

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

Washington State Student Success Framework

Request for Vendor Information

Addendum 01

Note to potential respondents:

- This Addendum (01) is intended to revise, clarify and become part of the RFI -- Washington State Student Success Framework -- released on 10/26/2011. This is a cumulative list of questions and answers.
 - All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the OSPI Web site and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) Web site.
-

Questions provided by vendors as of the close of the question and answer period, and OSPI's respective responses are provided below:

Vendor Question # 1. Your web site indicated that the due date is "Tuesday November 12, 2011" - but the 12th is Saturday. Did you mean Tuesday November 15, 2011?

Page 15, Estimated Schedule of Activities, is modified as indicated below:

Estimated Schedule of Activities (revised to)

RFI Activity	Date
Issue Request for Information	Oct. 26, 2011
Question and answer period	Oct 27 – Nov. 4, 2011
Responses due	Nov 12 14, 2011 at 5:00 pm PST
Review responses	Nov 13-20 , 15-21 2011
Conduct product demonstrations	As required

Vendor Question # 2. How big is the data in terms of GB/TB?

The amount of data can be extrapolated based on the following information:

- Representative School District – Walla Walla School District
 - Student Population: 5,997 students
 - Current Data Requirement: 1 GB
- Washington State
 - Student Population: 1,034,000 students

- o Estimated Data Requirement (all school districts): 174 GB

* Note that this calculation assumes a central data store. Alternative models for data storage are welcomed. It is understood that the associated data storage requirement will vary, accordingly

Vendor Question # 3. The RFP instructs vendors to provide a detailed response to question 67a on page 19 of the RFI. However, there is no question 67a. Can OSPI please clarify?

The guidance provided on page 19 is modified as indicated below:

“Questions 31 through 73 require a yes or no response, except for questions 43, 45, 46, 67a, 71, 72, and 73 which require an additional detailed response.”

Vendor Question # 4. Can OSPI please confirm the due date and time for the response? The current due date is Saturday, November 12. Would OSPI consider amending this date to the close of the following business day, Monday, November 14th?

See response to question 1, above.

Vendor Question # 5. Can OSPI please indicate the anticipated timeframe for the release of an RFP related to the Washington State Student Success Framework?

The date of release of an RFP cannot be predicted accurately at this time. The RFI was published in support of a Feasibility Study which will recommend a best alternative approach for satisfying the requirement for a Washington State Student Success Framework. The project's sponsors will make a decision about if, when and how to best move forward with the project and RFP once the study has been completed.

Vendor Question # 6. Can OSPI please indicate whether responses will be subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act? If so, can sections of vendor responses be declared proprietary/confidential?

Responses to the RFI are subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act. Vendors may choose to declare any portion of their responses as proprietary/confidential and it will be treated accordingly.

Vendor Question # 7. Does the state have any preferred models of training? I.e., on-site, on-line or a combination?

Vendors are encouraged to recommend the approach that they feel is most effective and efficient, given their solution delivery model and experience in the industry.

Vendor Question # 8. Are the unique staff IDs and student IDs integrated into the data? Are they being consumed by source systems?

Yes, to both questions.

Vendor Question # 9. Single sign-on/authentication is referenced, can you please describe what security, authentication and identity management tools are being used?

The OSPI security system for many of its applications is a role-based authentication and access control system. It was developed in-house and provides to Washington State's school districts decentralized management to the access control system in Education Data System (EDS) Portal.

In the future, OSPI plans to work with other Washington state education system partners to determine if a federated single sign-on solution based on the Security Assertion Markup

Language (SAML) standards is viable. The vision is that educators, administrators, staff, parents and students would have the ability to use one set of authorizing credentials to access multiple on-line education systems. Federation implies that outside of the formal agreement, each partner independently controls its internal systems.

Since the different domains in education are controlled by different entities – in this case OSPI and its various stakeholders' systems, formal agreements on authentication methods and protocols will be explored.

Additionally, because networks linking the domains, typically the Internet, are not assumed to be secure, measures will be used to validate and protect credentials and the authentication process.

Vendor Question # 10. Does the state have a preference for a particular reporting tool or technology?

Vendors should identify the reporting tools and technologies appropriate to their specific solutions and experience within the industry.

Vendor Question # 11. Does the state currently license any reporting and analytics tools?

OSPI currently relies on Sql Server Reporting Services.

Vendor Question # 12. What are the current assessment systems in use today by teachers for classroom / other assessments?

Some of the systems currently used by school districts and schools in the state include:

- Tyler Technologies
- Skyward
- Zangle
- Sungard
- Pearson School Systems

Vendor Question # 13. Does the state envision teachers manually loading assessment data to the system, or would assessment data be made available to the system through some integration with assessment system(s)?

Refer to Story T5 in the Appendix B – WS3F High-level Capability Map.

Where possible, duplicate data entry should be avoided. If data is input into an existing system, interface with that system to pull the data into the WS3F data management system should be considered.

Vendor Question # 14. How does the SLDS interface with other existing systems today when necessary to supplement SLDS data with additional data not being collected in the SLDS?

The SLDS has been created to map, extract, transform and load (ETL) data from a number of systems. If data is required from additional source systems, or if additional data is required from an existing SLDS source system, the standard tool sets and processes use to establish the system will be utilized.

Vendor Question # 15. What is the mechanism by which the SLDS supplement its own data for reporting, query and analysis, and data integration products?

The system utilizes an ETL process, mapping data mapped from source systems, converting it, and pushing it into a data warehouse with standard and customized reporting capabilities.

Vendor Question # 16. What capabilities does the SLDS have to expand scope of data integration to incorporate additional data sets as the State's reporting / analysis requirements evolve and additional source systems are needed to feed the SLDS?

The limits of the SLDS are not set. The expansion of SLDS to include data sets, beyond those currently included in the system, is not considered problematic. SLDS toolsets are considered adequate to support the needs of the WS3F project, with the potential addition of middleware as described in the model presented on page 9 of the RFI.

Vendor Question # 17. Is the SLDS based on a proprietary architecture for reporting or data integration?

Yes.

Vendor Question # 18. Will data from WS3F be directly integrated into the SLDS? How does the State envision this integration, via a database connection, web services, sif, or other?

Please refer to the model provided on page 9 of the RFI for one possible approach to integration. OSPI welcomes alternative proposals from vendors.

Vendor Question # 19. Who will be responsible for data integration between the WS3F and the SLDS?

Integration will likely be completed as a joint effort between the WS3F vendor, the SLDS team and OSPI's WS3F project team. Vendors may suggest an alternative approach.

Vendor Question # 20. Does the SLDS provide a standard interface for sources to feed data to it for integration? What is that interface - Web services, something else? In what format must the data be provided – XML, .csv, other?

No. Each source system interface is a custom ETL package which is pulled into the solution's data warehouse.