

Adult Education Management System RFP Questions and Answers

Questions from Bidders' Conference and Email

1. Would it be possible for bidders to receive a version of the RFP in Microsoft Word format, or is the PDF version the only one that is available?
 - a. The Microsoft Word version is available upon request to bill.hurwitch@maine.gov.
2. What is the total number of programs?
 - a. There are approximately 107 programs in the state.
3. How is revenue reported and directed?
 - a. The only financial reporting included in this RFP deals with recording and tracking registration, lab, book, and other such fees. However, there is no intent to create online payment services. The Association portal already does this and we have no desire to replace those services.
4. How many schools or locations are there in the Maine Adult Education system?
 - a. There are 107 total adult education programs. About half have separate learning center locations and/or other offices that would need to connect to the system
5. Can the solution be hosted at location in other continents?
 - a. Yes
6. How do the multiple schools manage their own brands, courses and programs?
 - a. These are issues related to the Adult Education Association portal; there is no intent in this RFP to replace that system/service.
7. Do you foresee a scenario where a student may add two courses to their basket from separate schools yet want to process them in a single shopping cart transaction?
 - a. These are issues related to the Adult Education Association portal; there is no intent in this RFP to replace that system/service.
8. Are the reporting requirements for the individual school/location level or across the system?
 - a. There will be standard state and local reports that all programs will need to produce – including (but not limited to) all the National Reporting System tables, student transcripts, attendance reports, class rosters, transaction reports (e.g. showing all the classes an individual has signed up for in that semester).
9. What type of reporting is being desired at a participating school level?
 - a. It is necessary to include the ability for local programs to create additional reports and/or layouts to meet any unique local need.
10. Do you want the ability for the schools to produce print brochures from this catalog information?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
11. Please elaborate if a document management system is also required?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
12. Do you want to gather student inquiries and route them to the participating schools?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
13. Do schools want flexibility in marketing intelligence gathered on students, such as configurable questions?

- a. This is not a RFP requirement.
- 14. Is it important to be able to data mine information captured on students for targeted marketing list creation?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
- 15. Would you need the ability to see real time profitability of course, and set off “go/no-go” workflows?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
- 16. Do schools require the ability to offer discounts based on a variety of criteria (groups, time, coupon)?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
- 17. Are vendors that use out-of-country resources eligible to submit proposals?
 - a. There are no country restrictions for bidders.
- 18. Will there be any extension to the bidding deadline?
 - a. No extension is planned at this time.
- 19. Have vendors provided on-site demos?
 - a. There have been no adult education vendor presentations.
- 20. What is the location for the project staff?
 - a. The State project staff is based in Augusta.
- 21. Can you provide information regarding user counts and types?
 - a. There are over 7,000 instructors employed by the local programs plus local program and MDOE adult education staff.
- 22. How many registrations are there per year?

Approximately 110,000.
- 23. Is there a page limit for proposals?
 - a. No
- 24. Who are the members of the evaluation team? Are any members contracted through CAI?
 - a. The evaluation team includes representatives of the MDOE Adult Education program, the Maine Adult Education Association, the SLDS team and the State Office of Information Technology. CAI is not involved in the evaluation.
- 25. What is the State’s fiscal year?
 - a. July 1 to June 30.
- 26. Will the State be providing a list of bidder’s conference attendees?
 - a. No
- 27. Is there a preference for a COTS solution?
 - a. No
- 28. Will RFP responses that propose custom development be considered?
 - a. Yes
- 29. What is the requirement for instructional data?
 - a. The system should capture at a minimum instructional hours, type, grant program and category. This includes NRS and local data.
- 30. 1.1 - To what extent does the State require vendors to comply with HIPAA Standards?
 - a. The system must meet all HIPAA requirements. At the present time no individual health data collection is planned.
- 31. 1.1 - Please clarify the extent of the expected "email notifications" services (ie. multi-directional or system-to-user?).
 - a. System-to-user.

32. 1.1 - Does "email notifications" and "integrated messaging" refer to the same service?
- No
33. 1.1 - Will the state provide samples of digital test score reports from vendors for import (ie. CASAS)?
- No. These details will be made available to the successful bidder during the business requirements discovery phase of the project.
34. 1.1 - Please clarify what "status" will be checked (i.e. Student's program completion status? etc.)
- Status of program completion.
35. 1.3.2 – What is expected for self-service capabilities?
- The system should make it easier for students to enroll, manage and track their participation in adult education programs and reduce the need to directly contact local program staff.
36. 1.3.3 - Currently, enrichment students do not provide DOB, let alone SSN identifiers, especially when registering through the online portal. (B) Does the new system require the creation of Standard State Student ID for all enrichment students (eg Yoga, basket weaving, tours of Italy, etc.)? (B) If so, who bears the cost of changes to the MAEA portal? Is the bidder required to vouch for that subcontractor's work?
- All students must be assigned a unique State Student ID. They may already have such an ID from the K-12 school system; if not, they must be assigned a new id within the Department's State Student ID construct. The bidder must separately specify any costs to the MAEA portal.
Any contract resulting from this bid will be awarded to the successful bidder as the primary contract. Bidders may propose to subcontract portions of the work. However, the primary contract is solely responsible for all work under the agreement. If the bidder intends to subcontract any part of the bidder's performance, the bidder must state the total percentage of work to be subcontracted (measured as a percentage of total agreement price), and identify each subcontractor by name, address, and telephone number.
37. 1.4 – What is the anticipated decision date for awarding the contract?
- Late August or early September 2011.
38. 1.5 - Can you provide a list of bidder's conference vendors?
- A list of bidders' conference participants will not be provided.
39. 1.6.e - What is the deadline for written questions?
- 4:00 PM (Eastern), June 3, 2011.
40. 1.10 If I name a subcontractor in my proposal, and the same subcontractor is named in another proposal, is this permitted?
- Yes.
41. 1.2 How much is budgeted for this system, including professional services to implement?
- The SLDS ARRA Grant budget for the system is approximately \$1,000,000.
42. 2.2 - It is stated that funding for this initiative is part of the 2009 ARRA Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant. As such this is 'one-time' funding. It is also stated the DOE is open to hosted solutions. As hosted solutions carry recurring costs (typically annually) is the DOE prepared to provide recurring funding to support this initiative if it were to be hosted by a 3rd party? If so, how much is the DOE prepared to fund on a recurring basis?

- a. Ongoing support, hosting and maintenance costs will be funded through the General Fund. The amount has not been determined at this time.
43. 2.2 - How many years hosting should be included in the annual costs?
- a. For comparison purposes bidders should plan on five (5) years hosting costs. The evaluation committee will look at the initial year costs plus four years of support, maintenance and hosting (State and/or vendor hosting).
44. 2.2 – Should bidders submit two separate proposals if they are offering both vendor and State hosted solutions?
- a. Only one proposal is necessary. Costs for vendor and State hosting should be listed in the Cost Proposal. For State hosting bidders should list all hardware and software requirements in the cost proposal.
45. 2.2 – Is there a preference for vendor or State hosting?
- a. No. Either option is acceptable. Proposals will be evaluated on technical functionality and costs.
46. 2.2.1.2 - It appears the database requirement applies to a State-hosted solution, and does not apply to a vendor-hosted solution. Can you please comment if this interpretation is correct? If not, please clarify.
- a. The system must be able to integrate with the MDOE Microsoft SQL Server databases. This applies to State and vendor hosted systems.
47. 2.2.1.2 – What database and programming software does the State support?
- a. The State primarily supports Microsoft SQL Server, Oracle, .Net and Java.
48. 2.2.1.4 – Please let us know expected response time with bandwidth of 56kbs.
- a. The ideal response time is within two (2) seconds.
49. 2.3 – Is security determined at the State or local level?
- a. System roles are determined by the State. Assignment of users to these roles is delegated to the local level.
50. 2.3 – Is security determined at the State or local level?
- a. System roles are determined by the State. Assignment of users to these roles is delegated to the local level
51. 2.3.1 – Could you please clarify this link on this link:
<http://www.maine.gov/oit/policies/DeployCertPolicy.htm>. The link doesn't work.
- a. The link has been changed to:
<http://www.maine.gov/oit/policies/AppDeployCert.htm>.
52. 2.3.2 – Where are the application roles located for single sign-on through the SLDS Education Portal?
- a. The portal provides access to the applications through the State active Directory. The applications provide the roles for access to application data.
53. 2.3.3.1 - Does "add, change, or delete roles" mean that local administrators can apply these actions to new and existing users? (as opposed to having local administrators modify definitions of roles and privilege sets)
- a. Roles are determined and managed solely at the State level. Local administrators can assign users to these roles.
54. 2.3.3.4 - We utilize a different technique of applying roles to the users. Each user has a single role. However, an authorized administrator assigns the user with a specific set of modifiable rights. Given that flexibility, one role is assigned to each user. Does this approach meet this requirement?

- a. Yes, provided it can be implemented to allow overall MDOE management of user access to the system and the delegation of a subset of right to local administrators. The local administrators may then assign only the specific subset of rights they are given to users.
55. 2.3.3.5 - The RFP outlines non-MDOE users who may access the new solution; will all users be authenticated using the same methodology (i.e., through SAML), or should the new solution support hybrid authentication?
- a. Authentication must be in accordance with industry best practices and standards. The Department is currently using SAML authentication with its single sign-on (SSO) portal. This portal will be the entry point for all non-DOE users. The solution may support a hybrid authentication.
56. 2.3.3.6 - When you mention ‘application area’, we interpret this to mean a grouping of user-defined pages. Can you please comment if this interpretation is correct? If not, please clarify.
- a. See question #57
57. 2.3.3.10 - Does "Application Areas" in this context refer to function modules such as "registrations", "course catalog" etc.?
- a. Yes, this is essentially correct – other examples might include assessment, attendance and grading etc.
58. 2.3.3.12 - Please give examples of "organizations"? (i.e. is this like Fairfield Adult Education, Dept of Ed, etc.?)
- a. In some contexts this may refer to an individual adult education program. In other contexts the “Organization” may refer to a consortium of local adult education programs and perhaps other groups who have banded together for a particular project/grant.
59. 2.3.3.14 –What do you mean by row level security? Do you mean field level? Record Level?
- a. Row level security provides more granularity than table level for records in the database system.
60. 2.3.3.17 - For a vendor-hosted solution, it would appear to be fine to use a vendor’s email server to meet this requirement. Please confirm that this interpretation is correct. If not, please elaborate.
- a. There are no limitations on the server used to meet the SMTP requirement if the solution is vendor-hosted.
61. 2.3.3.17 – How is the email used internally?
- a. System messages and workflow notifications.
62. 2.3.3.18 – Are the auditing requirements at the field level for changes?
- a. Yes, the State needs to know what changes were made, when and who made the change.
63. 2.3.3.21 - Is there a standard statewide list of academic programs? Is there a standard list of which courses satisfy which program requirements? If so, please provides lists (or business rules that apply).
- a. On the adult education section of the MDOE website there is a document providing the requested information (Section 2 pages 12 – 28 of the document) It can be access at:

<http://www.maine.gov/education/aded/dev/handbook/DirectorUs%20Handbook04.pdf>

64. 2.4.1 – With what components of the SLDS does the Adult Education system need to integrate?
 - a. At the present time integration is required with the Education Portal and Education Data warehouse.
65. 2.4.1 – Please elaborate on Integration Requirement with SLDS data warehouse. What kind of integration is envisaged?
 - a. Ability to ETL data for reporting and analysis.
66. 2.4.2.1 – Do the proposals require a detailed migration plan? Will the State provide information about the data to be migrated?
 - a. The proposals should include a description of the vendor’s migration plan and processes. The State will not be providing additional detail at this time.
67. 2.4.2.1 - What is the scope of the migration from the current system?
 - a. Data to be migrated from the current system includes GED, college transitions, academic and enrichment data.
68. 2.4.2.1 – Will there be data migrated from the local programs?
 - a. Most of the programs are very small will not require data migration. MDOE will provide any field layouts.
69. 2.4.2.1 - Please provide details of GED system existing functionality?
 - a. These details will be made available to the successful bidder during the business requirements discovery phase of the project.
70. 2.4.2.1 - Please provide details of GED system technical platform and architecture?
 - a. The GED system is a .NET application with an MS SQL database.
71. 2.4.2.1 - Is the current GED system currently supported for maintenance?
 - a. Yes. It is supported in-house by Office of Information Technology (OIT) staff.
72. 2.4.2.1 - Can the integration be with web services?
 - a. If the web services can meet the business requirements, yes.
73. 2.4.2.1 - Please let us know version of FileMaker Pro System of current system?
 - a. Recommended: V11 It will work with some diminished capability with V8.5 or newer
74. 2.4.2.1 – What is the current database size?
 - a. Totally empty database = about 8,000KB From there is runs up to 260,000KB for the database of the State’s largest local adult education program
75. 2.4.2.1 – How many years of data will be migrated?
 - a. A minimum of five (5) years must be migrated. The vendor should provide a process for migrating additional years of data.
76. 2.4.2.2 - Please elaborate on the disparate internal and external sources. What specific systems are currently anticipated by MDOE at this point?
 - a. The Maine Adult Education Association (www.maineadulted.org).
77. 2.4.2.2 - Will this be on an ad-hoc basis or a pre-determined frequency (weekly/monthly/annually)?
 - a. Both
78. 2.4.2.4 - Can the data exchange occur between the application and the Maine Adult Education Web Site on a nightly basis?

- a. Up loading of course catalogue information can be done on a predetermined schedule. However, course registration type activity needs to be on as close to real time basis as possible
79. 2.4.2.4 - Will the new, imported data into the AEMS be added to the old, existing data? Or, will the new data overwrite and delete the old data? Or, will the functionality be a combination of both types of rules? If a combination, please elaborate.
- a. Mostly adding new data, but at the same time checking for existing records and if one exists updating the information from the imported data.
80. 2.5 – Do the programs have open entry and exit or are they closed end?
- a. Both
81. 2.5 – Does the State want bi-directional registration?
- a. Bi-directional is preferred.
82. 2.5 – Is registration decentralized to the schools?
- a. No.
83. 2.5 – How is enrollment done?
- a. Enrichment enrollment is by class. Academic programs are by hours.
84. 2.5 – How often are hours entered in the Maine system?
- a. At least quarterly to meet federal requirements.
85. 2.5 – What are the number of user interface forms in the existing system?
- a. There are a total of about 175 user interface and/or report forms
86. 2.5 – How many reports are in the existing system?
- a. See question #85
87. 2.5 – What workflows are in the existing system?
- a. The existing system does not have workflow functionality.
88. 2.5 – What are the number of concurrent users in the existing system?
- a. In most local programs there might be from 1-3 concurrent uses. In the larger adult education programs it is possible to have 5-6 concurrent users in multiple locations around the school district/city.
89. 2.5.8 – What assessment tools are currently used?
- a. There are two State approved tools: BEST Plus and CASAS. A link to the State assessment policy is posted on page 27 of the RFP.
90. 2.5.13 - Please clarify: does this requirement refer to "template" messages?
- a. Yes, for the most part these would be template messages
91. 2.5.16 – What are the improvement requirements?
- a. Improvement is measured by scoring on the assessments. Please see the State of Maine Assessment Policy listed in Appendix B of the RFP.
92. 2.5.20 Please give an example of how/when a user would "reject" data.
- a. For example, during the auditing of data it might be discovered that the wrong Educational Functioning Level was assigned based on the assessment test results. It would therefore, be necessary to make that correction. Often times this auditing being referred to here is the initial checking done by the input operator at the time of data entry or shortly after. Another example would be finding out that a person's address or phone number is not correct or has been changed.
93. 2.5.20 - It appears MDOE wants the ability to have row-level permission, so that if a user creates a record, only an authorized user, with specific privileges, will have the authority to edit/delete that record. Please comment on whether or not this is the case.

- a. All users must have appropriate access privileges to take any action on data in the system. Conversely, all data in the system must be fully accessible to any user with the appropriate permissions.
94. 2.5.26 - What criteria are required to determine if a teaching certification needs to be updated?
- a. The primary item is the certificates expiration date.
95. 2.5.32 - Please provide more detail on the desired functionality of the proposed system for this requirement. From a functional, client-need perspective (not technical), what specifically do you want to happen once the proposed system interfaces with the MDOE staff system?
- a. To see if the staff member is in the MDOE system and if so pull the information needed to fill in the staff demographics items in our database
96. 2.5.40 - Which class of user would submit reporting by email, and under what circumstances?
- a. Possibly the program director but more likely the primary data input person after it has been checked by the director or designee
97. 2.5.42 - What data are being validated?
- a. This depends on what is being done. It could be any number of data points
98. 2.5.42 - What is meant by 'validate data'?
- a. Making sure that all required data is included and where/if possible determine its accuracy
99. 2.5.43 - Are GED/HSD requirements set by school districts or by the state?
- a. GED by State – HSD may vary district to district
100. 2.5.44 - We find there is very little, if any, duplication of data entry from screen to screen. To be sure this client need is addressed, can you please give some examples of situations where you've found this comes into play?
- a. Student name and address appear in a number of places in the database, the assumption is that it will only need to be entered once. Also for any item that does appear on more than one layout, input or correction of that item needs to be able to be done from any occurrence.
101. 2.5.45 – How long are records retained?
- a. There is no limit for transcript data. Local data is typically held for ten (10) years.
102. 2.5.46 - Which data do you anticipate will be uploaded to MDOE for validation of completeness and accuracy?
- a. At this point in time it is not possible to determine the specifics here. Since this will be a centralized system, once the initial consolidation of the current local data is accomplished there will be little need for further uploads, however that does not mean we should not build the capability into the new system
103. 2.5.46 - Which reports do you anticipate will be uploaded to MDOE for validation of completeness and accuracy?
- a. See #102
104. 2.5.46 - What is your anticipated frequency of these uploads?
- a. See #102
105. 2.5.46 - In what format (CSV, XML, etc.) do you anticipate the uploaded data to be sent?
- a. See #102

106. 2.5.47 – Is PCI PA-DSS V2.0 compliance a requirement for online payments?
The Payment Card Industry has set its standard in terms of payment and cardholder data security for payment applications, is your organization interested in upholding the same security standard for your students? If so, this should be a mandatory requirement. For more information, on this standard please go to: https://www.pcisecuritystandards.org/security_standards/documents.php?association=PA-DSS?
- a. This would be a very low priority as MDOE is not looking to get into the money handling side of the registration process. The Adult Education Association portal has money handling capabilities so there is no need to duplicate it.
107. 2.5.49 - We interpret this requirement to mean that MDOE wants the entire site closed to all users during certain hours. Please comment on whether or not this is the case. If not, please clarify.
- a. MDOE does not wish to close the entire site to all users during certain hours. Conversely, it requires that the system be operation and accepting data from local or State users/system during hours set by the Department.
108. 2.6 – How many reports are expected?
- a. Approximately 80 federal reports and 150 to 200 State reports plus local reports as needed.
109. 2.6 – Are reports tied to fiscal years?
- a. There are a number of reporting periods throughout the year plus ad hoc queries.
110. 2.7.1.2 - Does MDOE wish these exports to be created with password protected files?
- a. Exports by MDOE users must include sufficient security controls to ensure the exported data is only available to authorized recipients.
111. 2.7.1.2 - Does MDOE wish that these data are sent via secure FTP sites?
- a. Exports by MDOE users must include sufficient security controls to ensure the exported data is only available to authorized recipients. Secure data must be transmitted securely.
112. 2.7.2.1 - What 3rd party data will need to be imported?
- a. Some of the assessment tools we work with do have the capability to interface with MIS software. Note that we currently are not making use of that capability, but still what to make sure it is available should we want to start using it.
113. 2.7.2.1 - Will the data include instructional hours? Class information? Assessment information?
- a. Most likely it would be assessment info more often than anything else
114. 2.7.2.1 - What frequency will this importing of data occur? (Daily, weekly, monthly, yearly or one time)
- a. There probably will not be a standard day/time or interval. It will be on an as needed basis.
115. 2.8 – How many MDOE personnel are to be trained in system administration?
- a. Five to ten State personnel.
116. 2.8 – Are the trainings to be held at a single location?
- a. All MDOE training will be held in Augusta. Field personnel training may be held at multiple locations throughout the State.
117. 2.8.2 – What training is required at the local program level? Is the vendor expected to provide training on adult education programs?

- a. The vendor is responsible on providing training on how to use the proposed system.
118. 2.8.2 – What is the culture for training? Is it local or regional?
- a. Training preferences vary by region. Where possible regional training is encouraged.
119. 2.8.2 – Is there a preference for on-site or web-based training?
- a. The method of training depends on content. On-site training is preferred for local program staff/administrators.
120. 2.8.2 – Does the training programs include policies?
- a. The State training staff will cover policies.
121. 3.4.1.4 - By ‘comprehensive’ we imagine you are requesting a representative sample rather than a complete list of every client the vendor has served in the past three years. Can you please comment if this interpretation is correct? If not, please clarify.
- a. The client list may be representative of all the bidders’ clients but should include all clients whose applications/requirements most closely resemble the needs outlined in the RFP. MDOE reserves the right to contact any of the bidder’s clients whether on or off the list.
122. 3.5 - For State-hosted solution, MDOE is asking for a five-year cost proposal. For a vendor-hosted solution, how many years should the cost proposal cover?
- a. Vendor hosted solutions should list the annual costs plus any annual cost increases over five years.
123. 3.6 - in the case a vendor has suggested revisions or additions to language in the RFP and all of its contents, where should these revisions/additions be located in the physical proposal?
- a. Proposals may include a section for Bidder Comments. While the Department is very interested in the “best” solution that meets all its requirements, bidders should only take exceptions with due care since any exceptions deemed unacceptable by the Department may be grounds for eliminating or reducing the score of the bidder’s proposal. If the awarded bidder’s proposal includes any exceptions, the award itself will in no way indicate to the awarded bidder whether the exceptions, individually or collectively, are negotiable or non-negotiable.
124. 4.2 - How are the post-proposal submission activities (demonstration, etc.) going to be scored if the selected vendor’s selection is based on “points” which are not shown beyond those related to the actual submission of a proposal?
- a. Demonstrations may confirm or change the scoring on the Section 2 requirements at the discretion of the Evaluation Committee.
125. 4.3 - Our understanding is that part of the proposal evaluation process includes the potential for MDOE to test and validate the functionality contained in the highest-scoring bidder proposal(s). Because this T&E is part of the evaluation process, does that mean that screen shots need not be included as part of the initial proposal submission as a means of validating vendor-stated system functionality?
- a. Bidders should include in their proposals all information that will aid in evaluating proposed functionality. The T&E Stage is optional at the discretion of the Evaluation Committee
126. APPENDIX: C - It appears that the forms included in Appendix C: Standard Agreement are included for vendor review purposes only and do not need any further

action at this point. Can you please comment if this interpretation is correct? If not, please clarify.

- a. The sample Standard Agreement in Appendix C is the foundation for the awarded contract resulting from this RFP. Bidders may propose exceptions to the sample language. However, bidders should only take exceptions with due care since any exceptions deemed unacceptable by the Department may be grounds for eliminating or reducing the score of the bidder's proposal. If the awarded bidder's proposal includes any exceptions, the award itself will in no way indicate to the awarded bidder whether the exceptions, individually or collectively, are negotiable or non-negotiable.
127. Rider B-IT.35 – Is the warranty the same as maintenance and support?
 - a. The warranty covers bug fixes for one year after acceptance of the system by the State. Maintenance and support is separate and may cover items like upgrades, enhancements and help-desk support.
128. We anticipate that MDOE wants the vendor to provide technical support and help desk services to the LEAs and MDOE staff for each contract year. Furthermore, it seems the most logical line item in which to include technical support is ‘Maintenance and Support Costs’. Please comment if these are both accurate interpretations?
 - a. Proposals should include a description of the proposed maintenance and support services.
129. It appears that there are a number of variables and unknowns that would be clarified and fully vetted during the discovery process (items such as, but not limited to, importing and exporting data to and from a wide variety of disparate systems). Therefore, is it acceptable to MDOE to include a pre-determined ‘bank of hours’? This quantity of hours would be used to cover these coding/testing/documentation activities as they relate specifically to the requirements set forth in the proposal. Is this a reasonable and acceptable approach to MDOE?
 - a. Proposals are fixed price. Bidders may include assumptions.
130. Is Search Engine Optimization important to the schools?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
131. Would it be important to have tools to analyze your return on investment on marketing efforts?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
132. Will the contract be ongoing to cover maintenance and support?
 - a. Annual maintenance and support will be covered under a separate agreement or purchase order.
133. Is there a vision for the Adult Education System evolving to include Learning Management System capabilities? Specifically, should the system be able to publish lesson plans, assignments, tests (SCORM compliant) and have the ability to score and store results?
 - a. This is not a RFP requirement.
134. The concept student/teacher “linkage” seems key to the Adult Education System. Is the assumption that student/teacher data (course sign-up, rosters, teacher verification, etc.) exists in other systems and will be merely integrated into the new system and validated or will the student/teacher data be entered directly into the new system or will this be a combination of both approaches?

- a. Most exists and will be “pulled” in, but there will be a certain amount that will have to be directly inputted into the new system
135. How important is it to MDOE to have a locally-based Project Manager? In other words, all other factors aside, will additional scoring weight be given to a vendor proposing a locally-based Project Manager?
- a. The Department has found from past practice that projects run smoother and tend to be more successful when resources are on-site dealing directly with the Department staff for a significant percentage of the project time.
136. What are the biggest challenges for this project?
- a. Finding a solution that is a good fit for Maine’s requirements and a system that reduces the burden on the local programs while providing greater functionality.