

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #2022-025**  
**Degree Planning Solution**  
**RESPONSE ADDENDUM #1**  
**November 5, 2021**

**CLARIFICATION**

**QUESTIONS**

- 1. Please confirm the total number of students that will need access to the Degree Planning Solution.**

**ANSWER:**

Campus	Student #
University of Maine	12000
University of Maine at Machias	500
University of Maine at Augusta	3300
University of Maine at Farmington	1700
University of Maine at Fort Kent	850
University of Maine at Presque Isle	1100
University of Southern Maine	6600
University of Maine Law	250

- 2. Please confirm how many degree advisors would need access to the Degree Planning Solution.**

**ANSWER:**

Campus	
University of Maine	350
University of Maine at Machias	
University of Maine at Augusta	150
University of Maine at Farmington	115
University of Maine at Fort Kent	
University of Maine at Presque Isle	39
University of Southern Maine	297
University of Maine Law	

3. Excluding degree advisors, how many staff and faculty would need access to the Degree Planning Solution?

**ANSWER:**

Campus	
University of Maine	1500
University of Maine at Machias	
University of Maine at Augusta	20
University of Maine at Farmington	7
University of Maine at Fort Kent	
University of Maine at Presque Isle	20
University of Southern Maine	175
University of Maine Law	

4. Please confirm if the reference to 'Mobile Friendly' (Appendix H, question 2) is in reference to a particular software product / vendor? If so, please provide vendor name / product name / website. If not, please confirm if 'Mobile Friendly' is in reference to applications that are built to be used on mobile devices - mobile friendly?

**ANSWER: Mobile friendly is in reference to applications built to be used on mobile devices**

5. Requirement: 3. Describe how the solution provides the means to allow appropriate staff to adjust "typically offered" data for a course. Question: "Typically Offered" is a data point usually pulled from a course catalog listing. Is it the intent of this request to have the provided planning platform write-back to PeopleSoft with this information?

**ANSWER:**

6. Requirement: Provide a mechanism to add customized course info into the sequence or completion plan. Question: Are customized courses referring to courses with multiple special topics options?

**ANSWER: Customized courses could include internships or study abroad as well as special topics.**

7. What kind of personalization do you have in mind for the student view?

**ANSWER: See item #1 within requirements**

8. Is it the intention of the MaineSystem for this solution to write back to PS for course exceptions?

**ANSWER: Not at this time – we would be interested in hearing the possibility for this**

9. Requirement: Provide ability to manually update the degree requirements Question: Is this in relation to individual student degree requirements or institutional degree requirement changes/updates?

**ANSWER: Both**

10. Requirement: Provide ability to correct errors discovered in degree planning tool, with mechanism to inform student records office to make necessary corrections to MaineStreet. Is this in relation to individual student degree requirements or institutional degree requirement changes/updates?  
[ANSWER: Institutional degree requirements](#)
11. Can UMS please explain in what capacity Highpoint Schedule Planner is currently used on campus? Is UMS looking to retire this solution? Do all UMS campuses use this solution?  
[ANSWER: Schedule planner is currently not used – Schedule builder may be added in the near future](#)
12. What is UMS's degree audit?  
[ANSWER: PeopleSoft Campus Solutions \(MaineStreet\)](#)
13. Can UMS confirm if you are looking to replace your degree audit solution with the requested Degree Planner Solution?  
[ANSWER: Not at this time](#)
14. Can UMS confirm Question 15 is fully completed (or is there something missing)?: "Provide a mechanism to send a communication to Registrar when changes require"  
[ANSWER: This is referring to errors that might be detected within the degree planner that should be communicated to the Registrar's office for correction. Is your software able to do this?](#)
15. Are you expecting this Degree Planner to integrate with your student success/advising tool? If yes, would that be a requirement?  
[ANSWER: If possible – some campuses utilize EAB Navigate](#)
16. Is there an incumbent providing similar services to your institution? If yes, then please name the incumbent. If yes, then can you describe why you are proceeding with an RFP to procure services? Are there different / new services you'd like a new vendor to provide?  
[ANSWER: No incumbent \(we utilize PeopleSoft but the degree planning piece is not built out\)](#)
17. Which systems need to integrate with the Degree Planning Solution?  
[ANSWER: PeopleSoft Campus Solutions \(MaineStreet\) SIS and possibly EAB Navigate \(as mentioned above\).](#)
18. What data / system integration tools (ETL) are in use by the University of Maine System currently?  
[ANSWER: We would be using a combination of Informatica IICS and custom scripts to transport data to their platform. We can accommodate either SFTP or API interfaces, and are open to others with additional time requirements.](#)

19. Does your degree audit have standard APIs?

ANSWER: No

20. Is there a single instance of Peoplesoft shared across all institutions or is there a separate PS instance and catalog for each?

ANSWER: There are 7 separate institutions for the University Maine Systems, not a single institution, each with its own catalog.

21. Related to the PeopleSoft question above, is there a shared or consistent catalog used by all institutions?

ANSWER: Not at the current time although work on a more unified catalog is underway

22. Did UMS evaluate solutions that could meet its requirements through vendor presentations leading up to the RFP release? If so, what types and names of solutions and vendors were evaluated.

ANSWER: No

23. Can UMS share who will be on the evaluation committee for this RFP?

ANSWER:

All communication during the RFP process is restricted to what is provided to instructions in RFP Section 1.2.2. The evaluation team may not be disclosed at this stage of the process to ensure that vendors do not engage.

24. Who has the authority to sign the proposal and how do they make decisions?

ANSWER:

The instructions for the evaluation are provided in RFP Section 2.0. Decisions for award are made based on the recommendation provided by the evaluation team to the sponsor and senior management as required.

25. Due to COVID-19 and local mandates, our firm has continued to limit access to our local office and employees responsible for this RFP response work remotely for the time being. With this in mind are you willing to accept an electronic signature in lieu of a wet ink signature on all forms?

ANSWER: YES

26. Currently the due date of this RFP is a Sunday. Can UMS please extend the deadline to the following Monday at earliest (11/22/21)?

ANSWER: The deadline was extended to Sunday November 21, 2021 on or before 11:59 pm EST to give Respondents maximum amount of time to provide the submission.

27. For Section 3.2.2.2, "insert Appendix C", do you desire vendors to include screenshot copies of their Excel table (and any necessary explanation)? Or was there another desired response to that section?

ANSWER: Please provide the information in Appendix C using the excel version. This document is available on the website provide in RFP Section 1.2.2.

28. For Section 3.2.3.2, “insert Appendix D” do you desire vendors to include screenshot redlines if any (and any necessary explanation)? Or was there another desired response to that section?

[ANSWER: If you plan to provide redlines please do so after this section of your response](#)

29. Can vendors extract the contents of the following in a Word/PDF file (ensuring the integrity of the appendix) so that it can more readily respond in line the question prompts:

– Appendix G, Appendix H, Appendix H1, Appendix I, Appendix J, Appendix K

[ANSWER: Yes, please refer to the website, location provided in RFP Section 1.2.2.](#)

30. For Appendix H2, do you desire vendors to include identical copies of their Excel table (and any additional necessary explanation)? Or was there another desired response to that section?

[ANSWER: Please provide the information in Appendix H2 using the excel version. This document is available on the website provide in RFP Section 1.2.2.](#)

31. Has UMS identified a budget for this initiative, and if so, is it possible to share? Is there a price above which proposals would not be accepted?

[ANSWER: We cannot provide any budgeted amount.](#)