

The School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida  
SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
Bureau of Procurement and Materials Management  
1450 N.E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Room 352  
Miami, Fl. 33132

Direct All Inquiries To Barbara Jones  
The Bureau of Procurement and Materials  
Management -

PHONE: (305) 995-2348  
TDD PHONE: (305) 995-2400

**BID/RFP ADDENDUM  
(INFORMATION ONLY)**

Date: 1/16/04  
Addendum No. 1

**BID/RFP TITLE: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #059-DD10  
ELECTRONIC GRADEBOOK PROGRAM**

This addendum modifies the conditions of the above referenced BID/RFP as follows, and is only for information purposes:

1. See Attached Questions and Answers

PLEASE NOTE: If your firm has mailed a copy of this bid/proposal to another vendor, it is your responsibility to forward them a copy of this addendum.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO RFP #059-DD10

1. Are there monies budgeted and available for the gradebook implementation?
  1. Yes
2. Will the gradebook be purchased by the district or by individual schools?
  2. District
3. Will the awarded Proposer be the sole source selection for gradebooks that May be purchased by schools in M-DCPS? If not, will more than one Proposer be selected during this RFP process
  3. There are already, gradebooks in use by 100+ schools. This RFP is intended to provide the other 200+ schools availability to a gradebook program purchased by the district and operated in a central fashion over the Wide Area Network. Schools will always have the options of using their existing gradebook programs or purchasing one different than the district offering
4. What Student Information System is used by M-DCPS?
  4. An internally developed, mainframe CICS based system. It is extremely comprehensive and much of the data is available through server based data warehouse.
5. Please provide any copies of any written communications with other vendors per section D-4 on page vii of the RFP.
  5. *There are none*
6. On page 2, Section IV, #9, the RFP states, "Automatically generate user names and passwords for the student and parent access...". Please clarify the specific security model required.
  6. Administrative and instructional uses (Principals, Teachers, etc.) must have access administratively assigned. Data warehouse personnel information, RACF security server (mainframe based with server access) and ADS (through LDAP connectivity are available for this purpose depending on gradebook architecture. For those products offering parent and/or student access, a provision must be built-in for account maintenance and password/PIN generation as no ADS or RACF connectivity is available for these non-employees
7. On page 2, Section IV, #11, the RFP states, "Allow for archived "vault copies" of the Gradebook ..." Please clarify any specific functional parameters associated with this requirement.
  7. By law gradebooks fall under retention rules and must be kept for possible future review, audit or evidentiary purposes. Therefore the system must provide for indefinite archive of all gradebooks for all teachers from previous years (since inception of the gradebook system) moving forward. Existing paper gradebooks will continue to be warehoused in their current form.

8. On page 2, Section IV, #12, the RFP states, "Support various grading methodologies ..." Please provide a summary of all grading methodologies that must be supported.
8. *At a minimum, the gradebook program should be able to support all calculated grading methods. This would include averaging, summation, summation percentage, raw score conversion to percentage, extra credits grades, overrides, curved grades, bonus points and any other district required special condition grading methods. These calculated grading methods must accommodate grade input of alpha and numeric grades including plus and minus, non conforming non calculated grades such as the use of symbols. Calculations must allow weighting schemes to be applied to grades, groupings, and standards-based/outcomes tracking. Class should be unrestricted with respect to the number of grades, grade sub-groupings, grading periods and semesters within a class file.*
9. On page 2, Section IV, #21, the RFP states, "Give the district the ability to customize and add data fields." Please provide examples.
9. To enable the application to grow with district and state reporting needs the ability to add and/or customize fields is useful. As an example, Florida legislation requires that any student not meeting performance standards must have an Academic Improvement Plan (AIP). As over 150,000 students will need one, the district may wish to add an AIP indicator field to the gradebook class list
10. On page 2, Section IV, #1 under Preferred features, the RFP states, "Roll-up information to permit reporting on the school, feeder pattern, ..." Please provide examples as to how access to this information is desired.
10. Schools in our district are organized into Access Centers or Regions defined by a geographical area. Within these areas are feeder patterns where schools of lower grade level feed students to schools of higher grade levels, the requirements refers to summary and detail reporting on students/grades by Feeder Pattern and Access Center.
11. On page 2, Section IV, #2 under Preferred features, the RFP states, "Create statistical distribution and analysis reports, graphs, and charts." Please provide examples as to the types of reports desired.
11. *The gradebook program must be capable of producing reports, graphs and charts to be created and distributed that analyze the performance of the students and classes based on classroom grades, attendance, mastery of Sunshine State Standards and other relevant data as needed. For example, statistical analysis should be available to establish a curve or adjust weighting of assignments. Additionally, the program should be proactive to upgrading as emerging technologies become available.*
12. On page 2, Section IV, #3 under Preferred features, the RFP states, "View and print current report cards." Does the district currently print report cards for all schools? Are report cards for M-DCPS standardized across the district by grade level?
12. This refers to interim progress reports. Yes, the district currently prints report cards for all students centrally at the end of each 9 weeks grade reporting period. Interim progress reports are produced by the schools and the software feature would be preferred.

13. On page 2, Section IV, #3 under Preferred features, the RFP states, "Compare class-by-class student performance." What specific performance statistics should be considered?
  13. *The gradebook should be an essential tool that assists the district in providing reliable analysis of student progress to the students, parents, teacher, school, district and state. It must have the capacity to generate reports that demonstrate student mastery of Sunshine State Standards and other assessment tools as associated with particular grades according to configurable mastery levels.*
14. On page 3, Section V, #1 the RFP states, "Proposer(s) must provide documentation of being an established software provider, having done business for at least five years developing, providing, and managing gradebook software." If the Proposer has been in business for over five years but has not been developing gradebook software for five years, will that business be removed from consideration (i.e. business established in 1989 but providing gradebook software since 2000)?
  14. *That will be determined by the evaluation committee.*
15. On page 4, Section VI, the RFP describes the requirements for the Proof of Concept. Will this Proof of Concept commence following the short listing of Proposer(s) or will all Proposer(s) be expected to participate.
  15. A demonstration/presentation can/may be asked of any and all respondents. A proof of concept will be limited to a "short list" of selected proposers.
16. On page 4, Section VI, the RFP describes the requirements for the Proof of Concept. On what date will the Proof of Concept be expected to commence?
  16. To be determined by the district based upon hardware, software and implementation complexity requirements. However, the target timeframe is February through May 2004.
17. On page 4, Section VI, the RFP describes the requirements for the Proof of Concept. Will the student/teacher/schedule data used in the Proof of Concept be provided by the Proposer(s) or by the district? If provided by the district, what accommodations will be made to ensure proper formatting of data exported from the district Student Information System for use by the Proposer(s) gradebook?
  17. The District will provide the data and identify existing options for interface. It is the proposers responsibility to be able to import/interface to the data and methods of the district.