission

While hardcopy proposals are also accepted (note mailing address below), electronic submission through email is the preferred method of delivering your proposal.

- Email proposals are preferred and should be sent to mgang@mccs.me.edu
- The Email Subject line must read "MCCS LMS RFP Response"
- Hardcopy proposals are to be mailed to:

Martin Gang
Chief Information & Technology Officer
Maine Community College System
323 State Street.
Augusta, ME 04330

- The mailed/mailed proposal must be RECEIVED no later than 4 PM EST on March 15, 2019
- MCCS will acknowledge receipt of all proposals sent through email within one business day.
- MCCS will not send confirmation of receipt of hardcopy proposals. Therefore, it is strongly encouraged that all hardcopy proposals be sent with a delivery confirmation required from the carrier.
- It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that its proposal is received in its entirety by the proposal due date and time. Any bid received after the date and time specified will not be accepted, read, or evaluated.
- MCCS will not be responsible for computer, server, Internet or any technical problems, errors, delivery delays, or failures beyond its physical control. Bidders are advised to send their bid responses before the bid deadline to avoid potential delays.
- The MCCS account receiving the submissions is limited to receive emails up to 50 MB in size. If your response is larger than 50 MB, please split your response into separate emails, and indicate in the subject line that you are doing so. All emails containing any part of your bid response must be received before the bid deadline.

4.2 Modification or Withdrawal of Offers

The bidder's authorized representative may withdraw or modify their proposal, prior to the due date. Modification to, or withdrawal of, a proposal received by MCCS after the exact hour and date specified for receipt of proposals will not be considered.

4.3 Pricing

Pricing on this RFP must be firm and remain open for a period of not less than 180 days from the proposal due date. Any attempt to manipulate the format of the document, attach caveats to pricing, or submit pricing that deviates from the current format will put your proposal at risk.

4.4 References

Please provide references from five (5) peer Institutions of Higher Education as part of your response, including the following information:

- Institution Name
- Technology Contact: Name, phone number, and e-mail
- Academic Contact: Name, phone number, and e-mail

By submitting this information, the bidder authorizes MCCS to contact these clients for purposes consistent with the review of their proposal.

4.5 Reference Site Visits

MCCS may request a site visit to a bidder's working support center to aid in the evaluation of the bidder's proposal. Site visits, if required will be discussed in the technical proposal.

4.6 Evaluation Environment

Within the proposal, provide at least one test course environment and provide the following:

- A set of login credentials for each of the following roles:
 - course administrative access
 - course instructor access
 - course observer access (such as Dean access, if available)
 - student access
 - and guest access (if available)
- The required URL for accessing the test.

This test course will be used by MCCS and college personnel as part of the evaluation and selection process, and should include:

- Access to as many relevant tools and technologies, and features/functionality as possible as outlined in your proposal
- Simulated student data which is complete, including grades and submitted content
- The ability for MCCS personnel to create, delete and modify content
- Working communication tools
- A complete listing of any features or LMS elements that are not technically or logistically able to be included in this test environment

Because of the centrality of this testing environment to the Systems' evaluation of all proposals, access may be provided as soon as is practicable, and can precede the completed submission of the proposal.

4.7 Vendor Presentations

Vendors may be requested to provide an on-site presentation of their proposal, which would include a detailed analysis of how each of the bid requirements would be satisfied should the bidder receive the award. Vendor presentations are tentatively scheduled for the week of April 16, 2019. These presentations will not be open to the public.

If special accommodations are required in order to attend a site visit, email Martin Gang at mgang@mccs.me.edu no later than seven (7) days before the scheduled presentation.

4.8 Pre-Award Discussions

After the proposals are opened, but before the award, MCCS may elect to engage in discussions with any or all of the proposal respondents for purposes of:

- Resolving minor differences
- Clarifying necessary details and responsibilities
- Emphasizing important issues and points
- Receiving formal assurances from said respondents

MCCS may request best and final offers from those bidders determined by MCCS to be reasonably viable for contract award. However, MCCS reserves the right to award a contract on the basis of initial proposals received. Therefore, each proposal should contain the bidder's best terms from a price and technical standpoint.

Following evaluation of the best and final offers, MCCS may select for final contract negotiations/execution the offers that are most advantageous to MCCS, considering cost and the evaluation criteria in this RFP.

4.9 Proposal Requirements

To be considered complete, each proposal must include the following:

- Cover page with company name, proposal principal authors, date, company address and company URL
- Primary contact(s) with phone number and e-mail address(es)
- The bid should be dated and signed by an officer of your company with the authority to approve the submission of the proposal
- Section labeled BUSINESS PROPOSAL as described in Section 5
- Section labeled TECHNICAL PROPOSAL as described Section 6.1.1
- Section labeled SECURITY as described in Section 6.2
- Section labeled SPECIAL CONSIDERATION as described in Section 6.3
- Section labeled TRAINING PROPOSAL
- Section labeled COST PROPOSAL

5.0 BUSINESS PROPOSAL

The Business Proposal must address the following topics except those specifically identified as “optional.”

5.1 General (optional)

This section of the business proposal may be used to introduce or summarize any information the Respondent deems relevant or important to the successful acquisition of the products and/or services requested in this RFP.

5.2 Respondent’s Company Structure

The legal form of the Respondent’s business organization, the state in which formed (accompanied by a certificate of authority), the types of business ventures in which the organization is involved, and a chart of the organization are to be included in this section. If the organization includes more than one product division, the division responsible for the development and marketing of the requested products and/or services in the United States must be described in more detail than other components of the organization.

5.3 Company Financial Information

This section must include the Respondent’s financial statement, including an income statement and balance sheet, for each of the two most recently completed fiscal years. The financial

statements must demonstrate the Respondent's financial stability. If the financial statements being provided by the Respondent are those of a parent or holding company, additional financial information should be provided for the entity/organization directly responding to this RFP.

5.4 Contract

Any or all portions of this RFP and any or all portions of the bidder's response may be incorporated as part of the final contract.

5.5 References

The Respondent must include a list of at least five (5) clients for whom the Respondent has provided products and/or services that are the same or similar to those products and/or services requested in this RFP. Information provided should include the name, address, and telephone number of the client facility and the name, title, and phone of a person who may be contacted for further information.

5.6 Authorizing Document

Respondent personnel signing the Transmittal Letter of the proposal must be legally authorized by the organization to commit the organization contractually. This section shall contain proof of such authority. A copy of corporate bylaws or a corporate resolution adopted by the board of directors indicating this authority will fulfill this requirement.

5.6 Subcontractors

The bidder is responsible for the performance of any obligations that may result from this RFP, and shall not be relieved by the non-performance of any subcontractor. Any bidder's proposal must identify all subcontractors and describe the contractual relationship between the bidder and each subcontractor. Either a copy of the executed subcontract or a letter of agreement over the official signature of the firms involved must accompany each proposal.

Any subcontracts entered into by the bidder must comply with MCCS statutes, and will be subject to the provisions thereof. For each portion of the proposed products or services to be provided by a subcontractor, the technical proposal must include the identification of the functions to be provided by the subcontractor and the subcontractor's related qualifications and experience.

The combined qualifications and experience of the bidder and any or all subcontractors will be considered in the RFP evaluation. The Respondent must furnish information to MCCS as to the amount of the subcontract, the qualifications of the subcontractor for guaranteeing performance,

and any other data that may be required by MCCS. All subcontracts held by the bidder must be made available upon request for inspection and examination by appropriate MCCS officials, and such relationships must meet with the approval of MCCS.

The bidder must list any subcontractor's name, address and the state in which formed that are proposed to be used in providing the required products or services. The subcontractor's responsibilities under the proposal, the anticipated dollar amount for subcontract, the subcontractor's form of organization, and an indication from the subcontractor of a willingness to carry out these responsibilities are to be included for each subcontractor. This assurance in no way relieves the bidder of any responsibilities in responding to this RFP or in completing the commitments documented in the proposal.

5.7 General Information

Each Respondent must enter your company's general information including contact information.

5.8 Experience Serving Higher Education Institutions

Each Respondent is asked to please provide a brief description of your company's experience in serving higher educational institutions.

5.9 Experience Serving Similar Clients

Each Respondent is asked to please describe your company's experience in serving clients of a similar size to the Maine Community College System that also had a similar scope. Please provide specific clients and detailed examples. Please remember the seven colleges of the Maine Community College System are each individually accredited institutions.

5.10 Value Added Offerings

MCCS is always considering creative, cost-effective solutions to increase efficiencies and decrease expenditures. Does your company offer integrated service programs that will add value to the contract? Please describe the details of the program including cost, structure, and the benefits to be realized by MCCS as an alternative to the proposal for consideration.

6.0 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

The Technical Proposal must be divided into the sections as described below. Every point made in each section must be addressed in the order given. The same outline numbers must be used in

the response. RFP language should not be repeated within the response. Where appropriate, supporting documentation may be referenced by a page and paragraph number. However, when this is done, the body of the technical proposal must contain a meaningful summary of the referenced material. The referenced document must be included as an appendix to the technical proposal with referenced sections clearly marked. If there are multiple references or multiple documents, these must be listed and organized for ease of use by MCCS.

The Functional Section and Technical Section of the Technical Proposal will have multiple case studies. Bidders will be required to submit short videos demonstrating various aspects of their proposed solution to that case study. Please include a link/URL to the video, if possible, in the Technical Proposal. The intent of MCCS is to locate these materials on a secure server for approximately four (4) weeks, accessible by secure login to MCCS evaluators, subject matter experts, and procurement personnel directly involved in evaluating the proposal. Please include closed captioning option in the videos. Any licenses, waivers, nondisclosure agreements, or other releases that bidders may require for MCCS to use these materials as described must be included with the proposal at no cost to MCCS.

The scenario method of evaluation allows MCCS to focus its evaluation most efficiently on those aspects of proposed solutions that matter most to us. MCCS assumes that each proposed solution includes a common, industry-wide, base, LMS toolset (e.g., course news area, calendar, content repository, assignment-submission tool, quiz tool, discussion tool, attendance, and gradebook.). If your solution differs from this assumption, you must provide details in the corresponding section in the Technical Proposal. Each scenario will be scored based on innovation, creativity, simplicity, effectiveness, and completeness in addressing the challenges in the scenario, as well as ease of use.

For each case study in the Technical Proposal, a Respondent must submit a written narrative describing how its proposed solution would address the given scenario, and a video illustrating the solution described in the narrative.

Describe in detail any ways in which your proposed solution differs from the assumption that each proposed solution includes a common, industry-wide, base, LMS toolset (e.g., course news area, calendar, content repository, assignment- submission tool, quiz tool, discussion tool, attendance and gradebook).

6.1.0 Functional Section

- 6.1.1 Functional Case Study #1 – LMS Transition
- 6.1.2 Functional Case Study #2 – Multiple Sections
- 6.1.3 Functional Case Study #3 – Usability
- 6.1.4 Functional Case Study #4 – Accreditation
- 6.1.5 Functional Case Study #5 – Group Work
- 6.1.6 Functional Case Study #6 – Grading
- 6.1.7 Functional Case Study #7 – Course Calendar
- 6.1.8 Functional Case Study #8 – Day-to-Day Academic Support
- 6.1.9 Functional Case Study #10 – Content Accessibility

6.1.1 Technical Section

- 6.1.11 Technical Case Study #1 – Getting Data In
- 6.1.12 Technical Case Study #2 – Getting Data Out
- 6.1.13 Technical Case Study #3 – Day-to-Day Support
- 6.1.14 Technical Case Study #4 – System Updates
- 6.1.15 Technical Case Study #5 – Third-Party Integrations

6. 2 Security

- 6.2.1 Requested Documentation
- 6.2.2 Information Security
- 6.2.3 Security Architecture
- 6.2.4 Facility Security
- 6.2.5 Resiliency
- 6.2.6 Compliance
- 6.2.7 Data Governance

6. 3 Special Considerations

MCCS is comprised of seven independently accredited community colleges, each with their own individual Student Information System (Jenzabar EX), each with their own curriculum, and each their own student and employee identity and access authentication systems. That means that each college will have to upload and synchronize their courses and users independently of each other. In addition, the MCCS will implement a single hosted instance of Jenzabar Higher Reach for Workforce Development that will also need to upload course and user information. Also, final grades will need to be downloaded from the LMS to the appropriate SIS system.

Please describe in detail how this complex environment can be maintained and managed within a single hosted environment. Please include examples and case studies of any other similar system or district that is using your LMS.

7.0 TRAINING PROPOSAL

The Training Proposal must include a comprehensive plan for:

- 7.1 In-depth, onsite Faculty User Training using a Train the Trainer Model
- 7.2 Online General Faculty Use Training
- 7.3 Course administration training for Instructional support personnel
- 7.4 System Management Training for technical personnel
- 7.5 Any additional “How To” guides for faculty, students, and support staff

8.0 COST PROPOSAL

Include a complete cost proposal, separated out into the following five areas

- 8.1 General costs for the initial and additional time periods specified above
- 8.2 Comprehensive Training Costs separated into user training technical support training
- 8.3 Configuration and setup costs
- 8.4 Supplemental support cost including hourly rates for professional services
- 8.5 Optional peripheral systems, services and software packages

9.0 Interpretation of Contract Documents

No oral interpretation will be provided to any bidder as to the meaning of the specifications or other contract documents. Every request for such interpretation shall be made in writing at least three (3) or more business days before the proposal due date and submitted to:

Martin Gang
Chief Information & Technology Officer
Maine Community College System Office
323 State Street
Augusta, ME 04330

or via email at mgang@mccs.me.edu

Any interpretation made to a bidder will be issued in the form of an addendum to the contract/bid documents which, if issued, shall be sent as promptly as practicable to all persons to whom the specifications have been issued. All such addenda shall become part of the contract/bid documents.

10.0 Taxation and Compliance

MCCS is an educational institution organized under the laws of the State of Maine, and so its purchase of goods is exempt from state, federal, and local sales and use taxes. The successful bidder agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state and local statutes, laws, codes, rules, regulations, ordinances and orders in the performance of the Contract.

11.0 Evaluation and Scoring

Each proposal will be scored using the following matrix:

Item	Percentage Possible
BUSINESS PROPOSAL	5%
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	35%
SECURITY	10%
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	10%
TRAINING PROPOSAL	20%
COST PROPOSAL	20%
TOTAL	100%

12.0 Terms and Conditions

Standard Terms and Conditions applicable to all MCCS Contracts are included LMS RFP ATTACHMENT D – TERMS.

Technical Proposal

Attachment A – Functional Case Studies

Note:

All scenarios below should be discussed, where appropriate, with an eye towards instructors and students using their mobile devices or a desktop/laptop computer. Additionally, as all seven MCCS colleges act independently, please describe how the scenarios below can be accomplished in a single-tenant environment.

6.1.1 Case Study #1 – LMS Transition

Professor Parker has spent the last four years cultivating her course content. With the transition to a new LMS, she is worried that she will lose all of her hard work and spend undue hours manually moving and recreating content. Ideally, she wants the college as a whole to pick up and move everything into the new LMS. Any conflicts identified during course migration should be sent not only to her but also to the identified support staff so they can work together to resolve those issues. She would appreciate even more if those issues were automatically taken care of by the vendor.

Dr. Hall doesn't want to wait for the college to move his course. He is an early adopter and wants to move his course's structure and content. Dr. Hall needs the appropriate vendor support and documentation to do this successfully on his own.

Inevitably, there will be problems with the transition and instructors and support staff will need the help of the vendor to move forward. They will need high levels of support during heavy transition periods as well as after hours and post-transition support as new problems are identified. The best scenario is to have multiple avenues of support available including but not limited to chat, phone, email, and on campus and in person gatherings for instructors, support staff, and students.

6.1.2 Case Study #2 – Multiple Sections

The new LMS should support the academic units to offer an equivalent experience to students across sections of a course, in courses that have a significantly high number of sections, students and instructors. The LMS should also expedite and simplify the work of course coordinators across the colleges, who support these large-enrollment, multi-section courses. Dr. Stephaney Harvey is the instructional coordinator of English 100, a course with over 600 students, 28 sections, and 14 instructors. She is also the instructor for 2 of those sections.

Part A: In her role of **Course Coordinator**, Stephanie needs to:

1. Have access and edit privileges for all sections of the course, including the gradebooks.
2. Create a course template (from scratch or copying from a previous semester) with common content for all sections, and use it to populate all, or selected sections, of the course at the same time.
3. The configuration of elements or content such as visibility, due dates, grading, as well as any ties between elements (for instance, assignment and rubric) should be the same in the sections as in the course template. If copied from the previous semester, content should have dynamic dates connected to the course calendar, so copying from a previous semester would automatically update due dates for assignments and activities to reflect the current (or future) semester schedule.
4. Add, delete or edit an element or content in the course template (or in a section or elsewhere) and disseminate the changes to all, or selected, sections of the course, at the same time, at any time during the semester.
5. See grades quickly and easily across multiple sections, by the instructor, and/or by day/time that the sections meet, for comparison purposes. Create reports (plots, statistics) using this information.
6. Create assignments, quizzes, and exams using a pool of questions. Randomize the questions -- and generate different assignments, quizzes, and exams per section, then upload them to the corresponding section at once, including their configuration features. Students in different sections may have different due dates for the same assignment.
7. Download all student submissions of an assignment at the same time (batch download) for one or more sections.
8. Run a "plagiarism detection" tool for students' work for an assignment in multiple sections, at the same time
9. Discussion boards should be easily filtered/organized, allow for instructors/peers to acknowledge reading and/or give quick feedback (e.g., thumbs up button), provide notification of new posts, and offer an option preventing students from reading posts until they make an initial post which consists of an instructor selected number of minimum characters/words. Instructors should be able to view aggregate participation by student for easy grading with feedback via a rubric or inline grading. Peer-review is also needed for discussions, with an option for anonymity.

10. Set special criteria for the gradebook, such as dropping the 2 lowest quiz scores throughout the semester, or the highest and lowest quiz scores, etc.
11. Ability to schedule messages to be sent to students individually, across specific sections, or the entire course.
12. Release content based on date/time, student viewing of specific content (files, video, etc.), and student performance.

Part B: In her role of **Instructor**, Stephanie needs to do the same things as a course coordinator -- but only for the one or more sections of which she is the instructor. Specifically, Stephanie needs to do points 4 to 12 above -- but instead of having a master course, she needs to make changes in one of her sections, and then populate the rest of her sections.

Part C: In his role as **Teaching Assistant**, Javier is responsible for some grades (for example, recitation or lab work) -- but for other graded items (such as exams), should only be able to see the same content that students view, with no access to grades. These settings should be controllable by the **course coordinator** and/or the **section instructor**.

6.1.3 Case Study #3 – Usability

Dr. Holmes is an older professor whose experiences with past LMS's has been largely negative: they appear to him cluttered and unappealing with features he won't use and unintuitive without a clear hierarchy. He needs an LMS that has a "beginner" or "simple" setting with just the basics that would later allow him to add features, including third-party applications, as he becomes more comfortable with the system.

On the other hand, Dr. Huang is an LMS all-star. Her courses take advantage of many of the LMS's features and some third-party integrations. In teaching her course, however, she finds students need a couple of weeks to get used to the interface, and she loses out on quality instructional time. Ideally, she needs the ability to show and hide LMS features as they are needed in the course, so students are not overwhelmed when they first log in.

6.1.4 Case Study #4 – Accreditation

College deans, department heads and/or program coordinators need to present information supporting applications for accreditation. Dr. May is the program coordinator of an AA program. For NECHE accreditation, she needs to present evidence of development and/or mastery of skills in written communication, oral communication, and information literacy by students within each course, and across all courses within the college, the departments, and/or programs. Students develop these skills in the multiple courses throughout the program. In each course, there are specific learning objectives which are tied to skills through rubrics in assignments and exams.

Dr. May needs a system that allows her to do the following at the level of a section, a course (i.e., cross-sections), and/or across courses:

- Extract the information in the grading rubrics (grading points and feedback) per learning objective;
- Compile grading information from students to show the development and level of mastery of selected learning objectives;
- Generate reports (plots, statistics) about the development and level of mastery of selected learning objectives by the students;
- Compare development or level of mastery to program thresholds and create reports of key learning objectives that are being met and unmet.
- Aggregate/disaggregate data by a variety of different variables (student, program, rubric cell, multiple choice question, etc.)
- Reuse and share rubrics that align with student, program, and university level learning outcomes.

6.1.5 Case Study #5 – Group Work

Instructor Petri is teaching multiple courses that have students working collaboratively in groups across multiple projects. These groups need to have access to collaborative spaces within the LMS including:

- real-time content creation
- communication tools like chat, video conferencing, discussion boards, email, file exchange/sharing, etc.

These groups may/may not have different assignments/files/rubrics shared with each of them. Instructor Petri would like the flexibility to personalize and differentiate each group, if needed, or create a streamlined process of replicating the same settings for multiple groups at a time.

Additionally, Instructor Petri incorporates peer assessment into his course. The LMS needs to intelligently assign peer review so it can be completed at the group or individual level. However, sometimes he notices that friends are a part of different groups and therefore he wants to assign the peer reviews himself instead of it automatically happening from the LMS.

6.1.6 Case Study #6 – Grading

Professor Green teaches Introduction to Sociology each semester. He relies on a grading system that he has been using for the last 15 years, which he has found to be effective and fair for his students:

- He weights each of his three exams at 20% of the grade, all homework to 15%, quizzes at 15%, and participation is worth 10%.
- He drops one quiz, one homework assignment, and drops 20% of the participation points.
 - Participation points are out of a total of 200. This becomes 160 after he drops the 20%. If a student would receive more than 160 points, then this is just changed to 100% for the participation column.
- He also takes into account any specific considerations that might impact what is fair for a particular student, such as dropping an additional quiz for an excused illness or other event.
- After the third exam, Professor Green also offers extra credit opportunities where the points do not fit into any of the sections above.
- At the end of the semester, he displays the final grade as a letter (A, B, C, D, F) to each student based on a predefined cutoff.

Students in Professor Grey's course need to be able to assess their current and/or projected course performance at various points in the semester. The students should be able to input "what-if" scores into the gradebook to see how their overall course grade is impacted.

6.1.7 Case Study #7 – Course Calendar

Instructor Chahamana needs a student and instructor course calendar that auto-populates from assignments, exams, discussion forums, etc. within the LMS. He needs the flexibility to see all course due dates from this course and all of his other courses in a single view or to select an individual course. His students need the same capability between their courses with the ability to automatically sync to the native calendar of their mobile device. The course calendar should adapt to the student or instructor location and display time zone differences accordingly.

One additional feature students should have is for the calendar to remind them of upcoming key dates/events by text message, email, LMS announcement, and mobile app notification. Students need the ability to pick and choose how they are notified.

6.1.8 Case Study #8 – Day-to-Day Academic Support

Darcy Lincoln is part of a campus-wide group of staff that support students from many different roles including student navigators, academic advisors, and scholarship coordinators. This group needs day-to-day access to individual student information including but not limited to course progress, course content, assignments, calendar, instructor information, and grades. They need this not only for the set of courses their students are currently in but also for previous semesters information. They use this information to support student success and help plan short-term and long-term schedules. They would also need the ability to add events to the students' calendars inside the LMS.

6.1.9 Case Study #9 – Content Accessibility

Professor Lanoie wants her class to be accessible. Her area of expertise is in Network Security. She needs to spend her time teaching students about network security, but she is spending inordinate amounts of time trying to figure out how to make her course content accessible. She needs the LMS to automatically flag newly uploaded content that is not accessible and point her to resources on how to make improvements. Ideally, Professor Lanoie could edit the uploaded files within the LMS without having to download, change, and re-upload.

Students take advantage of accessible content, even if they do not require accommodations. Ideally, the LMS will automatically make any uploaded content (from the instructor or other students) available in multiple formats (audio, text, HTML) so students can select the format in which they are most comfortable.

Attachment B – Technical Case Studies

Note:

All scenarios below should be discussed, where appropriate, with an eye towards instructors and students using their mobile devices or a desktop/laptop computer. Additionally, as all seven MCCS colleges act independently, please describe how the scenarios below can be accomplished in a single-tenant environment.

6.1.11 Case Study #1 – Getting Data In

The start of the semester is looming and Melody Hammerstein, an LMS administrator at one college, is tasked with setting up the near real-time automatic feed from the Student Information System (SIS) into the LMS. It is important that the feed automatically adjusts as students add and drop courses, allows her to set automatic data conversions between SIS fields and the LMS, and allows her to manage manual changes that override the automatic feed. She needs a robust notification system (dashboards, emails, texts, etc.) that keep her informed of the progress and allow her to quickly manage errors, approvals, and the logs of what has happened.

Melody also administers the non-credit and staff professional development course enrollment. These learners are both internal and external to the institution and use a variety of credential options. She will need the same notification and management system as the for-credit enrollment sources.

As the number of sources grows, Melody needs help in maintaining the environment. She will need different staff to have different levels of access to allow them to have access to only the areas they should while maintaining proper logging for who does what.

6.1.12 Case Study #2 – Getting Data Out

Professor Patel teaches an advanced network practicum course in computer science requiring her students to take on external partners as reviewers and clients. At the end of the semester, Professor Patel needs to enter grades once into the LMS and know those grades will be automatically loaded into the Student Information System. Additionally, as part of her course, students can earn a micro-credential with their coursework that meets industry level standards. After Professor Patel approves their work and certifies the grade, the system should automatically upload the grade and upload the verification to the third-party badging system for the award of the micro-credential

Professor Patel has taught this course for a number of semesters and regularly downloads the analytics in an industry standard format to compare and contrast current data from previous semesters. Additionally, she uses this data throughout the semester to ensure that students are reviewing her feedback. Professor Patel uses this to improve her course and understand how her students are adapting to pedagogical changes. She also downloads the entire course and its contents into an industry standard format so that she can take the course with her if she decides to teach the course at another college.

Finally, the university has determined that Professor Patel's course is strategically important to computer studies student's long-term success. The university needs to combine LMS analytics with non-LMS data and therefore wants all LMS industry standard analytics data pushed in real time to the college's central data repository allowing different levels of administration to ensure students are finishing their career successfully.

6.1.13 Case Study #3 – Day-to-Day Technical Support

Dedrie Jones is a lead LMS course developer and assists with faculty requests and support. Much of Dedrie's day-to-day requests require her to look into courses and sections for specific issues. She also needs to quickly adjust her role in the LMS to see potential issues from the administrator, faculty, TA, and/or student perspective to resolve individual issues or identify potential problems.

When she cannot resolve a problem, Dedrie needs to contact the LMS vendor to get help. By the time she figures out she needs help, it is Friday at 7 pm. Dedrie needs the LMS provider to handle the request quickly, outside normal business hours, and provide feedback in a way that enables Dedrie to either let the faculty know the issue is resolved or what the next steps are to resolve the issue. Daily (if not more) communication between Dedrie, the vendor, and the faculty are needed to ensure the faculty can continue teaching without interruption.

Lastly, as usage of the LMS increases, support needs also increase. Dedrie would like to delegate responsibilities for certain courses, departments, or the entire college. She, as well as anyone she delegates responsibility to, needs an easy to use management interface, so the cascading of roles and responsibilities are easily seen, understood, and logged.

6.1.14 Case Study #4 – System Updates

Henri Benoit works directly with instructors at a college to understand how to use teaching and learning technology in their classroom effectively. As part of his role, he needs to understand any new and upcoming changes to the LMS and how it may impact the learning experience. He would expect that any new features or functionality have already been fully tested by the vendor not only to ensure they work, but also that they are fully compliant with security, accessibility, and other college standards. He needs appropriate lead time to fully test new features and functionality from various roles (administrator, instructor, TA, student, etc.) to effectively build learning materials and communicate change. Henri will also need to communicate with the administration so they can understand the impact of selecting, enabling, or turning off each of the new feature provided in the updates. For major changes, Henri needs to be able to run a report to understand who will be impacted so he can communicate with the faculty about those changes.

Henri also understands the ebb and flow of the college calendar and would prefer if major changes were not happening during already stressful times for faculty and students.

Lastly, he would like a partnership with the LMS vendor to provide feedback from faculty and instructional partners about their experiences and new instructional needs. It would be important to Henri to see how the faculty feedback is incorporated into upcoming development roadmaps.

6.1.15 Case Study #5 – Third Party Integrations

Professor Kang wants to integrate a new engagement technology in his course but wants to see all options available before making a final decision. Professor Kang wants to see solutions that are already supported by the college, as well as all of the potential solutions that the vendor has approved for use in their LMS. Once he sees all of the solutions, he finds the right technology and needs a way to request integration for his course. The tool does not need to show for everyone using the LMS but should be tailored to his specific course and allow for automatic syncing of data between both platforms (automatic enrollment changes, gradebook updates, analytics, etc.). However, after successfully using the tool, Professor Kang's colleagues in the department also decided to adopt the tool. His colleagues will need to easily request access to this tool for integration into their courses, and the LMS administrator will need to give the entire department access. As success continues, other specific courses, departments, or the entire college requests access. Although the college doesn't have a system-wide license to the tool, the LMS can provide access to the appropriate groups properly.

As this and other solutions grow or decline, campus administration will need to run real-time reports of usage of this third-party integration to properly understand the instructional technology needs of the system as well as remove or change licensing terms for those integrations.

Lastly, the administration does not want to spend development time and resources with each integration but instead wants to focus on those that adhere to industry standards such as IMS Global's LTI Advantage, SCORM, or API compliant. Additionally, as the standards continue to develop, it will be important for the LMS vendor to not only adhere to the new standards but also be a leading voice in the promotion of adoption by third-party vendors.

Attachment C – Security Section

MCCS Vendor Security Questionnaire

<p>Cloud Services Solution - Vendor Information</p>	<p>MCCS reviews the IT security of all Cloud-based services that store, process, or transmit data that MCCS considers to be Sensitive or Restricted. Please provide the documentation requested below and complete the questionnaire. N/A</p>	
Requested Documentation	Document Titles	Comments
<p>In addition to completing the questionnaire below, the following documentation should be provided to the University (as applicable and/or available and under a nondisclosure agreement - NDA - as needed in support of this security review.)</p>		<p>The University cannot validate and approve services or applications without supporting documentation. Please attach the requested documentation when returning the Security Questionnaire</p>
	<p>Cloud Security Alliance Consensus Assessments Initiative Questionnaire (if Cloud service provider)</p>	
	<p>A vulnerability, penetration, or ethical hack report prepared by a third party (not by the vendor)</p>	
	<p>Any documentation that describes your technical and security infrastructure</p>	
	<p>Data flow diagram (for college data processed by the application/service)</p>	
	<p>Data dictionary (for college data processed by the application/service)</p>	

Information Security	Information Security Questions	Comments and Notes
Management Program	Please describe your Security Management Program or attach a copy. Does your organization follow a particular security standard such as ISO-27001, ISO-22307, CoBIT, HITRUST, etc. or do you have your own?	
Policy Reviews	Can you notify us when changes are made to your security policies or procedures?	
User Access Policy	Please describe your employee termination procedures.	
Encryption Key Management	Will our data be encrypted at rest? What algorithm?	
	Will our data be encrypted in transit, including between servers? What algorithm?	
	Do you have an encryption key management system? If so, please tell us about it?	
Vulnerability / Patch Management	Do you conduct vulnerability scans of the servers?	
	Do you conduct application vulnerability scans?	
	Please explain your patching policy, timeframes, and procedures.	
Antivirus / Malicious Software	Do you have anti-malware and/or virus protection programs installed? Which programs?	

	<p>How often are your malware/virus protection programs updated? How often are complete scans scheduled?</p>	
<p>Incident Management</p>	<p>How will you alert your clients if their data may have been breached? Do you have a documented security incident response plan?</p>	
	<p>Can you incorporate client specific needs into your incident response plan?</p>	
	<p>Can you outline for us what responsibilities are ours and what are yours for an incident?</p>	
<p>Incident Reporting</p>	<p>What method do you use for log management?</p>	
	<p>Does your logging and monitoring method allow for isolation of an incident to specific tenants?</p>	
<p>Incident Response Legal Preparation</p>	<p>How do you incorporate "chain of custody" into your incident response plan?</p>	
	<p>Please share your procedures for forensic data collection and analysis?</p>	
	<p>Are you capable of supporting litigation holds (freeze of data from a specific point in time) for us?</p>	
<p>Asset Returns</p>	<p>Please share a copy of your Privacy Policy.</p>	

Audit Tools Access	How do you restrict, log, and monitor access to your systems? (Ex. Hypervisors, firewalls, vulnerability scanners, network sniffers, APIs, etc.)	
Source Code Access Restriction	Please describe your Source Code Analysis process.	
Security Architecture		
User ID Credentials	Please describe your identity management system and any options that are available to your clients.	
	Does your system support both role-based and context-based access to the data?	
	Do you support two-factor authentication? If so, what options are available?	
Data Security / Integrity	Is your Data Security Architecture designed using an industry standard? (ex. CDSA, MULITSAFE, CSA Trusted Cloud Architectural Standard, FedRAMP CAESARS)	
Application Security	Do you utilize NIST 800-64 (Security Considerations in the System Development Life Cycle) as the guideline for application development? Or, do you use another standard application security development framework?	
	Do you utilize an automated source-code analysis tool to detect code security defects?	
Data Integrity	Are data input and output integrity routines (i.e., reconciliation and edit checks) implemented for application interfaces and databases to prevent manual or systematic processing errors	

	or corruption of data?	
Production / Nonproduction Environments	Do you provide clients with separate environments for production and test processes?	
Remote User Multifactor Authentication	Is multi-factor authentication available for remote user access?	
Segmentation	Are system and network environments logically separated? Are system and network environments segmented to allow isolation of restricted data?	
Wireless Security	What procedures are in place that require strong encryption for authentication and transmission during wireless transmission?	
	Have vendor default passwords been changed?	
Shared Networks	How is access to systems with shared infrastructure restricted to only appropriate personnel?	
Equipment Identification	How does the information system identify and authenticate devices before establishing a network connection?	
Audit Logging / Intrusion Detection	Are file integrity (host) and network intrusion detection (IDS) tools implemented?	
	Are audit logs protected from modification?	
Mobile Code	How is mobile code monitored and controlled in your system?	

	Is all unauthorized mobile code prevented from executing?	
--	---	--

Facility Security	Facility Security Questions	Comments and Notes
Policy	What policies and procedures exist for providing physical safeguards of the systems and environment?	
Controlled Access Points	What physical security perimeters (fences, walls, barriers, guards, gates, electronic surveillance, physical authentication mechanisms, reception desks, and security patrols) have been implemented?	
Secure Area Authorization	Where will the data be located? Backups? Alternate data center?	
Offsite Authorization	Are you able to alert us if the data is to be moved to a different location?	

Resiliency	Resiliency Questions	Comments and Notes
Business Continuity Planning	Please explain your backup strategy? Disaster Recovery plan? Business Continuity plan?	
Equipment Power Failures	What types of mechanisms and redundancies are implemented to protect equipment from utility service outages (e.g., power failures, network disruptions, etc.)?	
Power / Telecommunications	Please share a data flow diagram of your systems as related to backups/mirrors/failovers?	

Compliance	Compliance Questions	Comments and Notes
Independent Audits	Please share your SAS70 Type II/SSAE 16 SOC2/ISAE3402 or similar third-party audit reports.	
	Do you conduct network penetration tests?	
	Do you conduct application penetration tests of your cloud infrastructure yearly or after any upgrade?	
	Please share your penetration test results.	
Third Party Audits	Are clients able to conduct their own vulnerability scans?	
Information System Regulatory Mapping	Do you have the capability to logically segment and recover data for a specific customer in the case of a failure or data loss?	
Risk Management	Is your organization insured by a 3rd party for losses?	

Data Governance	Data Governance Questions	Comments and Notes
Retention Policy	Do you have capabilities to enforce client data retention policies?	
Secure Disposal	Are you able to support secure deletion (ex. degaussing/cryptographic wiping) of archived data as determined by the client?	
	What happens to the data at the end of the contract?	
Nonproduction Data	Do you have procedures in place to ensure production data shall not be replicated or used in non-production environments?	
Information Leakage	Do you have controls in place to prevent data leakage or intentional/accidental compromise between tenants in a multi-tenant environment?	
	Do you have a Data Loss Prevention (DLP) or extrusion prevention solution in place for all systems which interface with your cloud service offering?	

Attachment D – Contract Terms and Conditions

NOTICE TO ALL BIDDERS REGARDING CONDITIONS ON BIDS

STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL MAINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM CONTRACTS

The following Maine Community College System (MCCS) standard contracting terms and conditions are incorporated and shall become a part of any final contract that will be awarded by any college or another operating unit of MCCS. These terms and conditions derive from the public nature and limited resources of MCCS.

MCCS DOES NOT AGREE TO:

1. provide any defense, hold harmless or indemnity;
2. waive any statutory or constitutional immunity;
3. apply the law of a state other than Maine;
4. procure types or amounts of insurance beyond those MCCS already maintains or waive any rights of subrogation;
5. add any entity as an additional insured to MCCS policies of insurance;
6. pay attorneys' fees or costs for any other entity;
7. promise confidentiality in a manner contrary to Maine's Freedom of Access Act;
8. permit an entity to change unilaterally any term or condition once the contract is signed; and
9. automatic renewals for term(s) greater than month-to-month.

By submitting a response to a Request for Proposal, bid or other like offer to do business with MCCS, **YOUR ENTITY UNDERSTANDS AND AGREES THAT:**

1. The above standard terms and conditions are thereby incorporated either expressly or by reference to this notice into any agreement entered into between MCCS and your entity, and that your entity will not propose or demand any contrary terms;
2. The above standard terms and conditions will govern the interpretation of such agreement notwithstanding the expression of any other term and/or condition to the contrary;
3. Your entity will not propose to any college or other operating unit of MCCS any contractual documents of any kind that are not in at least 11-point font and completely contained in one Word or PDF document, and that any references to terms; and
4. Your entity will identify at the time of submission which, if any, portion or your submitted materials are entitled to "trade secret" exemption from disclosure under Maine's Freedom of Access Act; that failure to so identify will authorize MCCS to conclude that no portions are so exempt; and that your entity will defend, indemnify and hold harmless MCCS in any and all legal actions that seek to compel MCCS to disclose under Maine's Freedom of Access Act some or all of your submitted materials and/or contract, if any, executed between MCCS and your entity.