Request for Information No. II
RFP No. 22/23-01 Professional Learning Management System
November 17, 2022

Response to Proposers' Questions

2.1 **Question**: Our Learning Management Service is used across K-12 as well as for Professional Development. Please offer advice re: replicating responses from previous proposals for Ed Tech JPA.

Answer: If a Vendor has been previously awarded for the same exact product under a different RFP then additional response is not needed. Ed Tech JPA can cross-list the previous award on its website upon request. However, if add-ons or additional or different products are available then a separate response to this RFP would be needed.

2.2 **Question**: Was this RFP created out of IUSD's need, rather than Ed Tech JPA's need?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA's board prioritized the Professional Learning Management RFP. IUSD is grateful that Ed Tech JPA took IUSD's timeline into account when planning this RFP.

2.3 **Question**: Is it standard for an Ed Tech JPA founding member to have an expiring contract that accelerates the timing of an RFP?

Answer: When determining which RFPs will be conducted Ed Tech JPA takes into account: Member responses to the annual survey (typically sent in March or April), member requests submitted throughout the year (typically submitted through the online request form and via email), and founding member requests. This procurement was discussed at Ed Tech JPA's annual planning board meeting in response to the member annual survey. The timing was beneficial for both Ed Tech JPA and Irvine USD's needs.

2.4 **Question**: Would a product need to be 100% compliant with WCAG 2.0 to receive a master contract?

Answer: While the RFP does include criteria regarding WCAG 2.0 (criteria no. 2.1.3 and 2.1.9) it is not required to be 100% in compliance for award. Criteria no. 2.1.3 is not an essential requirement. Criteria no. 2.1.9 requires a response from vendors for award, but does not specify that vendors must be 100% compliant. Vendors should respond to 2.1.9 by describing the accessibility of their Solution. Ed Tech JPA Members will determine which Solution best meets their needs when reviewing Vendor responses in awarded proposals.

Essential requirements are denoted in the RFP with double asterisks and green highlighting. Vendors should also answer non-essential criteria (blue highlighting) to the best of their ability. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 121 ADA to 600,000 ADA, and have different needs. Ed Tech JPA's RFP team will review Vendor Proposals and award to Vendors who comply with all terms and conditions (no

substantial exceptions) and meet all essential requirements. Ed Tech JPA will make all prevailing Proposals available to members for review. Members will determine what non-essential requirements are most important to them and use the information in Proposals to determine which Vendor best fits the needs of their organization.

2.5   **Question**: If partially compliant with WCAG 2.0, would a proposal be automatically rejected?

        Answer: Proposals that are not 100% compliant with WCAG 2.0 will not be automatically rejected. Vendors should be specific about what the proposed Solution's capabilities are related to accessibility. After award, Members will determine which awarded solution best meets their needs, based upon Vendor responses. Ed Tech JPA understands that not all criteria in the RFP will be met, and has attempted to separate essential and non-essential criteria as mentioned in question 2.4.

2.6   **Question**: Our company offers a wide range of human capital services. How specific should we be in this proposal?

        Answer: The RFP was designed to allow Vendors to include additional functionality and features (specifically criteria no. 3.1.10).   Please be sure to thoroughly describe any proposed additional functionality and features and include all pricing in the Pricing Forms in Appendix C.

2.7   **Question**: What is the anticipated size of the LMS user pool for Irvine USD?

        Answer: Currently Irvine USD has 1,600 teachers, 200 leadership team members, and 2,700 classified staff. Irvine USD plans for all staff to use its awarded Solution.

2.8   **Question**: I see that the Admin Fee is 4%. Is this the total gross amount? Or just an annual amount?

        Answer: The Administrative Fee is a percentage of the total gross and annual renewals.
Ed Tech JPA is a public, not for profit, agency. The intent of the Administrative Fee is to assist Ed Tech JPA in covering operating costs, including the cost to advertise the RFP, as well as staff time and legal costs associated with the development, administration, and negotiation of the RFP and resulting contracts as well as operating costs such as audit fees, etc.. The Administrative Fee is not intended to create a profit to Ed Tech JPA or any of its members. Ed Tech JPA has assumed significant operating costs, and hopes that in future years, as we continue to grow, the Board will be able to lower the Administrative Fee. Since its inception in 2019 Ed Tech JPA has lowered the Administrative Fee for vendors whose gross sales exceed two million dollars ($2,000,000.00) as follows:

Sales Amount*	Administrative Fee**
<$1,999,999.99	4%

$2,000,000.00 - $3,999,999.99	3.5%
$4,000,000.00 and above	3%

2.9   **Question**: Is this a one time fee or paid on an annual basis?

Answer: Quarterly reports and Administrative Fees are reported and paid on a quarterly basis. Quarters and reporting periods are listed below:

Reporting Period	Due Date
January 1 - March 31	April 30
April 1 - June 30	July 15 *to allow for fiscal year end
July 1 - September 30	October 31
October 1 - December 31	January 31

For example, for all Purchase Agreements with JPA Members executed from July through September, Vendor's would submit a summary of sales (template to be provided by the JPA) and payment by the end of October.

The Administrative Fee for each Purchase Agreement is paid on an annual basis for the duration of each agreement. After a Master Agreement is established with Ed Tech JPA a Purchase Agreement is made available to Ed Tech JPA members who may elect to contract with a Vendor. Purchase Agreements are reported in the Quarterly Reports.

Below is an example of a Quarterly Report.   The sale for Member Number 1 would only be reported once, unless an additional sale or extension was made at a future date. The sale for Member Number 2 would typically be reported annually for the duration of the 5 year agreement, with the Administrative Fee due when the new term was reported. However, in the event that a Member pays for a product up front the Administrative Fee may be paid up front.

EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Vendor Partner Quarterly Report

Vendor Partner Name: Example Inc
Reporting Period: January 1, 2023 - March 31, 2023
Accounts Payable Address:
Accounts Payable Email Address:
Did you have any reportable activity during this period? Yes

Member Agency	Date Purchase Agreement Executed	Date Order Fulfilled/Invoice Generated	Order Details/Products Purchased	Software License Fees	Implementation & Training Fees	Total Purchase Price	JPA Administrative Fee	New/Renewal	Contract Length	Notes
Member Number 1	January 30, 2(	February 15,		$10,000.0	$500.00	$10,500.0	$420.00	New	1 year	
Member Number 2	March 1, 202:	March 15, 2(		$35,000.(	$2,500.00	$37,500.0	$1,500.00	New	5 years	
						$0.00	$0.00			
						$0.00	$0.00			
						$0.00	$0.00			
			Total:			$48,000.0	$1,920.00			

I hereby certify that the provided information is true and accurate:

2.10　　　**Question**: If a vendor meets essential criteria, but is not selected for IUSD can their product be available through the JPA for other entities?

　　Answer: Yes. Ed Tech JPA offers multiple awards so its members can leverage the vendors that best meet their needs. Ed Tech JPA's RFP team will review Vendor Proposals and award to Vendors who comply with all terms and conditions (no substantial exceptions) and meet all essential requirements. Essential requirements are denoted in the RFP with double asterisks and green highlighting.

　　Vendors should also answer non-essential criteria (blue highlighting) to the best of their ability. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 121 ADA to 600,000 ADA, and have different needs. Ed Tech JPA will make all prevailing Proposals available to members for review. Members will determine what requirements are most important to them and use the information in Proposals to determine which Vendor best fits the needs of their organization.

　　Vendors who meet all essential requirements (green, double asterisks) and agree to the terms and conditions will be considered for award. Non-essential criteria (blue) are optional. Vendors are

encouraged to respond to non-essential criteria so member districts can make a determination regarding which solution is the best fit for their needs.

Additionally, the RFP is sectioned into different modules. All vendors must respond to essential requirements in Section 3.1. Essential requirements for sections 3.2 - 3.4 are required only to be considered for award in those specific sections. For example, if a vendor agrees to all terms and conditions and meets all essential requirements for sections 3.1 - 3.3, but not for section 3.4 they will be awarded for sections 3.1 - 3.3. Below is an example of a possible award scenario.

Vendor	General (required)	Collaboration	Content Organization & Creation	Management & Monitoring
Vendor A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vendor B	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Vendor C	Yes	No	Yes	No

JPA members have varying needs, and some may require services for only some modules included in this RFP. Members will evaluate Proposals based on their specific needs, so please include a clear description of what your solution offers.

2.11   **Question**: Was the Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference call recorded today? OR a list of Q&A?

Answer: All questions from the Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference are included on this RFI No. 2. The call was not recorded, however our team has captured questions and answers in this document.