



UNIVERSITY OF  
**TORONTO**

# **Questions & Answers #1**

**Request for Proposals**

**For**

**A Learning Management Engine and Related Services**

Request for Proposals No.: **UOT201615062**

Issued: **May 16, 2016**

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS to Request for Proposals No.: UOT201615062**

**This Questions & Answers consists of six (6) pages, including the cover sheet.**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>University Response</b>
1	Does the solution need to be hosted within Canada? Will preference be given to a solution hosted within Canada?	There is no minimum requirement for hosting in Canada. For references to Canada, please see sections Part 4 – 4.8.1, B.3.1, and Table 4 - 4.43.
2	Is the requirement for one, or for three stand alone LMS instances, one instance for St. George, UTM & UTSc?	<p>The University is seeking a single enterprise solution. There are no specific requirements or restrictions on the number of instances of software involved in the provision of that solution.</p> <p>For clarification, we are not seeking an LMS, we are seeking a Learning Management Engine (<a href="http://www.learningmanagementengine.com">http://www.learningmanagementengine.com</a>).</p>
3	Can the University share its criteria or expectations for awarding the bid to one vendor versus choosing multiple bidders?	Please see Section 1.3: Type of Contract for Deliverables in the RFP. The University intends to contract with one (1) legal entity
4	Can U of T confirm if vendor should provide a template contract, or provide answers/feedback on the Appendix A Term Sheet?	Proponents should provide their template contract and can choose to comment on the Appendix A Term Sheet.
5	Are there course conversion requirements?	Yes. Please see Section A.4 in Appendix E, and Row 2.1 in the Rate Bid Form in Appendix C.

No.	Question	University Response
6	Do the staging environments have to be replicas of the original? Or just a duplicate applications.	Please see Schedule A: Section 4.34 in Table 4.
7	Is the rectification date when the vendor is notified of rectification, or when rectifications are due back to U of T?	The rectification date and time is the deadline for Proponents to email back any requested rectifications to the University Contact.
8	What vendors does the University expect to compete for this RFP?	The University is open to all qualified Proponents that are able to meet the requirements. Proposals will be evaluated as per Appendix E Section C.
9	Can the University provide more detail regarding the Open Testing Period? Specifically, support expectations; test scripting responsibilities; and integration configurations?	<p>Please see Section C.2 - Stage IIB: Community Evaluation. The University will need to review the Proposals before detailing or finalizing the testing period and use cases.</p> <p>Proponents should provide details on their willingness and ability to support the University during the testing period, including any risks and assumptions.</p>
10	Can you provide specific use cases?	<p>Specific use cases will be shared with short listed Proponents as per the RFP. The University will have more information and clarity on the types of use cases to provide after reviewing the solutions provided in the Proposals. Proponents can provide their own use cases for review by the University.</p> <p>This response applies to all questions requesting additional information on use cases during the testing period.</p>

No.	Question	University Response
11	Does the University have its own LRS (Learning Records Store)?	No LRS is currently in production use.
12	Which Quali products are the University using and seeking integration with?	QualiCo Curriculum Management and Quali Ready
13	Where can we find Appendix A – Form of Agreement Term Sheet? Currently, only the Index appears to be included in the RFP document.	It is common practice to include a term sheet to indicate all of the terms that will be addressed in the negotiated contract, rather than a full form of an agreement that has not yet been negotiated. Since this is a negotiated agreement, where the details are worked out between the parties, we do not include a full contract template as we expect many of the terms will be shaped by the negotiations. Therefore, you are not missing anything. The RFP is complete, as you have received it.
14	What is your targeted “Go Live” date?	Subject to final negotiation with the selected Proponent. Proponents should provide an estimated “go live’ based on estimated times in Section A.7.3 and as per Section A.4 Implementation and Project Management.
15	1.9.2 What standards are you talking about?	Compliance with the listed metadata standards ensures that the rights, description and preservation information is recorded in a transferable way, and that the records can be harvested for discovery. Please see 1.9.3 for some examples.
16	1.9.4 What artifacts are you asking about? Portfolios? Student work? Something else?	All and any artefacts produced within the system, including those produced by students and instructors.

No.	Question	University Response
17	1.17 " Are there any protections in place regarding significant changes being made to a solution while it is in use? " - can you explain the use case	The University is concerned that a Proponent would make unannounced and/or arbitrary changes that would affect our users' teaching and learning processes and/or content, or break integrations with our toolset. Any changes or updates must be approved by the University before being applied. Please refer to A.5.2.
18	2.10.9 Does your solution support the ability to integrate with specific resources from within the Core LME (example from viewing grades in The University's SIS to viewing grades in the Core LME)? - please explain use case in more detail	The question/requirement relates to how the Proponent's LME works with a student information system.
19	2.25.7 Does your solution provide the ability to filter content by user role? - please provide more detail about what content is described here, and what the use case would be	The question/requirement relates to all and any content uploaded and/or created by users.
20	2.59.2 Does your solution provide the ability to handle large classes of five thousand active students and organizations of one hundred thousand members? - please explain the use case	This question/requirement relates to the fact that we have some large entities (e.g. multi-sectioned courses, program wide organizations, etc.) and an interest in entities that spans the entire community.
21	2.60.12 Does your solution provide dynamic group membership based on section number? - please clarify what you mean by "dynamic group membership" and how that interacts with "section number"	The ability to sub-divide a class or sections of a class into non-static membership groups.

No.	Question	University Response
22	2.61.1 Does your solution include an easy to use content drop box or file transfer feature? - is this question about how students turn in assignments or about how faculty upload content to the course? Please clarify.	This question/requirement refers to how documents and files can be shared between individuals or groups.
23	2.68.6 Can student visibility be dynamically set, using filtering by criteria, with no ability to manually hide individual students? - please clarify the use case for this	This question/requirement refers to the ability to dynamically group students using selected criteria, and then not allowing manual override (hiding a student). Could be used for tutorial groupings in a grade book for example.
24	2.74.7 Does your solution provide the ability to create multi-part assignment? - please describe the use case and what is meant by a “multi-part” assignment	This question/requirement refers to assignments that can have different parts, or have different timelines within the same overall assignment (drafts vs final versions, etc.).
25	2.84.10 Does your solution provide the ability to work with Microsoft Office 365 / Skype for Business / Lync? - In this context, please explain the use case/scenario.	This question/requirement refers to the ability of users to seamlessly leverage O365 services as integrated tools within our ecosystem.
26	Do you require that the LMS servers be on Canadian soil or will AWS placement suffice?	<p>There is nothing in the RFP that would exclude a Proposal that leverages AWS or any other cloud service. Proponents must pass the IRRM assessment.</p> <p>For clarification, we are not seeking an LMS, we are seeing a Learning Management Engine (<a href="http://www.learningmanagementengine.com">http://www.learningmanagementengine.com</a>)</p>

**END OF QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #1**