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

Direct All Inquiries To
The Bureau of Procurement and Materials
Management -
L. Leasburg-Kramer, C.P.M.
PHONE: (305) 995-1364
TDD PHONE: (305) 995-2400
Lleasburg-kramer@dadeschools.net

BID/RFP ADDENDUM

Date: 10/05/2005
Addendum No.   1

BID/RFP No.:   011-FF04
BID/RFP TITLE: Student Scheduler

This addendum modifies the conditions of the above referenced BID/RFP as follows:
1. Change to XVIII. SCHEDULE
2. Responses to Questions Received

The attached pages containing clarifications, additional information and requirements
constitutes an integral part of the referenced bid.

1   If your bid/proposal has not been mailed, substitute the pages marked REVISED and mail your
        entire bid/proposal package. **REMEMBER TO SIGN THE BIDDER QUALIFICATION FORM.**

OR

2.   If your bid/proposal has been mailed, sign and return this addendum form with the revised
        pages by the time and date indicated on the Bidder Qualification Form. BY SIGNING THIS
        ADDENDUM, THE VENDOR AGREES TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN
        THE BIDDER QUALIFICATION FORM AND ALL RELATED BID DOCUMENTS.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum Number

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.

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT BELOW)

LEGAL NAME OF BIDDER: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE ZIP CODE: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ E-MAIL I.D._____ FAX #_____

BY: SIGNATURE (Manual): _____
        OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTAТIVE
        NAME (Typed)- _____TITLE:_____
        OF AUTHORIZiD REPRESENTAТIVE

FM-4354 Rev. (07-98)

unsuccessful proposer(s).

The selection committee will consist of the following:

- A principal selected from an elementary or elem/middle (K-8 center), middle and senior high school;

- A school staff member, who is responsible for scheduling, selected from an elementary or elem/middle (K-8 center), middle and senior high school;

- An administrator from Procurement Management Services (non-voting);

- One administrator from Systems and Programming Services;

- One administrator from Support Services;

- One administrator from Curriculum & Instruction;

- A representative from the Division of Business Development and Assistance.

- One administrator from the School Improvement Zone;

- One administrator from Regional Operations;

- One subject expert from Business/Educational Community

The technical review sub-committee will consist of the following:

- Three administrators from Information Technology Services.

XVIII. SCHEDULE

The planned schedule for review of proposals is as follows:

> Mailing: September 12, 2005
> Opening of Proposals: November 1, 2005
> Evaluation of Proposals: November 7, 2005
> Demonstrations: December 1-2, 2005
> POC: January 2006 through February 2006
> Final Vote: February, 22 2006
> Award: March 2006 Board meeting

Above dates may vary based on number of submissions moved forward for testing and the available resources of ITS.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED

Question 1: Licensing Costs- Is the Tier structure under Item XIV, number 6, a geographic breakdown of schools or just a way to divide the number of schools into 50 school blocks?
Response: Not geographic. Just blocks of 50.

Question 2: Can you provide the breakdown of the number of school types (HS, MS, Elem, K-8) and the student populations for each type?
*Response**Enrollment K-12 as of 09/22/05 - 11:00 A.M.**

Non-Charter Schools

Elementary	*K-8*	*Middle*	*Senior*	*Special**
147,668	*12,828*	*68,440*	*105,090*	*3,541*

Charter Schools

Elementary	*K-8*	*Middle*	*Senior*	*Special**
4,386	*5,213*	*4,170*	*2,919*	*0*

Question 3: Are current school schedules relatively consistent across the district or do the high schools use a wide variety of schedule types (block, a/b, trimester, etc…)? Not consistent; wide variety.
Response: The only thing consistent among any of our schools (elementary, middle and senior highs) is the semester system: a full school year consists of two separate terms where each term consists of two nine-week grading periods (so there are four grading periods in a year) and some schedules can rotate every nine-week grading period (exploratory wheel classes).

Question 4. What is M-DCPS's goal for implementation? When does the district wish to have the software implemented in all schools?
Response: There are probably 2 different implementation plans (winter/spring pre-scheduling or fall post scheduling) that we would consider depending on when the RFP process completes.

Question 5: Does the customer require a walk-in scheduler in addition to the master schedule builder?
Response: Requirement number 18 addresses this per "individual student demand scheduler".

Question 6: Can the district provide a list of MWBE vendors that are qualified to participate on this project?
Response: This is an Open Solicitation. Submissions will be accepted from all vendors meeting specifications.

Question 7: Is the tier structure shown in section XIV.6 of the RFP a geographic breakdown of schools or just a way to divide the number of schools into 50 school blocks?
Response: See Question 1 above.

Question 8: Can you provide the breakdown of the number of school types by type (high school, middle school, elementary, K-8) and the student populations in each type?

Response:

As of 9/28 -
Number of schools by category - non-Charter schools

Elementary	K-8 Centers	Middle	Senior	Special
196	12	54	46	8

Number of schools by category - Charter schools

Elementary	K-8 Centers	Middle	Senior	Special
13	11	15	10	0

See Question 2 above.

Question 9: Are scheduling methods (scenarios) relatively consistent across the district or do the high schools and middle schools use a wide variety of scheduling scenarios (block, a/b, trimester, etc…) and number of terms (schedule by quarter, semester, etc.)
Response: See Question 3 above.

Question 10: What is M-DCPS's target date for the start of implementation? When does the district wish to have the software implemented in all schools?
Response: See Question 4 above.

Question 11: Are you planning implementing all schools at once, or phased in over several months? We generally phase-in an implementation and start with a small pilot first.
If phased in, do you have a preference as to how to define Phase I, ie by school type, geographic zone, volunteer basis, pilot group first?
Response: See Question 4 above.

Question 12: Is there one district-wide annual student registration deadline that is rigidly enforced, or does each school register students on its own individual timeline? Alternatively, do high school deadlines run in waves such that one wave is extremely early (such as November) and another wave extremely late (such as May)?
Response: There is not one-district wide annual registration deadline that is rigidly enforced. Each school registers students on its own individual timeline but the range for registration for the next school year runs from January through July for all schools, not just Seniors.

Question 13: Is there a standard district course catalog from which schools 'adopt' courses to offer?
Response: Yes, actually a state "catalog"
If so, what overrides are required at the school level, ie, can the school assign its own credit value to a course?
Response: No overrides allowed for credits although can assign as semester for ½ credit.

Does a school have the option of attaching extra digits to course codes in order to tailor courses to its population?
Response: One state course code is represented at each school differently via the use of a 6-byte course sequence/section or sections, in not necessarily a one-to-one relationship, which perhaps you would consider as "extra digits".

Question 14: Are there any year-round, multiple-track schools in the district?
Response: Not at this time.

Question 15: Regarding the proof of concept, do you want to use actual M-DCPS student data, and if so, how many schools do you want to include in the evaluation database? We would prefer provided we have resources that can attend to your requirements in the necessary timeframe at that time. We assume that M-DCPS will supply its own end-user hardware for the POF - will it also provide a server on which we can install the system to be left at M-DCPS during the evaluation period?
Response: Yes.