University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
5210 Grand Avenue
Fort Smith, AR 72904

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
RFP# AX-23-003 ONLINE PROCTORING SOLUTION
3-17-2023

ADDENDUM NO. 1
Vendor Questions Received in Response to the RFP

NOTE: **The following questions were copied verbatim from vendor submissions. Our answers follow. Vendors must acknowledge receipt of all addendum as part of their proposal response package -- see page 10 of Request for Proposal.**

----

1. Does the University of Arkansas have an estimated breakdown of usage by proctoring type? (i.e., Live Proctoring vs. Record & Review vs. Automated Proctoring)?

   A1: No estimate of breakdown but have largely used some form of live proctoring as primary means up to now.

2. Is integration with the Student Information System (Banner) a mandatory requirement? What information from the SIS would need to be integrated/imported?

   A2: We don't currently integrate Banner with the online proctoring. The current proctoring system is integrated with Blackboard Learn

3. Is the University of Arkansas using Blackboard Ultra currently, or planning to move to Ultra in the coming 12-18 months?

   A3: Not currently using Ultra course view and not sure when we might transition.

4. Can you advise if a specific date(s) or timeframe been established by the University with regards to the in-person presentations, as mentioned on page 6 – Section 3 – of the RFP document? Will in-person presentations be a requirement, or will online presentations be permitted?

   A4: Preference is for live, but online will be permitted. April – mid to late is expected time frame.

5. The Proposal Format did not mention where to put the responses themselves. We presume those should go after the introductory letter but wanted to ask if there is a different format you prefer.

A5: We do not have a prescribed format, so including after the introductory letter is fine.

6. In regard to volume, can you please provide a breakdown of the number of proctored exams using an automated versus live proctoring solution?

   A6: Not known, more heavily weighted towards live proctoring

7. Can you provide insight into the number of exams each test-taker is likely to have proctored remotely in both hybrid and online courses?

   A7: We currently allow 4 exams per class per semester based on live proctoring.

8. Can you provide the version number of the current Blackboard LMS?

   A8: The current Blackboard release is Release 3900.60.0-rel.34+a7e4e00. This is a SaaS release. Blackboard is updated every week, so this information changes. The "rel." every week and the number after "3900" every month.

9. Is it acceptable to provide email reference letters as long as they contain the brand/logo identification of the organization within the email?

   A9: We are okay with this.

10. Our solution typically operates downstream from the Learning Management System. Could more context on the information desired in the SIS be provided?

    A10: Unable to adequately answer.

11. The Israel Boycott form asks for an AASID. Is that something vendors need to have before submitting the RFP? If not, should we leave this blank.

    A11: You can leave that field blank.

12. Pricing models - Could you clarify your expectations for what is included in 'automated proctoring' as a list item on the pricing sheet? Do you mean browser lockdown features? My apologies for this question - in our case, we include record and review as part of our automated proctoring service (which also includes lockdown), so I want to be sure we delineate them in a way that makes sense for you.

    A:12 We would need to understand the different types of remote proctoring services available and how each may be priced if more than one approach is available.

13. Could you give an estimate of the total number of exams you expect to need proctored each year?

A13: Don't know how to estimate as this will depend on capabilities of system and ease of use for faculty and students alike. Could range from 5000 to 15,000 per year perhaps.

14. Is the university interested in user licenses, as well as per-exam model for pricing? If so, could you provide an estimate of how many users you expect annually.

   A:14 Not familiar with user licenses approach so would need to understand to answer. Have used Per Exam pricing to date.

15. The pricing sheet has a Grand Total which is auto-populated from the listed services - but in our case this will exceed the total unit price, since not every feature would be used together. For example, we have one fee for live proctoring, which includes the lockdown features, and another for record and review, but you wouldn't use both in one exam session. Is it acceptable if we add language to clarify this on the pricing sheet?

   A15: Yes, whatever helps us to understand the information provided.

16. What constitutes 'evidence of ability to meet timely deadlines?' Are you looking for documentation here from current users of Proctorio?

   A16: User feedback would be helpful.

17. RFP> SECTION 2 > Objective > Requirement - "The remote proctoring service should have the capability of an automated or live authentication solution and live proctored exam sessions with trained and certified proctors."
   Exceslofty Query> Is the proposer expected to provide proctors along with the platform, or will UAFS provide the proctors?

   A17: We will not provide the proctors.

18. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.2. The proposed system must support SSO for authentication (CAS/SAML/LDAP/AD) and an enterprise directory service for authorization (LDAP/AD). The system must support LDAP Version 3 and/or CAS for single sign-on and attribute utilization (SAML or LDAP).
   Excelsoft Query> Does UAFS expect the proposed platform to support all of the mentioned methods (CAS and SAML and LDP and AD) or is it okay to support any of them (CAS or SAML or LDP or AD)? Can we support any other methods mentioned in the above requirement (for example - oAuth, LTI, JWT)?

   A18: We use SAML authentication through PortalGuard, so we are guessing that would be the case with a Blackboard integration. However, we may want a vendor to support additional authentication types, should we switch in the future.

19. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.4. Vendor must provide 24/7 registration and tech support.
   Excelsoft Query> Is UAFS expecting the proposer to provide 24/7 L1 and L2 support? Will UAFS take care of L1 support, and is the proposer expected to provide L2 support?

A19: We are unfamiliar with L1 and L2 support? We need to know that if students have trouble when testing, they can reach someone at the vendor 24/7.

20. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.5. Product must provide a smooth workflow process for administration, faculty, and student.
Excelsoft Query> Can you please elaborate on the expected workflows to be supported by the proposed platform for administration and faculty roles.

A20: Please describe your processes so we understand what is required.

21. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.9 Product must have the capability of both an automated and live authentication solution.
Excelsoft Query> Please elaborate on all the authentication mechanisms (apart form automated and live authentication) to be supported by the proposed platform.

A21: Unknown.

22. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.9 Product must have the capability of both an automated and live authentication solution.
Excelsoft Query> Please validate our following understanding of automated and live authentication?
Automated:
1. The candidate flashes an authorized ID card onto the camera.
2. The proposed platform scans the details and sends them to the authorized UAFS platform (SIS) for validation.
3. Upon receiving the validation status from the authorized system, the proposed proctoring platform allows or denies access (Exam) to the candidate.
Live Authentication:
4. The candidate flashes an authorized ID card onto the camera.
1. The proctor validates the details against the college records.
2. Upon a match, the proctor admits the candidate to the platform.
3. Upon mismatch, the proctor blocks the candidate into the platform or takes appropriate action (escalating to the authorized university officer)

A22: You must describe your approach

23. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.9 1.11 The service should allow the flexibility for faculty to select the level of online test security.
Exceslofty Query>We request UAFS elaborate on what level of flexibility they expect from the platform on online test security. For example - please elaborate on the parameters/level that faculty would be selecting/setting to define the online test security.

A23: Describe your levels of service and how they can be selected by faculty giving exams in platform.

24. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.9 1.12 The service should allow faculty to customize the test environment to meet desired exam specifications.
Excelsoft Query>We request UAFS elaborate on the level of customizations they expect from the proposed platform on test environments. For example - please elaborate on the parameters/level that faculty would be selecting/setting to customize the test environments.

    A24: Special test instructions for example.

25. RFP> SECTION 2 > 1.9 3.1. Vendor must provide Real-time reporting (e.g. 30 minutes)
Excelsoft Query> Can UAFS please give some of the real-time reporting expected from the platform? When you say 30 minutes - is it that the maximum delay between the event/action and the reporting is 30 minutes.

    A25: Yes

26. RFP> SECTION 2 > 3.2. Vendor must provide in detail information regarding Ad-Hoc reporting.
Excelsoft Query > Can UAFS please give some of the Ad-Hoc reporting expected from the platform?

    A26: What can you provide to us as the user of the system that would help us understand the effectiveness of the system?

27. RFP> SECTION 2 > 4.1.a > Vendor must submit detail instructions on how to set-up or upload exams, including procedures for providing testing accommodations
Excelsoft Query> Is UAFS expecting the proposed proctoring platform to provide assessment services and the ability to construct items (questions), manage item banks, construct exams, schedule exams, and candidate registration management? .

    A27a: We are asking for how the exams are uploaded by instructors and how we submit test accommodations into the platform

    Excelsoft Query>Are Assessment and Candidate management (exam booking) existing platforms in UAFS, and UAFS expects the proposed platform to integrate with these existing platforms seamlessly?

    A27b: We do not have a candidate management system

    Excelsoft Query>Does UAFS expect the proposer to provide assessment and proctoring services?

    A27c: Yes

    Excelsoft Query> Is it mandatory for the proposer to bid for both services, or can we opt to bid only for either of the services with seamless integration between the two? For example, can we respond to providing only proctoring services guaranteeing seamless, secure, and API-based integration with the existing UAFS assessment and exam booking platforms?

A27d: Provide the response that best explains your capabilities.

28. RFP> SECTION 2 > 4.1.d >Vendor should provide information on proctor qualifications.
Excelsoft Query> Does UAFS expects the proposer to provide proctors? If not, is the proposed platform required to provide a workflow for the administrator (or authorized users) to collect proctor details and send them for approvals (with the number level specified by USAFS)?

A28: We will not provide proctors.

29. RFP> SECTION 4 > C > Recommendations and/or references from third parties indicating the respondent's past performance.
Excelsoft Query> Because of confidentiality clauses, some of our references may not be willing to provide the recommendation on their letterhead (at the proposal stage). However, they would be willing to share names, addresses, email or telephone numbers. Please confirm if this is fine.

A29: Yes, this is fine.

30. RFP > SECTION 5 > Performance Standards
Excelsoft Query> Excelsoft will ensure all the requested performance standards. However, we presume that at this point (proposal stage), UAFS does not expect us to provide proof or any attachments along with the proposal. UAFS – RFP - AX-23-003 5 #Excelsoft Queries

A30: Provide us with what you believe best illustrates your performance capabilities.

31. RFP > SECTION 6 > One (1) redacted (marked "REDACTED") copy of the   proposal, preferably on a flash drive. (See Proprietary Information)
Excelsoft Query> Since UAFS prefers a redacted copy on the flash drive, are we expected to courier the flash drive? If so, please give the destination address details. Is it okay to email a redacted copy (a separate copy) along with the original proposal?

A31: Since proposals are being requested by email, the redacted copy should also be sent by email and labeled as redacted. It is not necessary to send a flash drive by courier.

32. RFP > SECTION 6 > One (1) All bidders must hold a current General Vendors License. License must be valid in the state of Arkansas and accepted by Ark. Code 17-25-101.
Excelsoft Query> We've applied for a State general vendor license, but the license may only be available after submitting our offer. Will this pose a problem? Suppose we do not receive a vendor number in time to submit our proposal. Are there any steps you suggest we take, especially when responding to 'Contract & Grant Disclosure,' 'Certification – Israel Boycott,' and 'Certification – Employment of Illegal Immigrants' as we need to input vendor/license no in these forms?

A32: Disregard the following General Requirement: *All bidders must hold a current General Vendors License. License must be valid in the state of Arkansas and accepted by Ark. Code 17-25-101.*

33. RFP > SECTION 6 > Restriction of Boycott of Israel
    Excelsoft Query> As we are not a public company (State or Federal), are we still requirement that it is not currently engaged in and agrees not to engage in a boycott of Israel for the duration of the contract. If Excelsoft decides to engage in a boycott of Israel at any time after signing the contract, Excelsoft will notify the university in writing.

    A33: This is a requirement in order to do business with UAFS. The University of Arkansas at Fort Smith *(a public entity)* **shall not enter into a contract with a company** *(any prospective vendor)* **unless the contract includes a written certification that the person or company is not currently engaged in, and agrees for the duration of the contract not to engage in a boycott of Israel.**

34. RFP > SECTION 11 > RFP Checklist
    Excelsoft Query> When we click on the link "When we click on the link "http://www.uafs.edu/sites/default/files/Departments/vpat-fill-in_blank.pdf." we are getting 404 error. Please provide us the correct link

    A34: Please use the following link:
    https://www.healthy.arkansas.gov/images/uploads/pdf/VPAT_Fillable.pdf