

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #2026-039
Faculty Activity Tracking Solution
RESPONSE ADDENDUM #1
November 6, 2025

QUESTIONS

1. Could the Authority please confirm whether, and if so how, suppliers may propose their own license terms given the solution would be a standardized SaaS solution that requires our standard license, use, and IP ownership rights protections?

[ANSWER: Appendix D & D1 provide instructions for noting term differences.](#)

2. RFP-IT-Solution Requirements- Core Functionality 16 - Solution provides scheduled reminders for data updates. Can more detail about the user, data, and reminders desired be provided? What is the ideal workflow for these reminders?

[ANSWER: The proposed faculty activity reporting system could include customizable functionality for sending scheduled reminders to faculty, staff, and/or administrators to prompt them to review, update, and submit their activity data. Reminders would be triggered on a rolling basis before deadlines \(e.g., 30 days before, 15 days before\) and sent only to users whose data for the reporting period has not yet been submitted. It would be helpful to also allow reminders to be sent to specific user groups based on such criteria as department/college, faculty rank or tenure status, or specific activities that are missing.](#)

3. Would the University consider a short extension to the clarification and submission deadlines to allow sufficient time to finalize a complete and compliant response?

[ANSWER: Unfortunately, given our timeline, we cannot consider an extension.](#)

4. Can you please provide the number of FTE as well as part time?

[ANSWER: Our total FTE faculty, as reported to IPEDS in spring 2025, was 612. That represents 528 instructional full-time faculty and 252 part-time faculty. Our total employee FTE count was 2,325.](#)

5. Can the University confirm whether the initial implementation is limited to the University of Maine, or whether the intent is to deploy across the full University of Maine System during the base term?

[ANSWER: Confirmed, University of Maine, Orono at this time.](#)

6. For other UMS institutions that may “piggyback,” will each campus execute its own Rider D – Services Engagement Form, or will they draw from a shared instance administered centrally?

[ANSWER: Their own Rider D as specified in the Appendix D, Master Agreement Section 1](#)

7. Is the awarded vendor expected to price and support a single shared system or multiple campus instances?

[ANSWER: The commitment is for University of Maine, Orono only with option of the other campuses to join at their option.](#)

8. Would the University prefer that pricing include predefined multi-institution tiers (e.g., per-campus discounts), or is one unified enterprise rate acceptable?

[ANSWER: The pricing should be specific to the University of Maine, Orono needs at this time. Any additional pricing should be kept separate.](#)

9. The Cost Template requests both Exhibit 1 Tables 1 and 4 for base and “Growth/Enhancement” pricing—should system-wide licensing options appear in Table 1 (primary pricing) or Table 4 (optional enhancements)?

[ANSWER: The licensing and maintenance for the solution that supports the requirements detailed in the RFP and Appendix H need to be in Appendix C, Exhibit 1 Table 1](#)

[Growth/Enhancement pricing is for anything that the Respondent would like to offer the University for consideration outside of the requirements like the web profiles noted in the instructions for Appendix C, Exhibit 1, Table 4](#)

10. How many faculty and specifically administrative users should we assume for initial licensing purposes? The RFP specifies over 2,000 full and part time faculty across the entire system, how close is this number? How many administrative users would be at each location?

[ANSWER: We have approximately 525 full-time instructional faculty. In addition, we expect there may be 75 - 100 research staff members who may need licenses.](#)

11. Are graduate assistants or part-time lecturers included in the count of “faculty” for pricing purposes?

[ANSWER: Graduate assistants and part-time faculty will not be included.](#)

12. Should all costs (implementation, training, hosting, annual license) be expressed in annualized form for the 5-year scoring, or may implementation appear as a one-time cost in Year 1?

[ANSWER: Onetime cost in year 1 under the header Initial Cost “One Time” Implementation. See instructions in Submissions Form Package, Appendix C](#)

13. Can the University confirm that the “lowest-cost = maximum points” rule applies strictly to total 5-year cost, not to first-year cost alone?

[ANSWER: 5 year costs including the one-time costs in Appendix C, Exhibit 1, Table 1 and anything provided in Exhibit 1, Table 2 & 3](#)

14. Appendix H references import/export and integration capabilities—can the University clarify whether any specific data systems (e.g., Banner, Workday, PeopleSoft, Digital Measures, etc.) must be integrated at go-live, or if basic import/export functionality meets expectations?

[ANSWER: Peoplesoft](#)

15. Are faculty web-profile integrations (auto-publishing CV data) part of the required scope or considered optional enhancements?

[ANSWER: In Submissions Form Package, Appendix C on page 6 you will see this note with the instructions:](#)

IMPORTANT: The University requires pricing for Faculty Activity Tracking functionality in Exhibit 1, Table 1. [All additional functionalities including supporting the ability to populate web profiles with faculty data stored in the solution and other modules the Respondent may have for future consideration by the University, should reflect pricing in Exhibit 1, Table 4.](#)

16. Will all vendor questions and the University’s answers be published publicly via the Strategic Procurement website, or sent directly to respondents, or both?

[ANSWER: Both](#)