	REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #66-25058TS
	University of North Carolina at Charlotte Purchasing Office Reese Building, 3rd Floor 9201 University City Boulevard Charlotte, North Carolina 28223-0001
Addendum Issue Date: Thursday, April 10, 2025	Due Date: **Thursday, April 17, 2025 by 2:00 PM ET**
Purchasing Agent: Trever Swint	Faculty Activity Reporting System
ADDENDUM #1	

This addendum is issued to answer questions received during the open question period

1. In the functional requirements (and in other places), it's described the need to pull data from certain sources. I can definitely see pulling data from Banner on a nightly basis, to keep up-to-date information. My question is, for the other sources (Anthology, Niner, Google Scholar, ORCID), would these be one-time imports only during initial implementation? Or would they also need to be on a routine?
   All of these systems will require that data be integrated into the FAR solution on a regular basis. However, the rate at which data are added will differ by system. For example, data from Anthology would need to be integrated near the end of each semester, while data from Google Scholar might be integrated on a weekly (or more frequent) basis.

2. For ATTACHMENT H - Functional Requirements, would you prefer that we provide our responses inside the original docx file, or would you prefer the responses in a separate file?
   Responses can be included in the original docx as much as possible. If additional supporting documentation is required , please identify additional documents as "ATTACHMENT H CONT'D"

3. Approximately how many end users are expected to be able to log in and make use of the service (ie, how many faculty & staff users)?
   As a rough estimate, 1,585 faculty and maybe 170 people in administrative roles who would look at reports (This is based off of Fall 2024 numbers for full and part-time faculty)

4. As the UNC system has multiple schools- Charlotte, Asheville, Chapel Hill, etc. - will the system only be used by the Charlotte campus faculty & staff, or is there a potential that the other schools would make use of it as well? And if so, is it expected that those schools would make separate agreements with the vendor, or is it desired to be rolled into the agreement with UNC Charlotte?
   This specific RFP is solely for UNC Charlotte. However, other system schools may elect to piggyback off of the awarded contract resulting from this RFP, if they require the same services, without having to issue a separate solicitation.

5. Can you provide clarification on the Terms and Conditions located in the RFP, under ATTACHMENT C page 33 under section 2, paragraph 6 title "State Property and Intangible Rights"? As we interpret it, this paragraph states that the State of North Carolina will own any software, technical information, specifications, records, documentation, etc, which was created

specifically as part of this project. Have we interpreted this section correctly? If so, can we override or add an addendum to this paragraph to essentially state that anything programmed by the vendor is the exclusive property of the vendor, and no ownership of any kind is transferred to the State of North Carolina?

This paragraph refers to any software, data, deliverables, etc. specifically created for and paid for by the University as a result of this RFP process becoming property of the University and thus the State. This does not mean that any existing Vendor software or intellectual property will become state property if used on, or customized for, this project. Vendors may also propose modifications to the North Carolina Contract Terms when submitting their proposal and the University will take proposed modifications under advisement with our Legal Affairs Department when proposals are being considered for award.

6. In the data handling guidelines here: https://oneit.charlotte.edu/iso/guideline-data-handling/, it explicitly states that essentially no sensitive data can be stored on a "public cloud storage site (ie, non-university supplied cloud storage)". Are vendors for this RFP exempted from this requirement? If not, then this would imply that no SaaS operating on a non-university server is acceptable, and all software must be installed and run locally on site. Is that correct?
To clarify the data handling guidelines language: a public cloud storage site (ie, non-university supplied cloud storage) refers to those for which the university does not have a contractual agreement on file with Term & Conditions and data protection language established. Therefore, no, vendors for this RFP are not exempt from this requirement, as the selected vendor will enter into a contractual agreement with the university that will establish terms and conditions as well as data protection language. No, the data handling guideline should not infer that all software must be installed and run locally on site. Cloud products are acceptable.

7. User Access and Roles
   a. How many total users are expected to access the system? *Reference: "User Requirements" and "Use Cases" sections*
      Faculty:1,585
      Department Chairs: 55
      Deans: 15
      Review committees: Would be made up of faculty
      Administrative Staff: 100
      External Reviewers: None at this point, since we are not requiring a module for promotion processes

   b. Can you provide estimated user counts by role (e.g., Faculty, Department Chairs, Deans, Review Committees, Administrative Staff, External Reviewers)?
      Reference: "User Requirements" and "Use Cases" sections
      Faculty:1,585
      Department Chairs: 55
      Deans: 15
      Review committees: Would be made up of faculty
      Administrative Staff: 100
      External Reviewers: None at this point, since we are not requiring a module for promotion processes

   c. Will any external users (e.g., accreditors or external evaluators) require secure access to the system?
      Reference: "UC-8 Managing the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Process" and "Security Requirements"

No, the system should generate reports useful for accreditation processes, but the accreditors should not have direct access to the system.

8. Authentication and Security
   a. What is the current authentication method used by the university (e.g., SAML, Azure AD, LDAP)?
      Reference: "Single Sign-On (SSO) Capability" under "Technical & Integration Requirements"
      The University supports SAML-based SSO provided by Shibboleth.

   b. Are there specific multi-factor authentication (MFA) requirements by role or data sensitivity?
      Reference: "Security Requirements" section
      If using the University-provided SSO, Duo MFA is integrated into the authentication at the Identity Provider for all users, regardless of role.

9. Faculty Activity Data and Migration
   a. What categories of faculty activity data are currently tracked (e.g., teaching, research, service), and how are they structured?
      Reference: "Functional Requirements and User Impacts" and "Data Requirements"
      We have teaching evaluation data in Anthology
      We have teaching records in Banner
      We have grant/contract proposal and awards in Info/Ed (Niner Research)
      Teaching, research, and service are also stored in multiple systems, including custom built, Watermark, Google Drive, and Dropbox

   b. How many years of historical faculty activity data need to be migrated into the new system?
      Reference: "Retention Requirements"
      The majority of our historical data is within the last 5 years, but we do have some data dating back to 1999 that needs to be migrated into the new system.

   c. Is the expectation to migrate all historical data (e.g., over 5 years), or a defined subset?
      Reference: "Data Requirements" and "Retention Requirements"
      See response to "b" above.

10. System Integration
    a. Should integrations with Banner, Anthology, InfoEd (Niner Research), and other systems be real-time, batch-scheduled, or both?
       Reference: "Integration Requirements" and "UC-3 Integrating with Existing Systems"
       Probably both, depending on the system

    b. Do APIs or pre-built connectors currently exist for these systems?
       Reference: "Integration Requirements"
       It depends. We have some API connections for some of our required systems. Mulesoft is our integrations tool.

    c. Are there any known schemas, file formats, or data models required for batch imports?
       Reference: "Data Inputs"
       Yes, there will be specific data formats based on the particular systems in which integrations are required.

d. Will a sandbox/test environment be provided for integration testing with systems like Banner, Anthology, and InfoEd?
Reference: "Supportability Requirements"
There is a test environment for Banner and InfoEd but not Anthology. If test environments exist, they will be provided for testing in coordination with university IT team.

11. Web Profile and User Interface
    a. How are faculty web profiles currently maintained and updated? Are they integrated with any existing systems?
    Reference: "UC-5 Updating Faculty Web Profiles"
    We don't currently require faculty to have web profiles. Many do, and those are primarily updated by the college webmaster or faculty member.

    b. Are there any user interface mockups, branding guidelines, or accessibility standards that the vendor must adhere to?
    Reference: "User Interface Requirements", "Branding", and "Accessibility" under "Additional Non-Functional Requirements"
    Please reference our university brand identity and visual standards guidelines at https://brand.charlotte.edu/. The university prefers to be ADA compliant. The university website may be used as an example of interface mockup for stylistic design.

    c. What are the most commonly used devices and browsers among your faculty and staff (e.g., desktops, tablets, mobile; Chrome, Edge, Safari)?
    Reference: "User Interface Requirements" and "Browser Compatibility"
    Laptops, desktops, mobile (iOS, Android, and Google), Chrome, Edge, Safari, Mozilla Firefox

12. Workflows and Processes
    a. Can you describe the specific steps and approval stages involved in the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) process?
    Reference: "UC-8 Managing the RPT Process"
    Candidate submits materials to the department chair - hopefully through the FAR system.
    Department chair shares those materials with multiple levels of Departmental Review Committees

    Since we are not directly seeking a module for RPT processes, this is probably all that we would use the FAR system for in the RPT process.

13. Success Metrics and Outcomes
    a. What are the top 3 success criteria for this project from your perspective (e.g., high faculty adoption, data accuracy, accreditation support, improved workflow efficiency)?
    Reference: "Purpose and Scope", "Business Requirements Overview", and "Use Cases"
    1. High faculty adoption (easy to use and engaging interface)
    2. Administrative and Accreditation reporting (usefulness, ease of creating, etc.)
    3. Data Accuracy

14. Some of the requirements may have independent variables which we cannot control (for example, importing data from certain systems may require UNC Charlotte IT staff's assistance). Also, the need to be able to store indefinite amounts of uploaded files have server costs which we cannot control. As a result, is it acceptable in our proposals to list estimated timeframes and pricing in the form of ranges? (eg, $15K - $30K per year, or 3 - 6 months, etc). Or, would you prefer vendors deliver concrete numbers that are essentially guaranteed?
We would prefer concrete numbers, but recognize that there are variables.

15. What is your Faculty FTE? We define this as full time plus ⅓ part time.
FTE - 1,256 based on Fall 2024

16. Would UNC Charlotte be interested in a module that allows faculty to take ownership of their careers and administrators to manage that process?
This is not included in the RFP requirements

17. Since Qlik is an existing platform at UNCC, has it been considered as a solution for this project to reduce purchasing new product licenses?
All solutions that meet the requirements will be considered.

18. Is there a specific budget amount for this project? Implementation costs vs annual licensing? (RFP 4.1)
Funding for this project has been identified, but we don't have a specific budget amount set.

19. How many web-based profiles will be created and is there an estimated number of concurrent users? Are the users internal and external to UNCC accounts? (Attachment H:pg 8)
We anticipate 1,585 faculty profiles. We do not have an estimated number of concurrent users. Users will all be internal.

20. Measured in GB, how much data is anticipated to be reloaded and consumed between the source systems daily, weekly, or monthly? (Attachment H:pg 6)
We don't currently have an anticipated amount of data.

21. How many users (internal to UNCC) will be consuming information defined by each of the Use Cases and role types? (Attachment H:pg 8)
Faculty:1,585
Department Chairs: 55
Deans: 15
Review committees: Would be made up of faculty
Administrative Staff: 100
External Reviewers: None at this point, since we are not requiring a module for promotion processes

22. Regarding "Attachment A - Financial Proposal", is there a template vendors should download and fill out from the "Vendor Forms" website, or are vendors supposed to generate their own financial proposals?
There is not a template. Vendors must submit their own financial proposals. Please see section 4.1 regarding the pricing the University is seeking.

A SIGNED COPY OF THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE INCLUDED WITH YOUR PROPOSAL

COMPANY NAME	DATE
PRINTED NAME	SIGNATURE