

OFFEROR QUESTIONS – RFP 25-1000, Idaho Report Card

All questions submitted by Offerors have been answered below.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
1	1.8.B Major Reference Documents	8	Please confirm this is the correct link for “Institute of Education Sciences. (n.d.). <i>Data Visualization Toolkit</i> . Institute of Education Sciences”: Communities360 - Home > Overview > Home (ed.gov) (the link in the RFP is broken).	That is the correct link; however, it does not appear to be broken.
2	2.3-- Questions	10	The invitation to submit questions regarding Terms and Conditions (“T&C”) at the bottom of p. 11 of the RFP appears to be in tension with the requirement at the top of p. 11 of the RFP that Proposals will be deemed nonresponsive if they take exception to the Department’s T&C or require the Department to accept other T&C not in the RFP. Does submission of such questions, if Offeror intends to negotiate the T&C it submits questions about, make its Proposal non-responsive?	The Department will consider Offeror questions and proposed revisions related to the Department’s terms and conditions, as outlined in Section 2.3, but will not negotiate them later.
3	8.1.1.A Report Card Requirements	19	The Evidence/Info to Provide column provides: “The solution will not include any proprietary formulas or reaggregation of data already aggregated by the Department.” Offeror uses proprietary software and algorithms. Can IDE please confirm its understanding that Offeror may use propriety software and algorithms despite this statement?	To clarify, the vendor may choose to use the proprietary software and algorithms to visualize the data provided by the Department. However, the constituents must be able to reproduce the data displayed on the State Report Card with the data provided by the Department.
4	8.4.4.G Hosting Requirements	32	Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends deleting “as well as for an additional five years following the end of the contract.” 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
5	5-- General T&C, Intellectual Property and Ownership Materials	5	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Intellectual Property. The Agreement does not transfer any ownership rights. Offeror and its licensors retain title to the Offering, any Documentation, source code, and any techniques, skills, concepts or know-how Offeror utilizes or develops while performing the Agreement. IDE retains ownership to IDE Materials and any data IDE derives from using an Offering. The Software source code is an Offeror trade secret. IDE and Users will not access source code or attempt to reverse engineer, reverse assemble or decompile the Software or System. IDE and Users will not remove any copyright or proprietary rights notice from any Offering. The Agreement does not limit any rights IDE may have under any open-source license covering any open-source component included in the Offering. <p>Use of any online training provided with an Offering but not separately listed on the Order Form is governed by the terms of the Agreement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	<p>The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.</p>

6	13-- General T&C, Indemnification	7	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Indemnification by Offeror. Provided IDE complies with the Agreement, Offeror will defend and indemnify IDE for any third-party claim against IDE for: (a) any copyright, patent, trade secret or other intellectual property rights violation relating to the Software, Work Product, or any Software or Work Product included in an Offeror Cloud Offering; or (b) bodily injury, death or damage to tangible property, arising solely from actions for which Offeror is legally responsible. Tangible property does not include software or data. IDE will promptly notify Offeror in writing of any such claim. IDE will allow Offeror to control the litigation or settlement of any such claim and will cooperate with Offeror in the investigation, defense and settlement. Offeror will indemnify IDE by paying for the costs and attorneys’ fees IDE incurs at Offeror’s direction and any judgment finally awarded against IDE or settlement approved by Offeror. IDE may participate at IDE's own expense. <p>If any intellectual property claim is made or, in Offeror's opinion, is likely to be made, Offeror may: (i) modify the Software or Work Product; (ii) obtain rights for IDE to continue using the Software or Work Product; or (iii) terminate IDE’s license to use the Software or Work Product and refund any Fees paid by IDE for the then-current annual period or for the Work Product at issue. IDE will abide by Offeror’s decision.</p> <p>Offeror’s indemnification obligation does not apply to claims based on: (1) IDE’s combination of the Software or Work Product with other software or materials; (2) IDE’s modification to the Software or Work Product; (3) prior versions of the Software if IDE had not installed the latest version or updates to the Software prior to the date the claim arose as instructed by Offeror; or (4) IDE’s unique specifications for the Work Product.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	<p>The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.</p>
---	-----------------------------------	---	---	--

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
7	22-- General T&C, Attorney Fees	10	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: see Indemnification by Offeror provision immediately above. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
8	23.1-- General T&C, Governing Law and Jurisdiction	10	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends replacing the last sentence of Section 23.1 with “Any action to enforce the provisions of this agreement shall be brought in state or federal court in Idaho.” 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
9	5, 5.4, 5.6--&C for Solicitations, Insurance	2	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Insurance. During the Term, Offeror will keep the following insurance policies in force: (a) Workers Compensation – Statutory (in the amounts required by applicable law); (b) Employer's Liability – USD \$1,000,000 per occurrence; bodily injury by accident or disease, including death; (c) Commercial General Liability – USD \$1,000,000 combined limit per occurrence and USD \$2,000,000 aggregate; bodily injury, personal injury and property damage, including blanket contractual liability; and (d) Automobile Liability (if vehicles are brought on IDE's premises) – USD \$1,000,000 combined limit per occurrence; bodily injury and property damage covering owned, non-owned and hired vehicles. Evidence of coverage is available at [insert publicly available link]. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	<p>The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.</p>

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
10	7— T&C for Solicitations , Liability, especially 7.2 and 7.6	4	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Exclusion of Damages. Neither IDE, Offeror, nor Offeror’s third-party licensors are liable for special, incidental, indirect, consequential, punitive, or reliance damages (arising in contract, tort or otherwise) even if they have been informed of the possibility of such damages. Neither Offeror nor Offeror’s third-party licensors are liable for any third-party claim against IDE. Offeror’s third-party licensors are not liable for any direct damages. <p>Limitation of Liability. THE TOTAL AMOUNT IDE MAY RECOVER FROM OFFEROR FOR ALL CLAIMS ARISING FROM OR RELATING TO THE AGREEMENT IS LIMITED IN THE AGGREGATE TO THE FEES IDE HAS PAID FOR THE OFFERING AT ISSUE DURING THE APPLICABLE ANNUAL PERIOD IN WHICH THE CLAIM AROSE.</p> <p>Applicability. This section does not apply to the Indemnification by Offeror section or to either party’s violation of the other’s intellectual property rights. The limitations in this section will apply even if any of the remedies provided in the Offeror Warranties and Disclaimers section fail of their essential purpose. Some jurisdictions do not allow limitations of liability or exclusions of certain types of damages so certain provisions of this section may not apply to IDE. However, the provisions apply to the greatest extent permitted by applicable law.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
11	6-- T&C for Cloud Services, Updates	2	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Disclaimer of Third-Party Actions. Offeror exercises no control over the flow of information to or from the System, Offeror’s network, or other portions of the internet. Such flow largely depends on the performance of internet services provided or controlled by third parties. At times, actions or inactions of such third parties can impair or disrupt connections to the System. Offeror will use commercially reasonable efforts to take all actions it deems appropriate to avoid or remedy such events, but Offeror cannot guarantee that such events will not occur. OFFEROR DISCLAIMS ANY AND ALL LIABILITY RESULTING FROM OR RELATED TO INTERNET OR NETWORK FAILURES. EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE EXPRESSLY PROVIDED IN THE AGREEMENT, OFFEROR DISCLAIMS ANY AND ALL LIABILITY ARISING FROM ACTIONS OR INACTIONS OF A THIRD PARTY. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	<p>The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.</p>

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
12	9-- T&C for Cloud Services , Injunction and Enforcement	3	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends the following edits: (i) changing “no adequate remedy exists at law” to “no adequate remedy at law may exist” in the first sentence; (ii) changing “it would be difficult to determine the damages resulting from tis breach of these IDE Special Terms and Conditions for Cloud Services, and such breach would Cause irreparable harm to the IDE” to “it may be difficult to determine the damages resulting from tis breach of these IDE Special Terms and Conditions for Cloud Services, and such breach may Cause irreparable harm to the IDE”; and (iii) changing “a grant of injunctive relief provides the best remedy” to “a grant of injunctive relief may provide the best remedy.” Offeror also recommends removing the following: “without any requirement that the IDE prove actual damage or post a bond or other security. The Contractor waives any opposition to such injunctive relief or any right to such proof, bond, or other security.” 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
13	21-- T&C for Cloud Services , Data Incidents	5	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends changing the twenty-four hour notification period in subsection (1) to seventy-two hours. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.

14	22.1-- T&C for Cloud Services , Warranties, especially	6	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Intellectual Property Warranty. Offeror warrants it has the right to license the Software or Work Product or provide the Offering to IDE. IDE’s exclusive remedy for Offeror’s breach of this warranty is set forth in the Indemnification by Offeror section. <p>Virus Warranty; Conformance with Documentation Warranty. Offeror warrants that when delivered, each commercially available release of the Software will not contain a virus and will substantially conform to its Documentation. As IDE’s exclusive remedy for breach of this warranty, Offeror, at its option, will: (a) repair the Software; (b) replace the Software; or (c) terminate the applicable Order Form and refund the Fees paid for the Software during the then-current annual period or any prepaid Fees under the Order Form.</p> <p>Skilled Personnel Warranty. Offeror warrants that the Consulting Services will be performed by skilled personnel. As IDE’s exclusive remedy for breach of this warranty, Offeror will refund the Fees paid for the Consulting Services at issue.</p> <p>WARRANTY DISCLAIMERS. OFFEROR AND ITS THIRD-PARTY LICENSORS DISCLAIM ALL OTHER WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR ARISING AS A RESULT OF CUSTOM OR USAGE IN THE TRADE OR BY COURSE OF DEALING. OFFEROR MAKES NO WARRANTY THAT THE SOFTWARE OR THE SYSTEM WILL OPERATE ERROR-FREE OR WITHOUT INTERRUPTION OR THAT ANY DATA TRANSMISSIONS TO, FROM, OR THROUGH THE SYSTEM WILL BE COMPLETELY SECURE. OFFEROR DOES NOT WARRANT OR REPRESENT THAT IDE’S USE OF THE OFFERING ALONE WILL RESULT IN IDE’S COMPLIANCE WITH ANY APPLICABLE LAW.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
----	--	---	--	---

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
15	2.3— T&C for Cloud Services , IDE Data	1	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offer recommends including its standard definition of IDE Materials: any materials that IDE provides to Offeror or directs Offeror to obtain. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
16	4— T&C for Cloud Services , Service Failure or Damage	2	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offer recommends removing this provision because it is nonstandard. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
17	5— T&C for Cloud Services , Uptime Guarantee	2	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror may need to revise this provision if it impacts Offeror’s standard availability. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
18	12— T&C for Cloud Services , IDE Access	3	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends revising the first sentence to read as follows: “The IDE may access and request a copy of any IDE Data in the Contractor’s possession at any time.” Offeror may need to further negotiate this provision because it is overbroad. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
19	14-- T&C for Cloud Services , Deletion	3	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends revising the time period in subsection (3) from thirty days to sixty days. Offeror will retain data for sixty days and then delete it. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
20	18-- T&C for Cloud Services , Audits	5	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends revising the last sentence to read as follows: “The Contractor shall give the IDE a copy of the most current SOC 2 Type II audit report upon request.” 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
21	19—T&C for Cloud Services, IDE Testing	5	<p>Offeror responds below as instructed in Section 2.3 (p. 11) of the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale: Offeror looks forward to negotiating this provision, which differs from Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. 2. Recommended verbiage: Offeror recommends replacing this provision with its standard audit clause: Audit. Upon thirty (30) business days’ notice to IDE, Offeror may conduct an audit during IDE’s normal business hours to verify IDE’s compliance with the Agreement. If the audit reveals that IDE owes additional fees, IDE will pay the amounts owed. 3. Why fair and equitable: Pricing is based on Offeror’s standard terms and conditions. Any change to the terms and conditions may impact pricing. 	The Department does not accept the proposed term. Please base pricing on the Department’s terms and conditions.
22	8.5 Optional Functionality	35	Can you elaborate on what the state is seeking with these optional requirements? Does IDE want role-specific views of reports for districts and schools where each entity can only see their own data, and could potentially include de-identified data? Or does IDE want a non-role-specific, unsuppressed version of the report that wouldn’t be released publicly but is still de-identified, which would be available to all school and district users across the state?	As an optional functionality, the Department requests role-specific views of reports for state, districts, and schools where each entity can only see their own unredacted data. To clarify, the Department will not provide de-identified or student-level data to the Offeror.
22.1	8.5 Optional Functionality	35	If role-specific views of reports are requested, (1) how many unique users would the state anticipate needing access to the reports?	Initially, the Department anticipates approximately 3,000 role-specific users.
22.2	8.5 Optional Functionality	35	If role-specific views of reports are requested, (2) how many users would the state anticipate would be accessing the report concurrently?	Initially, the Department anticipates approximately 3,000 role-specific users.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
22.3	8.5 Optional Functionality	35	If role-specific views of reports are requested, (3) does the state anticipate any users doing any additional analytics in the platform beyond what is displayed on the dashboard?	The Department is not envisioning any additional analytics beyond the State Report Card. If the Offeror is proposing additional analytics, please describe it in the Proposal.
24	8.5 Optional Functionality	35	Will the state provide a SAML based authentication system SAS can use to perform authentication?	Idaho does not currently have a SAML authentication system available for the Offeror to use. However, comprehensive IAM SAML capabilities are currently in the planning phase with the anticipated deployment for the next year.
25	General	General	The General T&C, T&C for Cloud Services, and T&C for Solicitations do not address all T&C relevant to Offeror's Proposal. As a result, is IDE willing to consider additional T&C if Offeror's Proposal is accepted?	The Department will not negotiate terms and conditions after the acceptance of a Proposal. Proposals which condition the Proposal based upon the Department accepting other terms and conditions not found in the RFP, or which take exception to the Department's terms and conditions, will be found non-responsive, and no further consideration of the Proposal will be given.
26	8.4.4.B Hosting Requirements	31	Can clarification be provided regarding what audit the State is referring to? Would a SOC2 report suffice?	Yes, a SOC2 report would be sufficient.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
27	8.4.4.C Hosting Requirements	31	The standard offering for Cloud Services includes a standard SLA of 99.5% for Cloud customers. Many of our Cloud customers are more than satisfied with this service level agreement. Would the state consider our SLA acceptable?	If the Offeror is proposing an SLA of 99.5% or above but less than 99.99%, the Department will consider the Proposal with the expectation that a penalty of the associated downtime will be negotiated.
28	8.4.6.D Technical - Security	32	All data in the Offeror's Solution must be encrypted during transmission, use and at rest. Please describe what it means to encrypt data during "use".	The Offeror must ensure that the data are protected throughout the process. Encryption during the transition and rest will adequately meet this requirement.
29	8.1.3.A Testing and Deployment	23	How much time does IDE intend to allot its staff to complete UAT tasks prior to final acceptance?	2-3 weeks, depending on the number of tasks.
30	8.1.3.B Testing and Deployment	23	How much time does IDE intend to allot for LEA review (pre-deployment validation process) prior to release of the report card?	2-3 weeks, depending on the time of the year.
31	8.1.3E Testing and Deployment	22	Can the state provide the average and largest anticipated dataset sizes that will be shared with the Offeror?	3GB
32	1.4 Background Information	7	May we please have access to the independent research and results of stakeholder surveys reviewed by the Subject Matter Experts as a result of the RFI from December 2023?	Because the requested research and surveys were utilized to draft the RFP, that information constitutes trade secrets and will not be provided prior to the issuance of a notice of intent to award a contract.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
33	1.7 Project Timeline	8	The RFP states a December 2024 milestone, "Release the dashboard to production". Can you clarify the expectations related to this milestone? Does this mean all user experience design, content, and initial development of the dashboard must be completed for December 2024?	The U.S. Department of Education expects the State Report Card for the prior school year to be released by the end of December for public consumption. The Department expects at least the existing data to be transferred to the new platform and available to the public by December 2024.
34	8.1.2 Application Design and Mana	20	What evidence/info needs to be provided under 8.1.1 Report Card Requirements for 8.1.2A - Design and Programming Resources?	Each criterion marked with [M] or [ME] necessitates a response, but not necessarily an additional submittal. Where, as with 8.1.2A, there is not a specific request for evidence/information to provide, the Offeror may reply with a "Yes" or "No" as described under Section 8.4.
35	1.6 Budget	8	The RFP states that if the contract is renewed, the anticipated budget for ongoing maintenance is \$300,000 annually. What are the required activities for optional renewal years?	This will include, but is not limited to, maintenance, development, and deployment of new features/visualizations.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
36	1.3 Purpose	7	Is there any new metric development (e.g., the development of new indicators and/or news to interpret indicators for state accountability) required for this scope or is it assumed that all of the metrics already exist in a format that is consumable by the selected partner?	<p>Yes. The existing State Report Card does not fully meet the federal requirements. Please see the technical audit report provided by the U.S. Department of Education attached hereto.</p> <p>In addition, as described in Section 8.1.1A (page 19) of this RFP, the Department is interested in incorporating the Annual Student Achievement Report as part of the State Report Card to meet the needs of the Accountability Oversight Committee.</p>
37	8.1.2.B Data Management ; 8.1.2.E	21-22	Does SDE intend to utilize the planned ISEE data modernization to enable the data collection, organization, and validation needed for this platform? How do these systems and planned projects interact?	No interactions are planned at this point. The data provided to the Offeror will be sourced from various systems including the ISEE data system. The Department will provide the Offeror with the files in an agreed upon format.
38	8.1.2C - Design and Programming	20	Is there an existing set of Report Card users (school leaders, teachers, parents) that can be tapped to engage in user testing? What does the Idaho Department of Education expect in terms of user engagement in the Report Card design process?	The Department has a group of folks who are interested in the process of developing the State Report Card. The State Report Card must reflect the needs of users. Please describe in the Proposal how the Offeror plans to engage users in the design process.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
39	8.1.2C - Design and Programming	20	What specifications or parameters are known about the brand of the new Idaho Report Card?	Please see Section 8.1.1A (page 19) of this RFP. The Offeror may find the technical audit report provided by the U.S. Department of Education helpful.
40	8.1.2A - Design and Programming	20	How many people per month visit the current site?	The information is currently not available.
41	8.1.2A - Design and Programming	20	Are you open to leveraging open source technology?	Idaho is open to any managed solutions that the Offeror may specify, including open source or COTS. Regardless of the solution, the Offeror is responsible for management and security of the provided platform.
42	1.7 Project Timeline	8	What milestones are expected in January-June 2025, compared to the December 2024 release?	The Department expects at least the existing data to be transferred to the new platform by December 2024. The January and June 2025 milestones may include the development of missing data elements required by the U.S. Department of Education (see the U.S. Department of Education technical audit report) and integration of the Annual Student Achievement Report as part of the State Report Card.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
43	8.1.3.E	24	What teams from the State will be stakeholders in the design, development, and testing of the solution?	It is likely to include various individuals from the Idaho Department of Education and Office of the State Board of Education.
44	8.1.4A	25	What languages other than English does the Solution have to support?	The Department expects the Solution to be available in Spanish. The Department may provide a language plan to assist other language readers. Please see the top 10 languages of origin spoken by English Learners in Idaho for the Offeror's information.
45	8.1.5C	27	How much historical data is expected to be migrated from the legacy application, and is it readily available?	The Department expects all the data to be migrated from the legacy application to the new platform unless deemed unnecessary during the transition period. The data are readily available in the CSV file.
46	8.1.5C	27	What is the existing data file format from the legacy application?	Please see the datapoints and entities file format, attached hereto.
47	8.1.5C	27	What is the format of the source data from LEAs, if different from the legacy application data format?	ISEE Idaho System for Educational Excellence Idaho State Board of Education To clarify, the Department will aggregate and redact the data provided by the LEAs and other vendors.

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
48	8.4.1K	30	How many different types of users or user roles are expected, and approximately how many of each user would the solution need to support?	If this question is referencing the optional role-based access, three roles: SEA administrators, LEA administrators, and school administrators. Initially, the Department anticipates approximately 3,000 role-based users. In addition, the Report Card will have non-role specific public viewers. The Department is unsure how many public viewers are currently accessing the existing Report Card.
49	8.4.1K	30	What is the anticipated growth in the number of users of each type?	The Department anticipates the numbers to be stable.
50	8.4.1A	30	Notwithstanding the requirement for the Solution to be fully hosted by the Offeror, does the State have any preferences for the underlying tech stack, such as cloud services or dashboard tools?	As long as the Offeror is managing the solution, the Department does not have a preference on the underlying tech stack that the Offeror chooses to use. Any cloud services selected must meet all the requirements outlined in the RFP. The dashboard tools must be visually appealing and user-friendly, as outlined in the RFP Scope of Work.
51	8.5.2	35	Along with role-based access, would there be a potential requirement for the Solution to be multi-tenant?	If the Offeror is proposing multi-tenant solution, please describe it in the Proposal. The Department is not envisioning the multi-tenant solution at this point.
52	8.5.4	35	Given the possibility of using SSO, would the Solution be required to integrate with other existing applications or services?	No, it is not required.