



South Orange County Community College District

RFQ&P 389D:

District-wide Technology Strategic Master Plan Development Services

Addendum No. One (1)

August 27, 2020

Nick Newkirk

Purchasing and Contracts Manager

Note:

All documents remain unchanged except section or parts added to, revised, deleted and/or clarified by this Addendum.

1. The responses to the Request for Information submitted by the deadline of 5:00 PM on August 21, 2020, as well as the responses to the questions asked during the mandatory pre-proposal meeting at 10:00 AM on August 26, 2020 are shown below:

Q1: Does SOCCCD have a shared governance committee that provides oversight for technology & learning services? If so, please describe. What will be their involvement in this initiative?

A1: Yes. There are two shared governance committees for District-wide technology & learning services:

1. District-wide Technology Committee (DTC). DTC handles all technology related topics outside of distance learning.
2. Distance Online Education Committee (DOEC).

Both shared governance committees will be integrally involved throughout the entirety of the process.

Q2: SOCCCD- What was the most recent survey covering technology and learning services? In advance of the proposal submission, can SOCCCD provide:

1. The questions asked and the communities surveyed
2. Summary survey results
3. Will detailed survey results be made available to the successful vendor?

A2: Each year, the DTC conducts a self survey. The surveys for fiscal year 2018-19 and 2019-20 are attached to this Addendum.

Q3: Please describe the categories for IT spending that SOCCCD envisions should be included in the multi-year funding and allocation plan.

A3: The vast majority of technology funding comes from basic aid. There are three main categories of basic aid spending:

1. Obligations from the Board
2. District-wide shared initiatives
3. College specific funding

The District is currently seeing a shift from capital to operational (specifically cloud-based) expenses. See response to Question 31 that identifies typical projects approved for basic aid funding. It is the intent that through the development of the DTSMP the various categories for IT spending based on critical need and objective phasing will be established and will be the basis for developing the multi-year funding and allocation plan.

Q4: Can SOCCCD expand on what you would consider to be a "book format" technology Strategic Plan? Would a spiral bound presentation- or prose-based document be acceptable? Is SOCCCD looking for a hard cover book, thick paper bound document, notebook bound, or other?

A4: A spiral-bound format would be acceptable.

Q5: What are the key meetings expected with the SOCCCD leadership for plan review and approval?

A5: A minimum of two (2) meetings for plan review and approval will be required with all four (4) of the following constituency groups:

1. Saddleback College
2. Irvine Valley College
3. District Services
4. Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College and District Services together

Q6: Does SOCCCD have an expected timeline for the execution and completion of the DTSMP? Please describe.

A6: Per Scope of Services, Task 1, Action Item 7: Adoption and Implementation: The final phase of the DTSMP process includes adoption and implementation with a formal presentation to the Board of Trustees on or about October 2021. While the District anticipates the Task 1 engagement to be completed within one year, Proposers are required to present a schedule per Proposal Form D based in accordance with a reasonable allocation of resources and expertise and provide justification on why this engagement cannot be completed within one year. There is no specific timeline for the plans in Task 2, however they can be utilized within the course of the 5 year agreement term.

Q7: Are the task 2: specialized technology planning services focused on District-wide, rather than institution-specific need?

A7: All plans identified in Task 2 shall be drafted with a District-wide focus factoring college each of the colleges' specific needs.

Q8: In response to Proposal Form G, is SOCCCD looking to have respondents provide a list of current and previous clients for whom we have done similar work AND specific organizations that SOCCCD

can contact to provide commentary on our ability to complete this work based on their experience with us?

A8: Yes. The District intends to contact the listed references as part of its due diligence.

Q9: How many references does SOCCCD desire in response to this RFQ&P?

A9: The District recommends that respondents list as many references as possible, but no less than five (5) references in the past five (5) years.

Q10: In the firm information (p22), would SOCCCD consider admission of new partners a change in control/ownership of the firm?

A10: Yes. Each team member assigned to the District shall demonstrate the relevant experience either individually or cumulatively to perform and deliver the services identified in the RFQ&P.

Q11: Does SOCCCD look to have respondents list all the exceptions to the three sources of contract terms and conditions: General Terms & Conditions, Information Technology Professional services agreement, and the administrative services agreement?

A11: The District will not accept any exceptions to the General Terms & Conditions Proposal Form F.

In regard to exceptions for the Information Technology Professional Services Agreement and the Foundation's Administrative Services Agreement, Proposer shall submit any and all exceptions on a separate tab for each of the agreements per the instructions listed within the RFQ&P:

As part of the proposal submission, indicate in a separate Tab of the RFQ&P Response the Respondent's acceptance of all terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement. If there is any term or condition of the Agreement, which a Respondent requests to be modified, the Respondent must: (i) specifically identify such term or condition; and (ii) set forth the specific text of the modification requested for each such term or condition. Notwithstanding any requested modification to any term or condition of the Agreement, no such modifications are binding on the District or enforceable against the District unless the District affirmatively and specifically accepts any such requested modification.

Significant consideration will be given to Proposers who have limited to **no** exceptions to the Information Technology Professional Services Agreement and the Foundation's Administrative Services Agreement.

Q12: In the suggested Table of Contents for the plan, section 9 Appendices lists "Cost benefit analysis" and "Total cost of ownership". To what extent is SOCCCD looking for the selected vendor to perform these analyses on recommended IT initiatives? Would SOCCCD agree that these would be limited to only high value and high priority initiatives? Also, what level of specificity is desired? For example, would a range of values be acceptable?

A12: The District expects the selected Proposer to perform the analysis for all high value and high

priority IT initiatives. A range of values will be acceptable so long as the initiatives are separate and do not overlap.

Q13: While it is not specified in the list of actions required, does SOCCCD envision that leadership will review and assist in prioritizing recommended initiatives?

A13: Yes.

Q14: Will SOCCCD agree that the "comprehensive analysis and justification" listed in Task 1 DTSMP Deliverable #2 be limited to those high value, high priority initiatives where implementation cost and benefit information is readily available?

A14: See A12.

Q15: Will SOCCCD provide annual budgets for IT for the years of the planning horizon and anticipated growth or assumptions?

A15: Funded basic aid requests are made on an annual basis and are available online at the District's website. Budgets are allocated based on priorities. The DTSMP along with its anticipated growth assumptions and priorities will influence budget allocations, hence the requirement to have Proposers develop a Sample Implementation and Funding Allocation Plan per Appendix F.

Q16: Will SOCCCD consider extending the due date in light of the Labor Day holiday, and to offer 2 weeks after the receipt of answers to questions submitted?

A16: No.

Q17: Will the EMSP's and the FMP's be completed prior to the start of the District-wide Technology Strategic Plan project.

A17: Link to the recently completed EMSP (June 2020 Board Agenda Item #s 4.1 and 6.1):

http://soccdd.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&clip_id=728

Link to the recently completed FMP (July 2020 Board Agenda Items # 4.1 and 6.1):

http://soccdd.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&clip_id=729

Q18: Technology continues and is expected to change at a rapid pace, what are the expectations of a 10-year plan given the pace of innovation?

A18: The District anticipates the DTSMP to address and recommend technology needs within the 0-5 years term. In regards to years 5-10, the District expects the Proposer to have the insight and industry acumen, knowledge and understanding of where technology is heading. Proposers shall develop the long term plan based on strategies/solutions that will help the District adapt its technology platforms, professional development and protect the technology investments in preparation for the changing trends.

Q19: Can you please provide an organization chart?

A19: The organization charts are available on the District and college websites.

Q20: Can you please provide a description and supporting diagrams of your current applications and technology landscape?

A20: This information will be provided to the awarded firm.

Q21: Is there an expected end date for the delivery of the District-wide Technology Strategic Plan?

A21: See A6.

Q22: What internal District resources will be assigned to support the District-wide Technology Strategic Plan?

A22: Substantive time will be provided with each of the four constituency groups as identified in A5.

Q23: Who is the project sponsor?

A23: Bob Bramucci, Vice Chancellor of Technology and Learning Services

Q24: For Task 2, please provide additional details on these initiatives in terms of scope, goals, and expected deliverables.

A24: Based on the information provided for each of the plans identified within Task 2 of the RFQ&P, the Proposer shall define and develop each of the plans based on their industry knowledge and expertise.

Q25: Is there an incumbent?

A25: See A47.

Q26: Who will be involved in the collaboration process?

A26: See A5.

Q27: Does the current leadership team have a good understanding of the technical direction or will the vendor selected be required to build a plan from the ground up? Is this documented?

A27: The expectation is that the awarded firm will provide direction and recommendations based on their industry expertise, knowledge and accumen.

Q28: There is mention of an October 2021 delivery date – what is the actual expected timeline to deliver the final version of the end product?

A28: See A6.

Q29: What is the relationship of the Foundation to SOCCCD regarding this Technology Master Planning initiative?

A29: The Foundation for California Community Colleges CollegeBuys Program (Foundation) is the official nonprofit auxiliary organization for the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The Foundation brings with it the ability to enter into an Agreement on behalf of the 72 California Community College Districts.

The District is the issuing agency for this RFQ&P in partnership with the Foundation. The awarded firm will enter into an Agreement with the District (See Appendix D: Sample District Information Technology Professional Services Agreement) and a separate Agreement with the Foundation on behalf of the 72 California Community College Districts (see Appendix E: Sample Foundation Administrative Services Agreement).

Q30: What is the present status of the EMSP and FMP? Will they be completed and available as inputs at the start of the DTSMP process? If not, please provide a schedule for their completion.

A30: See A17.

Q31: For scoping purposes, can SOCCCD provide a general list of the DTSMP candidate projects/initiatives?

A31: The below list of basic aid projects are for the current fiscal year as proposed by the District-wide Technology Council. This list may be used as a guide/resource for purposes of understanding and developing the requirements of this initiative.

I) CSIS and Workday Systems Projects

1. SIS: State Compliance and College Requests
2. Workday HR/Finance System FY 2020-2021

II) District-wide Projects

1. Attendance Tracking
2. Block Registration - Phase 2
3. Data Integration Phase 2 - Financial Aid
4. District-wide Business Continuity Technical Planning
5. District-wide Data Backup Refresh
6. District-wide Infrastructure Cloud Services
7. District-wide Private WAN Network Refresh
8. District-wide Vulnerability Assessment
9. InFORM Data Warehouse Upgrade - Assessment on Reporting Portal and Existing Reports
10. Instructional Management System (IMS) Upgrade
11. MAP Enhancements/Guided Pathways Support

12. Service Desk and EDR Security
13. SIS Architecture Upgrade Phase 2
14. SIS Development Process Improvements

III) Saddleback College Projects

1. Cabling Plant Refresh
2. Classroom Technology and Audio-Video Refresh
3. College-wide Data Backup Refresh
4. Computer Refresh
5. Data Center Relocation
6. Domain Name System (DNS)
7. Intermediate Distribution Facility (IDF) Refresh
8. Physical Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade
9. Signage and Infrastructure: Outdoor Athletic Venues
10. Storage Area Network
11. Virtual System Refresh
12. Wireless Expansion

IV) Irvine Valley College Projects

1. College-wide Data Backup Refresh
2. Computer Desktop Refresh
3. Live Oak Terrace (LOT) Conversion into an Outdoor Theater (Technology Only)
4. New Marquees
5. Signage and Infrastructure, Outdoor Athletic Venues

Q32: For Task 1, Process 2, how many committee and board presentations should be planned?

A32: There shall be a minimum of two (2) meetings with each of the four (4) constituency groups. Up to two Board presentations may be required.

Q33: Are there other final presentations that will be required beyond the Board and committee groups listed?

A33: The final presentation of the DTSMP will be to the District's Board of Trustees.

Q34: For Task 1, Action Item 2, are specific named/branded software packages and hardware platforms to be evaluated/identified or is this a performance requirement for classes of software and hardware?

A34: This is a performance requirement for classes of software and hardware.

Q35: Since Task 2 planning scopes are a la carte, will the timing of these efforts be within the overall schedule of the DTSMP to be completed by October 2021 or are these on a completely independent

timetable? What assumptions can be made about durations and deadlines for each of the individual tasks?

A35: The plans identified in Task 2 are not not completely independent of the DTSMP schedule in Task 1. The District, at its discretion, may choose any one or more of the plans in Task 2 to be developed in parallel and/or complimentary to the DTSMP. The proposing firm shall ensure that sufficient bandwidth, capability, resources, and project sufficiencies are in place to support the District’s needs.

Q36: For Task 2, Distance Education Infrastructure Plan, what are the District’s current solutions for the key platforms listed (learning management system, student information system, lecture capture and transcription, plagiarism detection, accessibility checkers, media libraries, training and help desk systems)? In addition, can SOCCCD provide a list of student-facing systems?

A36: Current solutions and a list of student-facing systems are listed below.

District Services:

Student Facing Systems:	Description	Administered By
MySite	Portal for Student Information System; Academic Planning	SOCCCD
CampusLogic	Portal for Financial Aid information	3rd Party
Nelnet	Portal for Student Financial Disbursements	3rd Party
SmartSchedule	Schedule of Classes	SOCCCD
SEVIS	Portal for International Students	3rd Party
Academic Works	Portal for Scholarship applications and management	3rd Party
SARS	Appointment Scheduling	3rd Party
Advocate	Portal for Disciplinary Case Management	3rd Party
Outlook	College Email Application	SOCCCD

Other Systems	Description	Administered By
IMS	Instructional Management System	SOCCCD
Ivanti	Help Desk System	SOCCCD

Saddleback College and Irvine Valley College: Click on the link below:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1JLRzHgae7rZOKd3E-FEWrXKZBRhwiRwYIBWfJnJTUy/edit?usp=sharing>

Q37: For Task 2, Cloud Solutions Plan, can SOCCCD provide a list of which cloud platforms they currently use and a list of what they are hosting in the cloud?

A37: The District is currently utilizing AWS and are currently evaluating Azure. One product, (Smartschedule) has been architected in AWS.

Q38: What is SOCCCD’s desired timeframe for this project? Do you have specific start and end dates in mind? Are there any other particular milestones that need to be considered?

A38: See A6.

Q39: What is SOCCCD’s expectation for conducting work on-site?

A39: Any work on-site would be limited to essential activities. However, in the current environment

all such initiatives are taking place on online/virtual platforms.

Q40: How is the IT department organized between the District and the three campuses?

A40: 1) Information Technology Department in District Services
2) Media Services and Broadcast Systems at Saddleback College
3) Media Services at Irvine Valley College

Q41: What IT services does the District provide, and what is provided by each campus?

A41: In general, the colleges are responsible for classroom computing, distance education and the local wireless network. District Services is responsible for the District-wide wired network, the security architecture, and academic and administrative computing.

Q42: What is the current IT governance structure at SOCCCD?

A42: See A19.

Q43: The RFP states that “The awarded firm will enter into an Agreement with the District (See Appendix D: Sample District Information Technology Professional Services Agreement) and a separate Agreement with the Foundation on behalf of the 72 California Community College Districts.” Can you clarify what this means? Are the 72 Community College Districts able to use this agreement to contract with the awarded firm for similar project services?

A43: The result of this RFQ&P will result in two contracts being awarded (one with SOCCCD and one with the Foundation). The contract with the foundation will be the contractual vehicle from which the 72 California Community College Districts will be able to “piggyback” and leverage from. The award of contract by the Foundation **is not a guarantee of work** with the 72 California Community College Districts, the Foundation contact serves as a vehicle/opportunity for other districts to leverage at their discretion.

Q44: In Section 2 of the RFP, do the “Accessibility Requirements” apply to this RFP?

A44: Accessibility Requirements will apply to the services and output rendered from this RFQ&P.

Q45: In Proposal Form A (Letter of Interest and Approach, Cover Letter and Proposer Firm Information), there is a section for “Proposer Firm Information” which includes a number of questions for bidders to respond to. In our proposal, do we complete and return these pages from the RFP, or can we recreate this information in a Word document?

A45: Proposers can recreate the information in a Word document so long as all of the original language, format and order is the same as presented in the RFQ&P.

Q46: May we recreate the information in Proposal Form E (Fee and Rate Proposal) in Word to make it easier to provide this information in our proposal? Or do we need to fill out and return Form E as found in the RFP?

A46: Proposers can recreate the information in Proposal Form E so long as all of the original language, format and order is the same as presented in the RFQ&P.

Q47: Did SOCCCD and/or the Foundation hire an external consultant to develop SOCCCD's 2015 – 2020 Technology Plan? If yes:

- a. What vendor(s) conducted the work?
- b. What was the dollar value of the contract?

A47: The SOCCCD's 2015-2020 Technology Plan is exclusive to the District and was developed without the input of an external consultant. The Foundation has no association or bearing on the District's 2015-2020 Technology Plan. At no point through the engagement will the Foundation be involved in the development of any technology plan for any district (the Foundation's role is limited to awarding a piggybackable contract with the technology consultant for use and leverage by the 72 California Community College Districts).

The District-wide Technology Plan Task Force met over the period of November 2011 through August 2015 to draft the SOCCCD 2015-2020 Technology Plan. The plan was then submitted to the District-wide Technology Committee for final revisions. The plan was approved by the members of the District-wide Technology Committee on December 17, 2015 and approved by the District's Board of Trustees on September 26, 2016.

Link to the 2015-2020 Technology Master Plan (September 26, 2016 Board Agenda Item # 7.3):
http://soccdd.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&clip_id=585

Q48: Do you have a budget estimate or not-to-exceed threshold for this project that you can share? If yes, please provide detail.

A48: The District is sensitive to the overall project cost, hence firms shall base their responses on the scope of services to be rendered.

Q49: The Program Overview section refers to the outcome of this project as a "new" DTSMP. Can you provide a copy of the most recent previous DTSMP, or instructions on how to access it?

A49: See A47.

Q50: Will any of the Scope of Services be done on behalf of, or involve participation from, the Foundation?

A50: No.

Q51: If a conflict in scope/contract shall occur between the SOCCCD in Appendix D or the Foundation in Appendix E, which one shall take precedence?

A51: The two agreements are distinct and independent of each other and shall be treated as such. The scope of the RFQ&P is meant to be incorporated into the scope of the agreement and should be

complimentary. Any conflict between the RFQ&P scope and the two agreements should be addressed by the Proposer within the listing of exceptions per A11.

Q52: The proposal structure is clearly articulated. Can proposals include a Table of Contents ahead of "Letter of Interest and Approach, Cover Letter and Proposer Firm Information" and Proposal Form A; and if so, will this be included in the 2 page limit?

A52: Yes, a Table of Contents can be included and it would not count towards the page limit of Proposal Form A.

Q53: The introduction paragraph for Task 1 DTSMP Deliverables ends with "The final product will include, but not be limited to:" Does this mean that the District might add additional requirements at some future point in time, or does it mean that respondents can expand on the list of deliverables if we feel proposing additional deliverables is in the best interest of the District?

A53: The expectation is that Proposers can expand on the list of additional deliverables if it is in the best interest of the District.

Q54: Can you confirm that the District's executive leadership team is the Board of Trustees and Chancellor, or if there are other members so that we can scope the orientation meetings accordingly?

A54: The District's executive leadership team comprises of the Chancellor, two College Presidents and Vice Chancellors. The Board is not part of the executive team.

Q55: Please confirm that all District offices are at the Saddleback College campus in Mission Viejo.

A55: The District Services offices are located in the HS Building at Saddleback College.

Q56: The introduction to Task 2 states that "Services identified within Task 2 are considered additional and as-needed." Does this mean that these may be requested at the District's option?

A56: Yes, these are all optional services that the District intends to pick and choose from as-needed when needed.

Q57: What level of detail does the District expect respondents to provide for the Task 2 Services, and is the response to these Services included within the 5-page limit for Proposal Form C?

A57: See A24 in regard to the level of detail expected. The District will increase the page limit to 7 pages for Proposal Form C.

Q58: Has the District conducted any recent evaluations of its technology environment, systems, and services, that can be made available to the selected firm?

A58: The evaluations are classified and will only be provided as-needed to the awarded firm.

Q59: Are IT services currently provided by District employees, a managed services contract, or a

combination? If a combination, can you please describe how the workload is split between employees and the services provider(s)?

A59: A combination. The workload is split on a project by project basis.

Q60: Instruction 10 on Proposal Form C requests information on just one instance where a firm's Technology Strategic Plan was adopted and executed, and requests links to 3 to 5 similar Technology Strategic Plans. Since online availability of a client's Strategic Plan is under that entity's control, it's possible that fewer than 3 online plans may be available. How would the District like respondents to address such a circumstance?

A60: Technology Strategic Plans for educational institutions are Board approved and publicly available. If the plan is no longer available on the educational institution's website, then a pdf copy of the plan shall be provided.

Q61: Can Proposal Forms and Appendices which need to be completed be made available in MS Word format for ease of use?

A61: Proposers can recreate Proposal Forms and Appendices so long as all of the original language, format and order is the same as presented in the RFQ&P.

Q62: One of the items listed in the Sample Table of Contents for the DTSMP is a Service Catalog with Service Level Agreements. Can you confirm that the District expects a Service Catalog and SLAs to be developed with this project, and does the District currently have a Service Catalog?

A62: Yes, the District expects a Service Catalog and SLAs to be developed with this project. The Sample Table of Contents (TOC) was developed by a workgroup. The group's expectation is that each item in the TOC is in scope for the DTSMP. We do not currently have a formal service catalog.

Q63: What is the approved budget for the Scope of Services of this RFQ&P, and is that for Task 1 only or does it include all of the items in Task 2?

A63: See A48.

Q64: Will it include all 113 community colleges?

A64: See A43.

Q65: Can you provide a list of meeting attendees with the Addendum?

A65: Yes. A list of attendees is attached to this Addendum.

Q66: Later please repeat the email address for confirmation of call attendance.

A66: The email is: purchasing-dept@socccd.edu

Q67: Is SOCCCD looking for three plans -- one each for the member schools and one for the district?
Does the 5 page limit include the methodology and approach for task 1 & 2?

A67: The District is expecting one comprehensive overarching District-wide plan that addresses the technology needs from both of the colleges tied into one cohesive master plan. It is the intent that the DTSMP will be developed with a modular approach to detail and identify technology needs for each of the two colleges.

Q68: Since it sounds like pricing could be leveraged by other CCDs under the piggyback arrangement, how are we to account for pricing unique to SOCCCD when other CCDs are variable sizes and corresponding level of effort?

A68: Present the most competitive pricing factoring minimally the following as the basis of your pricing:

1) Synergies related to resources, information, technology platforms, and approach.

2) Common approach to addressing shared technology challenges amongst CCDs

The pricing shall be proposed based on the size and scale of the District's (SOCCCD) engagement. The price proposal submitted in response to this RFQ&P, shall then become the basis for negotiations and finalization of pricing for the Foundation Contract.

Q69: Are there limitations with responding to both tasks or only one task? For example, can a firm be awarded both tasks?

A69: The contract will be awarded to one firm that demonstrates the capability to deliver the most comprehensive experience, expertise, approach, pricing, and methodology to both Task 1 and Task 2.

Q70: Is the 2 page limit inclusive of BOTH the cover letter and the letter of interest

A70: Yes. There is no page limit for the Proposer's Firm Information.

Q71: What is the plan for on-site efforts for the meetings and assessments during Task 1 with COVID-19?

A71: See A39.

Q72: So are you looking for a Fee Sheet for each individual staffed to the project covering all actions they are working on?

A72: Follow the instructions listed as listed in Proposal Form E.

Q73: Must all references be higher ed?

A73: Higher Education references, while preferred, are not mandatory.

Q74: Is there anticipated project completion date (when the deliverable shall be provided)?

A74: See A6.

Q75: Will all projects identified be required to have a funding and allocation plan - Can SOCCCD describe the typical funding sources it would take advantage of for strategic technology initiatives?

A75: See A15.

Q76: Have you informed all Community colleges Technology Directors?

A76: Upon finalization of the Foundation contract, the Foundation will send a notification system-wide letting all districts know that a piggybackable contract for DTSMP Development Services is available for their leverage and use at their discretion.

Q77: Will more information/data (network diagrams, configurations, etc) be provided to price out tasks?

A77: Due to the sensitive nature, this information may be released to the awarded firm as determined by the District.

Q78: Does the resource list need to be the exact resource resumes who will be conducting the work or are sample scrubbed resumes sufficient?

A78: One page resumes for each individual identified as part of the project team shall be submitted per the instructions listed within Proposal Form B.

Q79: Will the District share the manufacturer of existing infrastructure? Is there a preference to stay with this manufacturer?

A79: There are various manufacturers utilized within the District. There is no specific preference or allegiance to any manufacturer.

Q80: Will the District consider expanding the page limit for Proposal Form A (Letter of Interest and Approach, and Cover Letter)?

A80: No.

Q81: Are the existing district Technology Standards available for reference?

A81: Formal technology standards do not exist and a comprehensive set of District wide technology standards will need to be developed as part of the DTSMP.

Q82: Will SOCCCD work with the vendor to achieve compliance with accessibility standards -- will there be a POC for questions, for example, and a person to speak with to resolve questions? Will this be limited to final versions of the task 1 and task 2 deliverable documents.

A82: A point of contact will be provided to resolve questions.

Q83: Can you provide a list of the firms who attended this conference call?

A83: See A65.

Q84: Is there a specific driver for doing this plan now? Can SOCCCD share this with us ?

A84: Having a Technology Master Plan is an accreditation requirement and the current plan goes through 2020. The Technology Master Plan requires that the EMSP and the FMP plans are finalized prior to developing the Technology Master Plan.

Q85: Will the winning contractor be restricted from participating in the future District Technology projects?

A85: No. The District does not foresee a potential for a conflict of interest or competitive advantage in relation to this question.

Q86: Will there be additional RFPs to deploy task 2 plans that come from this RFP

A86: No.

Q87: Will SOCCCD evaluate proposers on the overall fees or the hourly rates? Since this is a final fixed fee proposal (not hourly, not to exceed), will the hours provided only be used as an estimate?

A87. The District will evaluate Proposers on both the overall fees and the hourly rates. The District is price sensitive. The overall fees give the District an opportunity to ensure that overall engagement hours are fair and reasonable.

Q88: Today we are in Covid-19 and everyone working from home, so today's costs can go lower than normal when you would ask us to come onsite. Is it possible to give 2 pricing, one price during Covid-19 or working remotely and other cost to be onsite?

A88: Only one price shall be proposed. The District is currently conducting operations remotely and anticipates this situation to continue through the remainder of the calendar year. The awarded firm may be minimally required to provide some level of onsite engagement as/if needed.

Q90: Will SOCCCD provide an estimated # of initiatives that may require a funding and allocation plan, so that all vendors will have a common understanding? For example will 10 initiatives require such a plan, and will be included in the fees quoted? Earlier you stated they will be required only for high value, high cost initiatives

A90: There are typically 30-50 projects per year, but not all of them are all high value and high priority IT initiatives. Use A31 for this year's project list, which may be used as a representative guide/resource

for this purpose.

Q91: What is the time limit on the piggyback agreement? Or is that negotiated with the Foundation at a later time?

A91: See section III.7 for the term of the Foundation agreement (Appendix E) and is set to not exceed 5 years.

Q92: We understand the other 71 Districts will have the ability to piggyback off of this contract. We assume the other 71 Districts will also have the freedom to conduct their own separate procurement for strategic technology planning and hire a firm of their choice. Please confirm or clarify.

A92: The award of contract by the Foundation is not a guarantee of work with the 72 California Community College Districts. The Foundation contract serves as a vehicle/opportunity for other districts to leverage at their own discretion. Districts have a choice of doing their DTSMP independently, utilizing the awarded piggyback agreement as a result of this RFQ&P, or hiring a firm independently, through their own procurement process.

Q93: Can we partner with other firms as subcontractors to address specific expertise needs?

A93: Yes, however resumes for all members of the project team including subconsultants shall be included with Proposal Form B. The District will only award one contract to the primary firm. The primary firm shall be responsible for developing the structure and hierarchy with the subconsultant and shall submit a proposal that is representative of one organization.

Q94: To what extent is SOCCCD looking for a final ready public document? If so, will SOCCCD have members of the communications team available to work on this?

A94: The expectation is that the awarded firm will develop a complete and picture-perfect DTSMP document ready for final review and approval by the Board in October 2021.