



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

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

Online Exam Proctoring Solution Addendum #1

Addendum Issue Date:	June 25, 2020
Response Due Date:	June 30, 2020, 4pm EST
Return Proposal To:	Scott Fortin Chief Information Security Officer Maine Community College System 323 State Street Augusta, ME 04330
	207.629.4004 sfortin@mccs.me.edu

Support Requirement Addition

After further discussion by the RFP committee, the Maine Community College System (MCCS) is adding an additional requirement to section 6.1 of the RFP issued on June 15, 2020. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure end users of the Online Exam Proctoring Solution have ways to troubleshoot device, exam, and other technical or training issues while not burdening college support staff. If end user support is not a standard offering with the proposed solution, costs for adding this service should be detailed separately from standard solution costs.

Provide Support to Test Takers, Test Authors, and LMS Admins

1. The Respondent must provide 24/7 end user support for test takers, test authors, and college support staff who work with our shared LMS (IT, online learning support, etc).
2. The Respondent's support structure should allow multiple methods of communication: phone, chat, email, ticket system, etc.
3. The Respondent must detail service level agreements (SLAs) for each method of communication and the support structure as a whole.
4. The Respondent must outline escalation paths and reporting for issues not able to be resolved between solution support and the end user.

Bidder Questions/Answers

Three question sets were received from potential respondents. Company-specific information has been removed from the questions. Answers compiled from the RFP committee are below:

Question set #1, received 6/17/20 - 3:50pm

Would you please estimate the number of exams proctored annually for each of the proctoring modalities below? Or, you may state an estimate of the total number of exams annually proctored and estimate the percentage proctored by each modality. We are not requesting a detailed analysis per school, but a generalized estimate state-wide of the current utilization of each of the following modalities of proctoring.

MODALITY	NUMBER OR PERCENTAGE
Live, online proctoring	
Automated virtual proctoring	
Record & Review virtual proctoring	
Testing Center at the student's school	
Testing Center at another school	
Professional testing center (i.e. PearsonVUE, Prometric)	

Approved proctoring professional (i.e. Human Resources Director at a Corporation)	
Instructor-as-Proctor	
Other	

MCCS Answer: This question is extremely difficult to answer given the history of our System using different LMSs, tools for exam proctoring, and our distributed organizational structure. Estimated usage data is available in the RFP with the caveat we will know more after semester 1 and year 1. We anticipate with an easy-to-use proctoring tool; instructors will adopt and use the solution. This is especially true in scenarios where most or all of our courses are delivered online, as seen during the COVID-19 response.

As this answer is not specific or quantitative, the MCCS is willing to plan check-in points during solution adoption to ensure we are paying a realistic amount for the number of exams or students that use the solution. We also encourage respondents to develop flexible licensing and pricing models that:

- 1) Take these unknowns into consideration or*
- 2) Eliminate the unknowns as a barrier to responding and base the scale of the solution on known data like student FTE, headcount, IPEDS, etc.*

Question set #2, received 6/22/20 - 12:36pm

For the institutions listed with estimated proctored exam usage, is this based on historical usage of online proctoring products? Would it be possible to provide details on the type of online proctoring products being used? Can you break-down the estimates for Live Proctoring, Record and Review Proctoring, Auto-Proctoring, etc.?

MCCS Answer: Estimated proctor exam usage is based on a combination of online tools (Respondus Monitor, Respondus Lock Down Browser, Proctorio through ATI, Jenzabar Lockdown Browser, ProctorU) and in-person proctoring methods using a campus testing center or other approved off-site testing center. As stated in the answer to question set #1, more specific data as to the percentages or numbers of each of the modalities is not readily available due to the complexity of our organization and historical use of disparate tools. For this reason, the MCCS invites respondents to develop flexible licensing and pricing models that take these unknowns into consideration or base the scale of the solution on known data like student FTE, headcount, IPEDS, etc.

Is there an overall or majority preference for a specific model of proctoring across most campuses? Will the proctoring service be paid for centrally by MCCS or by each individual campus, by students, or all of the above?

MCCS Answer: The RFP committee has selected automated-virtual as the preference. However, each department, course, and campus will deliver exams differently. The perfect online exam proctoring solution would incorporate features of live proctoring and record and review proctoring when an automated-virtual proctor senses an 'event'.

The proctoring service will be paid centrally by the MCCS for years 1-3. We will review usage after semester 1 and year 1 to ensure we are getting value out of the solution. If certain institutions or departments use the solution more heavily, a charge-back model may be implemented internally.

Question set #3, received 6/23/20 - 12:50pm

4.3 Pricing: 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. Q. Is there an MCCS specific pricing format or pricing document that was intended to be released with the RFP?

MCCS Answer: Pricing on your standard quotation form is fine. Pricing should be valid for 180-days.

Pg. 22: 1. The above standard terms and conditions are thereby incorporated into any agreement entered into between MCCS and your entity. Q. Can proposer's provide exceptions to the standard terms and conditions with our response, with the intent to negotiate a final contract in good faith upon award?

MCCS Answer: Exceptions to the standard terms and conditions are only granted in rare cases and during final contract negotiation once a proposal has been reviewed and selected to move forward in the RFP process.

Can MCCS please sign and return the attached Non Disclosure Agreement so we can submit the requested confidential and proprietary technical documents with our proposal? Please return to ***.

MCCS Answer: We cannot agree to use the laws of another state. Our recommendation is to submit a solution proposal without 'confidential and proprietary technical documents'. In addition, as we are a public entity, and this is a public bid: Parts of your proposal could be subject to FOIA requests by other vendors or entities. If this happens, we typically ask vendors to revise their proposals and redact any trade secrets, intellectual property, and certain pricing.