



Amendment of Solicitation

Date of Issuance: May 10, 2016

Solicitation No. 0900000216

Requisition No. 0900007280

Amendment No. 002

Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is changed: [] No [] Yes, to: 3:00 PM CST/CDT

Pursuant to OAC 260:115-7-30(d), this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the Solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent.

Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:

- (1) Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted; or,
(2) If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date printed clearly on the front of the envelope.

ISSUED BY and RETURN TO:

U.S. Postal Delivery or Personal or Common Carrier Delivery:

Kearstyn Murphy Contracting Officer

Office of Management and Enterprise Services Central Purchasing 5005 N. Lincoln Blvd., Ste. 300 Oklahoma City, OK 73105

405 - 522 - 7024 Phone Number

Kearstyn.Murphy@omes.ok.gov E-Mail Address

Description of Amendment:

a. This is to incorporate the following:

Question 1: Hello, per Solicitation #0900000216 Online course curriculum for K-12 on the title page it states that the due date is May 30, 2016 at 3:00. This is Memorial day, will the office be open, or is this a typo? Please clarify. Thank you. Answer 1: The due date has been extended to May 31, 2016 at 3: 00PM. Question 2: The proposal is due on Monday May 30th, which is Memorial Day. Due to the holiday, can the proposal due date be extended to a day later in that week - preferably Friday June 3rd. This will allow time for vendors to ship the proposals after the holiday and still make the deadline Answer 2: The due date has been extended to May 31, 2016 at 3: 00PM. Question 3: Is this Solicitation going to be an annual/periodic process? In other words, will there be another opportunity to submit as a vendor later this year? Or at this time again next year? Answer 3: The state anticipates having similar solicitations every few years. Question 4: We have more than 300 courses we could submit, however the timing of this Solicitation does not allow us sufficient time to submit all the information as required in Section C.3 Mandatory Requirements. Can we submit groups of courses, for example AP courses, now and submit our middle school courses at a later date (to align with the review cycle in the Solicitation)? Answer 4: C3 instructions indicate that a vendor should "include whether the software is in complete compliance, partial compliance, or not available..." It would be appropriate to indicate that certain portions are not available at this time, but

Description of Amendment - continuing

will be supplied at the time of the course review. For instance, items like C.3.1.2. (Oklahoma subject code) and C.3.1.5. (alignment to Oklahoma academic standards) may not be readily available now but supplied at the time of course review. Further, policy/procedure items that apply to all courses from a given supplier may be addressed as such. As an example, a supplier may indicate that all courses have an enrollment cap of X students (C.3.1.3.) and all courses follow a specific protocol to monitor and report student progress (C.3.1.5., C.3.1.6., and C.3.1.7.).

Question 5: How will vendors new to providing online courses participate in this process after the initial due date?

Answer 5: The state anticipates having similar solicitations every few years.

Question 6: Will there be another opportunity to submit newly developed courses during the review process?

Answer 6: Additional courses may be submitted at the time vendors apply for their annual renewal (per Section B.1., the State may review "then current products and support offered by Supplier"). New course submissions will be placed at the end of the Course Review cycle.

Question 7: Are school districts required to select vendors from this list for purchasing online courses? Or do they have the ability to purchase courses from vendors not approved through this process?

Answer 7: School districts are not bound to use courses that go through this process. They may use uncertified courses at their own discretion.

Question 8: Is alignment documentation required to be submitted along with the initial vendor approval proposal or during the course approval process? Or provided when requested (due to the large volume of material included in alignment documentation)?

Answer 8: C3 instructions indicate that a vendor should "include whether the software is in complete compliance, partial compliance, or not available..." It would be appropriate to indicate that certain portions are not available at this time, but will be supplied at the time of the course review. For instance, items like C.3.1.2. (Oklahoma subject code) and C.3.1.5. (alignment to Oklahoma academic standards) may not be readily available now but supplied at the time of course review. Further, policy/procedure items that apply to all courses from a given supplier may be addressed as such. As an example, a supplier may indicate that all courses have an enrollment cap of X students (C.3.1.3.) and all courses follow a specific protocol to monitor and report student progress (C.3.1.5., C.3.1.6., and C.3.1.7.).

Question 9: Section B.6 on page 15 of 25 - Please explain the district purchase process for approved online courses. Is the district generating a quote via the website requirements outlined in section B.6 from the automated system/vendor discussion and then the district will enter into an agreement with the vendor for the licensing and payment for the selected courses?

Answer 9: The supplier will submit their prices for evaluation. This information will be available for the districts to view when choosing what courses they want to purchase. Once the districts have made a decision, then they will request a quote from the supplier referencing the statewide contract. After this, it's an internal process of approvals. The districts will not be entering into agreements with suppliers on their own. This is a statewide contract; therefore, the agreement will be with the state of Oklahoma and the suppliers will be held to the terms and conditions of the contract drafted.

Question 10: If evaluation does not begin until Spring/Summer 2016 and core subjects / other areas will not be reviewed until Fall 2016 or later, are districts going to be allowed to continue using online courses currently in the WAVE system in other subject areas until they are reviewed/approved by OMES?

Answer 10: Although courses will no longer be listed in the WAVE, the list of approved vendors will be posted online and made available to districts—along with the course pricing information, courses offered, and the schedule for each course review.

Question 11: For courses that will not be reviewed until 2017/2018, should the vendor include the documentation for those courses with the response or will that documentation be requested separately upon acceptance to the evaluation stage?

Description of Amendment - continuing

Answer 11: The vendor may not have all documentation available at the time of submission. Note that C3 instructions indicate that a vendor should "include whether the software is in complete compliance, partial compliance or not available..." It would be appropriate to indicate that certain portions are not available at this time, but will be supplied at the time of the course review. For instance, items like C.3.1.2. (Oklahoma subject code) and C.2.1.5. (Alignment to Oklahoma academic standards) may not be readily available now but supplied at the time of course review. Further, policy/procedure items that apply to all courses from a given vendor may be addressed as such. As an example, a vendor may indicate that all courses have an enrollment cap of X students (C.3.1.3.) and all courses follow a specific protocol to monitor and report student progress (C.3.1.5, C.3.1.6, and C.3.1.7).

Question 12: Is there a specific list of courses that will be reviewed in each review cycle?

Answer 12: The review cycle listed on page 16 of 25 contains the schedule of review according to content area and grade level.

Question 13: Will there be a 2016/17 review of K-8 courses?

Answer 13: No, please reference the review cycle listed on page 16 of 25. Middle school courses (grades 6-8) will be reviewed in fall of 2017. Elementary courses will be reviewed in spring of 2018.

Question 14: Is it the intent of SVCSB to not review K-5 content until Spring 2018?

Answer 14: Correct.

Question 15: Item C.3.1.2 on page 17 of 25 - Is there a master course catalog with the Oklahoma State Department of Education's approved Subject Codes available in Excel format? Also on the DOE website there is a course catalog for 2016-2017 for grades 9-12 but the course catalog for K-8 shows a date of 2015-16. Is there an updated 2016-2017 K-8 catalog?

Answer 15: There are two Pre-K-Grade 8 links on the website. The top link under the "subject codes" heading is for FY 2016-17 and it is current.

Question 16: Item C.3.1.5 on page 17 of 25 - Is the OMES looking for an explanation of how courses are aligned to the Oklahoma Content Standards or should the vendor include the actual alignment documentation with the response?

- If documentation should be submitted with the response, this would result in hundreds of printed pages. If required with this submission is it acceptable to provide a URL with a link to course documentation? If not, should these be held until the evaluation phase?

Answer 16: Submitting a URL is not acceptable. Note that C3 instructions indicate that a vendor should "include whether the software is in complete compliance, partial compliance or not available..." It would be appropriate to indicate that the standards alignment documentation is not available at this time, but will be supplied at the time of the course review. It would be helpful to note; however, that alignment to Oklahoma standards has occurred (or is in progress).

Question 17: Item C.3.1.8 on page 17 of 25 - Due to the evaluation schedule specific instructors may change between now and the time a course is evaluated. Since many courses won't be evaluated until 2017 or 2018 is the OMES looking for general vendor requirements for instructor qualifications?

Answer 17: It would be appropriate to indicate that C.3.1.8 (instructor credentials) is not available at this this, but will be supplied at the time of course review.

Question 18: Item C.3.1.9 on page 17 of 25 - Please clarify the statement "supply the course accreditation status" as the accrediting agencies accredit schools/providers not individual courses.

Answer 18: In many cases, the response to this item may be "N/A." However, if the course has recognition from an external entity (i.e. NCAA recognized, AP authorized) that would be noted.

Description of Amendment - continuing

Question 19: Item C.3.1.10 on page 17 of 25 - Some of the elements requested under C.3.1.10 are standard policies that are applicable to all courses offered by the vendor and are provided to the student/district separately not as part of the course syllabus. Is it acceptable to submit in this format?

Answer 19: It would be appropriate to indicate what the standard protocols are as part of this submission, then provided the individual completed syllabi at the time of course review. The course syllabus will be hyperlinked into the Oklahoma Online Course Catalog so that parents, students as well as their districts have access to course expectation while they are exploring their online options.

Question 20: Item C.3.1.10 on page 17 of 25 - Per the earlier question regarding number of pages, providers with a comprehensive course catalog would have to include hundreds of pages of documentation. Is it the desire of the OMES to have this documentation now or during the evaluation phase? If now, is it acceptable to provide a URL with access to the requested syllabi?

Answer 20: It is not acceptable to provide a URL. However, if the bidder has a copy of their course catalogue, then that can be submitted with their response. It would be appropriate to indicate what the standard protocols are as part of this submission, then provide the individual completed syllabi at the time of course review.

Question 21: Item C.3.1.10 on page 17 of 25 - Also, since the evaluation schedule for courses is spread over 3 years, how will the evaluation process handle course updates which create changes to course syllabi for courses submitted now but that won't be evaluated until 2017 or 2018?

Answer 21: You may either indicate that certain information will be supplied at the time of course review, or supply updated information at the time of course review.

Question 22: On page 18 of 25 under C.3.2.4 there is no C.3.2.4.2. Is an item requirement missing or was this section numbered incorrectly?

Answer 22: The number C.3.2.4.2. is missing. There is no hidden requirement there. It is an error in our paperwork.

Question 23: What is the process for review/approval/inclusion of elective courses for which there are not matching standards or course codes?

Answer 23: Such course will be evaluated beginning in the spring 2018. If a criterion is not applicable, that will be noted in the review.

Question 24: What happens when a vendor releases a new course version of a specific course that has been previously approved? How does that fit into the review cycle?

Answer 24: Please see Section C.3.2. beginning on page 17 of 25.

Question 25: If OMES is expecting vendors to include all documentation in the initial application, would the OMES consider moving the bid due date to June?

Answer 25: No, the closing date for this solicitation is May 31, 2016 at 3:00PM.

Question 26: Regarding C.3.1.5. standard alignments - Is there a correlation percentage that OMES is looking for?

Answer 26: The Course Reviewers will look for each standard identified for each course and the scores will be presented to the Board for consideration. If the Board decides to certify, the vendor will be contacted and have an opportunity to address.

Question 27: Another question regarding the standard alignments - Is there a correlation format or template available?

Answer 27: No, Vendors in the past have shown this information in a variety of ways.

Description of Amendment - continuing

Question 28: Is there an estimated date for the Spring/Summer 2016 course review?

Answer 28: Reviews for the first round of courses will begin soon after this solicitation closes.

Question 29: Are all regular CTE courses being considered STEM courses?

Answer 29: Priority will be for math and science courses then technology/engineering.

Question 30: Item B.6. Web Site Requirements - h) The ability to print a quote page with quote number and/or quote date, which shall be valid for at least thirty (30) days. Can you please clarify on the expected functionality?

Answer 30: All suppliers must be able to provide a quote referencing the statewide contract number, the negotiated statewide price, and an issuance date to requesting agencies. Any requested quote must be valid for thirty (30) days after it's issued.

Question 31: The reason I am writing is to ask whether it would be worthwhile to submit the RFP for the Middle Content development to be delivered in the Fall of 2017. As a custom developer, we do not retain the rights to any off-the-shelf content. We would be creating the online coursework from scratch following the standards and specifications defined by the RFP. At the conclusion of the work, the content would be owned by the State of Oklahoma and there would never be any kind of recurring license fees to access the content. Does this approach meet the requirements of the RFP? Thanks.

Answer 31: Is your company proposing to create middle school level courses that the state would then purchase? If so, that is not within the perimeters of this RFP.

Question 32: I am using the subject codes on the DOE website. Is there a link or site to view the course descriptions for the subject codes?

Answer 32: The state does not have a published list of course descriptions.

Question 33: For the following requirement, are the course names expected to match exactly?

C.3.1.2. Supply the course title and subject code (using appropriate course title and subject code as established by the Oklahoma State Department of Education's approved Subject Codes for the appropriate academic year)

For example, how should the general codes for grades K-8 be handled where the course title is Language Arts or Mathematics, with no specific grade designation? And how should we handle situations where we offer more than one course for a particular course code?

Answer 33: List the general code along with the content and grade level. If more than one course is appropriate for a single subject code, include that code with both courses.

Question 34: Sections C.3 requires the narrative to include whether the software is in complete compliance, partial compliance or not available with current solution. Please clarify the intention of the level of compliance. For example, if courses are currently in complete compliance of the alignment, syllabi, and teacher requirements, but we will be submitting the supporting documents at the time of the review to ensure the documents are up to date, would these courses be considered in complete compliance?

Answer 34: Without everything fully prepared at the time of submission, the course would be in partial compliance. Please note that missing information would be supplied at the time of course review. A partial completion for elements of the course materials will not negatively impact the vendor's approval status—provided all missing materials are provided upon request for the course review process.

Question 35: In the WAVE System, courses were listed both with and without instructors. Should pricing include only courses with instructors, or should both options be included?

Description of Amendment - continuing

Answer 35: Both options may be included—whatever you wish to be included in the Oklahoma Online Course Catalog.

Question 36: Should we submit all of the courses at this time or can we supplement with electives (since they are not listed on your course reviewer structure on page 16)? Please clarify if there will be time to add more courses at a different time or is this the only time to submit courses for consideration.

Answer 36: Additional courses may be submitted at the time vendors apply for their annual renewal (per Section B.1., the State may review “then current products and support offered by Supplier”). New course submissions will be placed at the end of the Course Review cycle.

Question 37: The Solicitation Specifications indicate that the review/accreditation process by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (INACOL) National Standards for Quality Online Courses, will this be part of the review/approval process?

Answer 37: Courses will be evaluated using rubrics to determine alignment with the current academic standards approved by the State of Oklahoma and the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) National Standards for Quality Online Courses. The rubric published in the most current National Standards for Quality Online Courses will be used as part of the Course Review, along with a rubric to measure the presence of each of the approved Oklahoma academic standards for the content area.

Question 38: Can the documentation submitted on courses include an electronic link to a course syllabi?

Answer 38: A hyperlink or any form of link will not suffice for this solicitation.

Question 39: What evidence will you need for your rubric that determines course approval?

Do we need to submit a crosswalk document that indicates where in the vendor's course the specific Oklahoma content standard is covered? Can we submit a statement that all Oklahoma course content standards are covered in the course design from each vendor?

Answer 39: You do not need to indicate *where* in the course specific standards are covered. The Course Review will determine that (although if you wish to provide such detailed information, you may and it will be forwarded to the course reviewers for consideration). You should indicate which *specific* standards are covered per course (vs listing “all”).

b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**) _____
Date

Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**) Title _____
Authorized Representative Signature