

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 062-LL10, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND AUTOMATED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM.

1. The RFP states: "Describe how the software solution allows for seamless integration with existing SQL server M-DCPS databases to allow automatic data import and export." How many SQL server databases must be integrated, over what timeframe? What domains/applications require integration with the proposed solution?

Remains to be seen depending on product implementation that is being proposed.

2. Please describe how the product integrates with Microsoft SharePoint Server. How many SharePoint applications are to be integrated with the new system?

Unsure at this time, but would like to know capabilities of product; delivered in the SharePoint environment at a minimum.

3. Section V. Evaluation Criteria, page 4, #5: "Provide documentation showing that the proposed software is a centralized system for all required functions of public school systems. Proposer is requested to submit documentation to support requirement. Flow chart describing architecture or detailed written response is requested." Is Miami-Dade looking for an integrated end-to-end system, with only Professional Development and TE currently? Please clarify "all required functions of public school systems".

Preferably yes.

4. Which HR package does Miami-Dade currently use?

SAP's Human Capital Management (e-Recruiting, OM, PA, ESS and we are implementing PY)

5. Does the district prefer an ASP or non-ASP model?

Unsure at this time

6. Does Miami-Dade plan on rolling out the system district wide by the 2012 school year?

Tentatively discussed:

***Deployment broken down by school year as follows:**

Single vendor includes Performance Evaluation System

2011-2012 Plan / Pilot

2012-2013 Deploy to all schools

Two vendors - separate Performance Evaluation System

2011-2012 Plan

2012-2013 Pilot

2013-2014 Deploy to all schools

7. Does the pricing model have to be completed as provided or can it be modified?

See attached "New Price Proposal Sheets"

8. If possible, please send the Request for Proposals documents in Microsoft Word. (Request for Proposals, Attachment B-Affirmative Action Form, and Instructions document)

Word documents attached.

9. I had a question regarding this RFP. It is in regards to the Tier IV -Proof of Concept that "may" be asked to provide. My initial read was that this may be required before any deployment, but after reading that the proposals may be re-ranked due the POC, I am now inclined to believe that this POC could happen before any award is given (should it be deemed necessary). Because of the technical specifics unique to MDCPS professional Development in this RFP, our proposal will be for developing a custom application meeting these needs. So, the application on the software platform suggested by the RFP does not exist yet. However, we (Workgroup Connections, Inc.) were the developers responsible for creating the current Professional Development System in use at MDCPS and that in it of itself would be used for our "Proof of concept". The new application we would be proposing would be re-written from the ground up on the new software platform to meet MDCPS's changing technology needs in addition to the new aspects required. I just want to make sure this line of thinking would be acceptable if vendors were required to provide the POC.

Our expectation is that the POC would be on the product to be installed at contract award.

10. Elaborate on the strategic and organizational purpose of the PD and Performance evaluation functionality requirements as listed and its context within the total talent management roadmap.

REFER TO FUNCTIONALITY IN ATTACHMENT A OF THE RFP FOR THE PD SYSTEM.

11. Elaborate on the meaning and intention of 'automated' as in 'automated performance evaluations'? Why is automation necessary, which parts is intended for automation and which parts will remain manual, to what extent are 'formulas' for automated evaluation worked out and documented?

LIIS REQUIREMENT PD: (IPEGS AND MEP EVALS AND PD NEED) Must be able to capture, store, aggregate, analyze, and report on performance evaluation measures (multiple and summative), maintain and allow update of an individual professional development plan, and link to the professional development system.

12. Indicate if integration with any existing or future compensation management processes is required or envisioned.

If possible.

13. Outline which existing PD and PM systems this functionality will replace or need to integrate with.

Details will be defined after award.

14. Elaborate on the expectation for digital learning/e-learning; if any existing web based training (WBT) courses will need to be migrated and if so, how many and if these courses are SCORM or AICC conformant

NO MIGRATION REQUIREMENT FOR PAST COURSES; FUTURE E-LEARNING COURSES NEED TO BE SCORM COMPLIANT

15. Elaborate on historical data migration expectations.

No

16. Elaborate on the existing SAP landscape today: which version, enhancement pack (EHP) level, scope of SAP HCM implementation, which ESS/MSS portal functionality in use.

**ECC 603 Dual Stack
BW NetWeaver 7.01 Dual Stack
E-Recruiting 603 Dual Stack
Portal NetWeaver 7.01 JAVA
SRM/SUS 5.5 Dual Stack
XI/PI NetWeaver 7.01 Dual Stack
Solution Manager NetWeaver 7.01 Dual Stack
TREX 7.1**

17. Elaborate on reporting and analytics requirements and if SAP BW/BOBJ are deployed and in use currently.

Our BI Reporting presently provides both analytical and operational reporting for E-Recruitment, Finance, Procurement & Human Resources modules of SAP (Payroll reporting is scheduled to go-live in November 2011). Almost all of the BI reporting are consumed via the web (Web BEx) with few Excel (BEx) reporting used by powers users within the District. We cater to primarily 2 distinct user communities i.e. School & District. School reporting are mostly deployed as canned with not much drag-n-drop or drill-down capabilities typically present in BI reporting. The District reporting have all of the analytical features within it. Currently we have close to 90 BI reports (queries) deployed in Production with Finance transactional data warehouse over or nearing 25 million transactional records. On an average, the Production SAP BI system serves between 400-600 users a day with Budget Availability, Position Control Listing and Open Purchase and Shopping Carts being the top used reports. Business Objects i.e. BOBJ bolt-on is presently being analyzed as a possible next natural evolution to support ad-hoc/power user type queries and enhance user experiences.

18. Describe the Miami-Dade SAP IT support teams: development, basis and security teams – specifically size, experience and availability, insofar as it is possible/appropriate in this context

Development – all contractors; BASIS – 3 employees and 1 contractor; Security – 2 employees. Employees only have the experience from working on this project contractors have multiple years experience. Availability would depend on priority and if it is before or after PY go live.

19. Describe Miami-Dade's timeline expectations for deployment of the solution.

Tentatively discussed:

***Deployment broken down by school year as follows:**

Single vendor includes Performance Evaluation System

2011-2012 Plan / Pilot

2012-2013 Deploy to all schools

Two vendors - separate Performance Evaluation System

2011-2012 Plan

2012-2013 Pilot

2013-2014 Deploy to all schools

20. It is our understanding significant investment has already been made into an existing professional development application. Is there consideration for keeping this system and customizing it to achieve the unique requirements of MDSO or is MSDS absolutely moving to a new professional development system?

MOVING TO A NEW SYSTEM

21. Is there thought or consideration for the system eventually evolving to include management and execution of teacher incentive payouts?

It will be part of the big picture but our SAP-ERP will handle.

22. Besides Active Directory, are there other external systems that MSDS foresees as possibly being required for integration?

Possibly.

23. The area of performance management seems to suggest that "student linkage" (i.e. linking student data, test scores, etc) to teacher performance is a point of emphasis in the new system. Is this a correct assumption? If not, what linkages between student achievement and teacher performance are envisioned?

YES. Also need to link teacher performance (based on student performance and other measures) to professional development.

24. In addition to system implementation, are there existing data inconsistencies, validation or reporting issues that may need attention beyond a "green-field" implementation?

Don't understand the question

25. Can the District please provide the RFP documents (RFP, instructions, and Attachment B) as Word documents, to ease the response process?

Word documents attached.

26. Item XXII of the Instructions document outlines requirements as related to “Lobbyists.” We’ve reviewed the pertinent information and want to confirm whether vendors responding to this RFP, who may or may not be invited in the future to discuss proposals or work on proof of concept, are considered “Lobbyists”?

The vendors invited to participate in the Oral presentation/POC will be required to register prior to the presentation.

27. Item IV-7 on page 3 of the RFP states “Selected Vendor will assist in data migration / data extraction / maintenance processes...” What systems are currently in place that perform similar functions as those outlined in the RFP? Is it expected that the new solution will replace these systems?

An automated PD and manual Performance Evaluation; yes

28. Item V-2 on page 3 of the RFP states, “Provide most recent company financial statement.” We understand that all aspects of vendor responses will be considered in the public domain. As a privately held company, we do not typically disclose our financial statements in such a public forum. Will the District accept these as confidential or accept financial statements in an alternate, non-public way? Or, will the District accept some other proof of financial stability (Dun & Bradstreet reports, letter from our auditor, etc.)?

The Evaluation Committee will evaluate any documents provided by the Proposer relating to the financial stability of the company.

29. Item 8 on page 4 of the RFP states “Describe what staff information the application stores including, but not limited to:

- a. school assignment
- b. position type
- c. job classification
- d. degrees

- e. certification, including renewal data
- f. mentoring program activity
- g. leadership activities
- h. performance history
- i. supervision and evaluation history
- j. compensation structure
- k. out of field waivers
- l. endorsement requirements
- m. co-teaching requirement
- n. clinical supervision qualified
- o. performance evaluation system ratings
- p. individual professional development plans (IPDP)
- q. contract status

For each of the above, can the District please provide information on the current system of record for each data point, as well as whether the new solution will need to integrate with the system of record or become the system of record?

Become system of record.

30. For item 9 on page 5, the District lists a wide range of ways the solution can store staff proficiencies. Again, can the District please provide information on the current system of record for each data point, as well as whether the new solution will need to integrate with the system of record or become the system of record?

The new solution will become the system of record and more information regarding the data points will be supplied after contract award.

31. In addition, for item 9 on page 5, can the District please confirm that Items j, k, l, and m are within scope? Perhaps we don't understand the requirement well enough, but it seems that these items would be beyond

the scope of a teacher PD / evaluation system and more part of an instructional management solution.

PD RESPONSE: Requirement by RTTT Local Instructional Improvement System minimum requirements (LIIS)

32. Item 10 on page 5 asks vendors to discuss “how the application categorizes staff proficiencies according to skills, knowledge, behavior characteristics...” Can the District please describe how it currently categories staff proficiencies? If rubrics / competency matrices are used, can those please be provided to vendors? Do rubrics vary by user type (beginning teacher, principal, etc.)? And, if so, how many user types will be accommodated in the new solution?

The competency units may differ by bargaining unit. Could be as high as 10 ultimately.

33. Item 17 on page 7 asks vendors to “Describe how the application creates professional development evaluations...” Can the District please clarify if this is what might be called an “end of course survey” where users evaluate the professional development experience or whether these are “post-assessments” where participants’ attainment of course objectives is evaluated, or something else ?

YES, both option, determined by course

34. We have the same question about Item 24 on page 8 – does “professional development evaluations” in this context refer to “end of user surveys” or “post-assessments”?

YES, both option, determined by course

35. What HR software package(s) are currently in use in the District? What are the future plans for this system?

SAP’s Human Capital Management (e-Recruiting, OM, PA, ESS and we are implementing PY)

36. Item 32 on page 10 outlines the District’s requirement for workflows for lesson plans, instructional materials / resources, and assessment items. These seem a bit out of scope for a professional development management solution / evaluation solution. Can the District please confirm that these are within scope for this solution and provide some background on the use of these within the envisioned solution? (We have the same

question about item 62 on page 13 where the same list is provided as it relates to Performance Evaluation Workflow.)

PD RESPONSE: Requirement by RTTT Local Instructional Improvement System minimum requirements (LIIS)

37. Can the District please provide a use case/clarification on Items 32-37 – what specific workflows are being referred to here? What new workflow processes are envisioned (item 37

We are not in a position to define these yet.

38. Can the District please clarify for Item 38(a)(i) on page 10 “student” – in this context, is this meant to be educators/participants in professional development rather than children? If not, how does the District envision actual children/students interacting with the solution? (We have the same question about Item 68 on page 14.)

Yes, participants in PD.

39. Can the District please clarify Item 42 on page 11 “Describe how the applications stores assessment information longitudinally”? What assessment data does this refer to? (We have the same question about Item 72 on page 14.)

Requirement by RTTT Local Instructional Improvement System minimum requirements (LIIS)

40. Can the District please provide detail on the source system for local and state data as outlined in Item 45 on page 11?

Currently a manual system.

41. What types of devices (laptop, PDAs, etc.) will be used to collect observation data?

We’d like a flexible system.

42. Will student assessment data be used as part of the performance evaluation process? Yes

If so, what will be the source system for that data?

From our data warehouse.

43. Does the District have a Performance Evaluation methodology and templates? If so, can those please be provided to vendors?

The new template is still under negotiation.

44. Item 53 on page 12 refers to “selection of measures.” Can the District please clarify what “measures” are meant in this context?

The district will utilize some of the DOE accountability measures and/or computed by our district staff.

Can the District also provide a use case for this requirement in general?

Not at this time.

45. Item 57 on page 12 says “Describe how the application provides the ability to automatically generate the evaluation tool based upon leading indicator data by professional development opportunities/recommendations.” Can the District please provide a use case for this requirement?

Not at this time.

46. Item 85 on page 15 lists a wide variety of data, documents, etc. that may be subject to import/export. Can the District please clarify, for each item, the current system of record for this data as well as whether the new solution will need to integrate with the system of record or become the system of record? In addition, can the District please clarify that items j through m (instructional materials and/or resources including from multiple publishers, curriculum guides, assessment items, assessment item banks) are relevant to this new solution and, if so, how?

Will become the system of record for only Performance Evaluation data and PD coursework information.

47. Item 90 on page 16 asks vendors to “Describe how the application allows for a file containing Employee I.D.’s to be sent daily through an automated process requiring no personnel involvement.” Can the District please provide further information on the data source for this information?

Data warehouse from SQL tables.

48. Item 95 on page 17 asks about access for user types such as students and parents. Can the District please clarify the role of students and parents with the new solution?

None

49. Does the District have internal resources to support a train-the-trainer model?

Yes

50. We have several questions as it regards the Price Proposal Sheets:

- a. Where should vendors provide information on software licensing fees?
- b. We are confused by the reference to "Item 55" in the hardware line item; that doesn't seem to point to the correct requirement number within the RFP. Can the District please clarify?
- c. Does the District want to see a "Total" line following the line for Discount?
- d. In the "per year" proposal, does the District want to see more than one year? (i.e., pricing may vary from year to year, in particular as it relates to training and implementation services)

a thru c - See attached "New Price Proposal Sheets"; d – multiple years will be negotiated after vendor is chosen.

51. What is the expected number of users for the new solution?

60,000

Will all users be brought online at the same time or will the solution be rolled out in phases?

Possibly as phased approach

52. Page 40 of the RFP outlines the Sign-In Sheet and On-line Attendance requirements for the new solution. Three different scenarios for submitting sign-in sheets and online attendance. Do all three scenarios need to be implemented? Or can vendors support just one or two of the scenarios? Is the District open to electronic verification rather than scanned sheets?

Open to electronic verification but scanned sheets have to be an option.

53. **Citation:** General

- a. Will other measures besides teacher observations be used in effectiveness ratings

MULTIPLE, (IPEGS/MEP)

54. **Citation:** General

- a. How many observations are planned / expected per year?

MULTIPLE, (IPEGS/MEP)

55. **Citation:** General

- a. Who will conduct the observations and how is that process being defined and tracked?

By principals (designee) for teachers; we want the software to do that

56. **Citation:** General

- a. Will self-evaluations or peer evaluations be utilized? If so, how?

Yes, some peer but still in definition stage

57. **Citation:** General

- a. Are the evaluations or plans tied to pay or other HR functions?

Yes, to pay

58. **Citation:** General

- a. Will the system be used for all staff or just instructional staff?

PD :All Staff, eventually

59. **Citation:** General

- a. What observation tools and PD management are currently in place?

IPEGS/MEP/ PD MENU& REGISTRATION

60. **Citation:** Requirement 17

Does Professional Development evaluation refer to an automated assessment which staff take as part of a professional development module , or to a rubric for teacher observation or evaluation done by others?

BOTH

61. **Citation:** Requirement 28

Does Professional Development evaluation refer to a staff quiz or an evaluation of staff performed by others?

MULTIPLE METHODS

62. **Citation:** Requirement 42

Does the word 'assessment' refer to quizzes taken by staff or evaluations performed by others on staff members?

BOTH

63. **Citation:** Requirement 44

Please explain more about the desired workflow related to signoff indicators.

Details will be defined after award.

64. **Citation:** Requirement 45

What are the elements of the evaluation that need to be locked? Will this be the case for the whole year? What is the local / state data that needs to be used?

After observation eval completed it should be "locked" awaiting addition of achievement data.

65. **Citation:** Requirement 46

Please explain meaning of updating annual results in data mass. Does this mean the District would like up-to-the-minute results or that you would like to do some form of transformation on the data during the update?

Student achievement results will need to be loaded en masse.

66. **Citation:** Requirement 49

Please provide examples of the contract statuses or evaluation criteria that would trigger observations or follow-ups.

Details will be defined after award.

67. **Citation:** Requirement 52

Would there be an approval workflow necessary to make annual modifications to the evaluation tool?

Yes

68. Citation: Requirement 53

A. Please clarify if the District prefers trend data on evaluations should automatically suggest changes to future evaluation criteria.

B. What 'measures' is the District referring to in the requirement?

The district will utilize some of the DOE accountability measures and/or computed by our district staff.

69. Citation: Requirement 56

Does the District want Vendors to include professional development content as part of this response?

No, just provide a list of the opportunities that the District has identified.

70. Citation: Requirement 57

Can the District please provide examples of the types of tools you would want to automatically evaluate, as well as scenarios when you would have these automatically created?

Not at this time

71. Citation: Requirement 78

Can you please provide examples of how you would like the solution to integrate with Sharepoint?

Delivered in the SharePoint environment at a minimum; but would like to know product capabilities.

72. Citation: Requirement 79

Does 'offline' refer to use without Internet connectivity or use outside of the district network?

Yes, either/or

73. Citation: Requirement 126

Is Requirement 126 for a team to work onsite in Miami-Dade for one year or is it acceptable to have a project team onsite as needed for implementation, training and support throughout year one of the contract?

As needed

74. Citation: Requirement 49

Describe how the application provides the ability to create observation and follow-up schedules based upon contract status and/or observation findings and evaluation ratings?

Please provide examples of the contract statuses or evaluation criteria that would trigger observations or follow-ups.

Newly hired teachers or employees receiving a needs improvement or unsatisfactory rating on an observable standard would trigger additional observations/follow-ups. All teachers must be observed at least once.

75. Citation: Requirement 56

Describe how the application can handle professional development opportunities/recommendations be automatically generated by the evaluation tool based upon end of year results.

Does the District want Vendors to include professional development content as part of this response?

No, just provide a list of the opportunities that the District has identified.