1. Do you have a reporting database for D2L where data can be queried without affecting operational performance?

Response:
The BOR system has not developed their own system-wide database to house information from D2L to support reporting. Nor have we licensed the D2L Analytics package at the time of this response. Individual faculty or campuses may have created data marts related to specific section, student, or campus information from D2L to support specific reporting needs.

2. Section 6 – Would you consider assigning levels of priority to each requirement? (1 = First-level Priority, 2 = Second-level Priority, etc.)

Response:
We are interested in understanding what opportunities the responding vendors can provide us to help organize, manage, interpret, and define actions associated with observed behaviors or identified markers. We will be interested in understanding how the priorities you note in your question could be incorporated into your solution to provide us those capabilities.

3. Section 6.1.1 – What are the industry standards for tracking and recording of retention information are you referencing? Please provide link to standards if available.

Response:
There is no link or specific retention standard we can reference. This item refers to the proposed solution following reasonable and customary industry standards for the operation, entry, tracking, and recording of retention information. Should a proposed solution vary from what is considered reasonable and customary, this item will provide us an opportunity to reflect our rating accordingly.

4. Section 6.2.10 – Please define “counselor.” Is this similar to an academic advisor, or a mental-health specialist?

Response:
“counselor” is a role defined to be someone that provides academic and/or career advice or counseling.

5. Section 6.2.13 – Do you anticipate that the same workflows will be used across the system (at all institutions) or will there be campus-specific workflows?

Response:
We routinely promote the sharing of work between our Universities as an efficiency measure and at times to ensure a consistent, improved level of service. As it relates to this solution, we will be looking for solutions that allow us share workflows across the Universities to gain efficiencies where possible. In doing so, we also understand it may be necessary to support individual campus workflows in recognition of the unique organizational structure and operational needs of the individual Universities.

6. Section 6.2.16 – Do you anticipate that the same intervention activities will be used across the system (at all institutions) or will there be campus-specific workflows?

Response:
We routinely promote the sharing of work between our Universities as an efficiency measure and at times to ensure a consistent, improved level of service. We anticipate there may be a common set of activities defined that all will adopt but there may also be institution specific activities that are only available and applicable on an institution by institution basis.

7. **Section 6.2.23** – Please explain and/or provide examples of, “Provides the ability to track a client defined status associated with a student’s case.”

Response:
We anticipate the need to track a student’s status once identified to be included in or added to the vendor’s early alert solution. In doing so, we are interested in understanding what capacity we will have to both identify and track the student’s status in the system (i.e. active, open, assigned, in-progress, closed, completed, archive, etc.)

8. **Section 6.4.1** – Please explain “Extends/utilizes existing security setup in Colleague for students, faculty and staff to manage access.”

Response:
As noted in the item, does the proposed solution utilize the security features of our existing Colleague system to manage access in the proposed solution? Is this done by extending the existing Colleague functionality through leveraging the existing security classes in the Colleague system, addition of security classes to the existing Colleague system, or addition of other features, fields, screens, or other to our existing Colleague system? How does the proposed system utilize the existing Colleague security in supporting the security in the proposed solution?

9. **Section 6.4.5** – Please explain “real time” in “Provides interface to support the copying of information between SD’s Colleague system and the Responder’s system in a ‘real time’ mode.”

Response:
“real time” has been defined in response to item 9. We are interested in understanding what each vendor’s solution can provide for functionality and cannot provide specific thresholds for acceptable delays at this time. Each vendor’s response will be taken into consideration when determining which proposal can provide the best solution for the Board of Regents.

10. **Section 6.4.6** – “Provides interface to support the copying of information between Desire-2-Learn and the Responder’s system in a ‘real time’ mode. If customization or development is necessary, please explain.” Identify what data is included in this interface. Please define “real-time.” What delay, if any, would be acceptable?

Response:
We cannot comment on the data points your system supports or requires from D2L to operate successfully. We anticipate data points likes grades on class assignments, attendance, and faculty comments are representative of factors we may want to consider when determining student retention status. “real time” has been defined in response to item 9. We are interested in understanding what each vendor’s solution can provide for functionality and cannot provide specific thresholds for acceptable delays at this time. Each vendor’s response will be taken into consideration when determining which proposal can provide the best solution for the Board of Regents.
11. **Section 6.4.17** – Please explain “Provides the ability to limit access to information via screens to information related to the student based on the value of the University code or identifier.”

Response:
We are a University system and in our current Colleague environment, all student information is combined into a single installed instance of the system and database. Students are assigned a ‘home University’ and a code to represent their association with that home University. Staff members are also associated with a University in this single instance. This question asks if we installed in the proposed system in a similar single instance environment, would the proposed system allow us to limit access to the student early alert information to only those people that have the appropriate University code or identifier assigned to them as an option that we could exercise at our discretion.

12. **Section 6.4.20** – Please confirm that this requirement was intentionally left blank.

Response:
Yes

13. **Section 6.7.17** – Please provide examples of “In a hosted environment, does client incur a charge for special maintenance held outside of normal business hours or on week-ends.”

Response:
In the event where the proposed solution is hosted by the vendor, will the SD BOR incur any additional charges to have maintenance of that environment (which would require a down time) performed outside of our normal business hours, Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 6:00 pm CT? If your hosting center is going to perform maintenance on the system on Wednesday 1:00 pm CT and we request to have that moved to 9:00 pm CT for example, or some other time outside our normal weekday business hours, will we incur an additional charge?

14. **Section 6.8.3** – Can you further clarify this requirement?

Response:
The vendor will provide experienced implementation resources in the Local Area Networking and server implementation and integration aspects of the deployment such that we, the client, have experts we can contact to either assist us in the implementation or allow us to secure those resources through you in order to implement the software. But, we are not required to go outside your organization to secure those resources/help.

15. **On Page 6**, you mention: “SDBOR will need the ability to import markers from other systems that the Universities define to be considered in determining at-risk students.” Please define “markers from other systems.” Can you provide examples of some of these other systems (other than Datatel Colleague and D2L)?

Response:
While we expect Datatel and D2L to be primary contributors, we also anticipate there could be other contributing sources in determining at-risk students. Therefore, what capacity does the proposed system provide us to import contributing factors or indicators from other systems? Possible contributors could be, but not limited to, the Universities CRM systems (currently EMAS and Hobson’s), housing systems, or our Banner system.
16. On page 7 you mention that each campus has implemented their own CRM system. Can you provide additional details on this system (homegrown, purchased, brand, etc.)?

Response:
Each University has the ability to select and implement their own recruitment and CRM system. Currently, 5 Universities have adopted the EMAS system and one has adopted the Hobson system.

17. Please confirm that page 8 of the RFP is intentionally left blank.

Response:
Page 8 begins with “3. Questions”. We will need to provide you a new page 8.