**MC** MONTGOMERY
COLLEGE

**ADDENDUM #1**
Issued: March 7, 2025

**ADDENDUM FOR THE PURPOSE OF:**

1.  To provide attached questions & answers.

2.  To change RFP closing date from March 12, 2025 at 3:00 PM (EDT), to **March 20, 2025** at 3:00 PM (EDT).

3.  To replace Section 2.3 statement, "Provide online proctors primarily located in the United States" to the following statement:

    - **Online proctors primarily located in the United States are preferred, but not required.**

4.  To replace section 3.2 statement, "Must provide online proctoring staff where at least 75% of staff are located in the United States" to the following statement:

    - **Online proctoring staff where, at least 75% of staff is located in the United States is preferred, but not required**.

All other specifications, terms and conditions remain unchanged.

_____
**Patrick Johnson, MBA**
**Director of Procurement**

Please **sign** below to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum and return with the proposal. Failure to return this Acknowledgement of Addendum may deem a proposal nonresponsive.

 **NOTE:**  All proposals MUST BE RECEIVED **electronically** by 3:00pm Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) on **March 20, 2025**.

Electronic proposal and addendum or addenda shall be sent to the following email address prior to the submittal deadline date and time at vendor.proposals@montgomerycollege.edu. **No responses will be accepted after this date and time.**

_____       _____
Company Name                                Authorized Signature

_____       _____
Date                                        Printed/Typed Signature

**MONTGOMERY COLLEGE ▪ OFFICE OF BUSINESS SERVICES**
**REQUEST FOR BID TITLE: ON-LINE EXAM PROCTORING SERVICES**
**RFP NUMBER: E525-014**
**RFP CLOSING DATE AND TIME: MARCH 20, 2025 @ 3:00 PM (EDT)**

| Vendor Questions | MC Response |
|---|---|
| 1. On page 42 of the RFP there are three sections to be filled out; which section for the Mid Atlantic Purchasing Team Rider Clause would we need to fill out? | The vendor does not need to complete any of the sections on the MWCOG Rider Clause Approval form on pages 42-43 of the bid document. |
| 2. What are your top priorities for accessibility and accommodation? | Please review section 4.3 (Technology Accessibility) of the bid document. |
| 3. What ratio of proctors to test-takers is required? | In recent years, the trend has been 7 or 10 students per proctor for Live proctoring coupled with Artificial Intelligence resources. We will need to learn about the efficiency and accessibility of resources used by proctors. |
| 4. Regarding 2.3 Scope of Services – On-line Exam Proctoring Solutions – Must provide online proctors, where at least 75% of proctors are located in the United States.<br>a. Is this requirement based on state legislation or an organizational preference?<br>b. If the latter, kindly explain if this requirement is based on language concerns. Or provide details explaining this rationale of this preference. | See Addendum #1 |
| 5. Please describe your top 3 decision criteria for selecting a proctoring solution. | Please review the evaluation criteria listed in Section 5, pages 19-20 of this bid document. |
| 6. Will this be a single-vendor award or a multi-vendor award? | This will be a single-vendor award. |
| 7. Is the institution seeking to offer various proctoring modalities so that the test security can match the needs of each test? Or is just a single-style proctoring solution across the institution preferred? | Vendors should have multiple or at least two modalities available in their platform. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8. What are 2-3 trends or key issues in testing/test administration your institution is facing? | - Cost<br>- Use of AI as a tool for proctoring and creating a secured testing environment |
| 9. Please describe your ideal proctoring management model. Will faculty be responsible for enabling proctoring on individual exams, or is the desire to have a single exam administrator or team of administrators for enablement? | The expectation is that the online proctoring platform provides a user-friendly environment for faculty and students to interact with minimal technical and administrative assistance.<br><br>Faculty will be responsible for enabling proctoring on individual exams. |
| 10. Is the institution seeking a proctoring solution that will secure the testing environment pre-assessment? | The expectation is that the test environment be secured throughout the test session. I'm not clear why students would need this service prior to the beginning of an exam session. |
| 11. I would like to know if there is a past incumbent for this solicitation and, if so, whether you can provide the contract amount associated with the previous award. | Montgomery College previously utilized Maryland Education Enterprise Consortium (MEEC) contract UB-20-J-24. More information about this contract can be found at https://www.meec-edu.org/on-line-exam-proctoring-services/ |
| 12. How are proctoring accommodations for students with disabilities expected to be handled? | This question must be answered by the vendor. Does the vendor's platform meet our accessibility requirements? What assistive technology and accommodations does the platform provide to testers? Are there comparability issues with any AT technologies?<br><br>Please also review section 4.3 (Technology Accessibility) of the bid document. |
| 13. Will the awarded vendor be required to provide training to faculty and staff? | Please review bid document in its entirety. Please review section 2.3 (Scope of Services). |
| 14. What reporting and documentation are required for monthly invoicing? | Please review bid document in its entirety. Please review sections 1.24 (Billing) & 2.3 (Scope of Services) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 15. What is the expected timeline for contract award and implementation? | The anticipated timeline for contract award is prior to the end of May. Proposal awards valued at $250,000+ require approval from the Board of Trustees. Purchase orders will be issued pending board approval of award(s). The expected implementation calendar will be based on the implementation timeline as well as the project understanding and approach that the awarded vendor submitted as part of their technical proposal. Please review section 2.4 (Project Understanding and Approach), section 6 (Proposal Submission) and attachment H (Technical Proposal Submission Topic Areas). |
| 16. Is there a maximum or minimum number of students allowed per test session? | This seems to be a question for classroom testing. This RFP is for a service that will handle large numbers of students completing academic exams for a variety of courses in an online environment (not a classroom). The number of students will be determined by the platform's technical capabilities. |
| 17. Are there specific limits on the number of students a single proctor can monitor at once? | Ideally, a small ratio of number of students per proctor is preferred. Currently, ProctorU has a ratio of 10 students per proctor with AI tools support. |
| 18. Is there a requirement for proctor-to-student ratios for live proctoring sessions? | Please see the answer to question 3. |
| 19. What specific integrations are required with Blackboard Ultra? Are there existing APIs or protocols that need to be used? | Blackboard uses LTI (Learning Tools Interoperability) to integrate 3rd party tools into Blackboard. Learning Tools Interoperability is a standard developed by IMS Global that allows you to integrate third-party resources into Blackboard Learn in a secure and seamless way. <br><br> A link to Blackboard's public help website - https://help.blackboard.com/Learn/Administrator/SaaS/Integrations/Learning_Tools_Interoperability |

| | |
|---|---|
| 20. Could you provide more details on the types of exams supported (e.g., multiple-choice, essays)? | Exams are designed by faculty. Each faculty decides what type of exam works for their class. Multiple-choice, essays are possible options. Vendors should provide a list of exams types they cannot support. |
| 21. What specific identity verification processes are acceptable? Are there preferred methods of verification? | We will follow standard procedures for ID verification. A more relevant detail that vendors will need to address is how they plan to store and secure captured ID photos and other sensitive information from students. |
| 22. How will suspicious behavior be flagged, and what constitutes suspicious behavior? | Suspicious behavior would include behavior that may suggest cheating, dishonesty, or a violation of exam rules.  Examples listed in section 2.3 of the bid document are eye movement, background noise and use of additional devices. Other examples may be talking to someone off camera, looking away from the camera, being out of frame, mouse movement, etc.<br><br>Montgomery College is seeking information from the vendor in their technical proposal regarding how their service defines, detects and flags suspicious behavior. |
| 23. Can you elaborate on the required user experience for both instructors and test-takers? | Montgomery College is interested in an easy-to-navigate platform for students, faculty and staff. Other expectations regarding user experience are listed in section 2.3 under the heading "User Experience" of the bid document.<br><br>Montgomery College is seeking information from the vendor in their technical proposal regarding the test-taker and instructor experience for each proctoring type. |
| 24. What specific features should be prioritized? | Please read the bid in its entirety.  Please include the features mentioned in sections 2.3 (Scope of Services) & 3.3 (Mandatory Requirements) when submitting a bid response. |
| 25. What are the expectations for technical support availability? Is 24/7 support mandatory? | Please read the bid document in its entirety. Please review section 2.3 (Scope of Services) & 3.3 (Mandatory Requirements). |

| | |
|---|---|
| 26. What training resources will be provided to faculty and students? | Montgomery College is seeking information from the vendor in their technical proposal regarding training to include training materials and onboard support that they provide for faculty, students and staff. |
| 27. What specific accessibility standards must the solution meet? Are there particular regulations (e.g., Section 508, WCAG) that should be referenced? | Please read the bid document in its entirety. Please review Section 4 (IT Data Security, Compliance and Accessibility Requirements). |
| 28. Is there a preferred format or template for the Technical Proposal? | Please read the bid document in its entirety. Please review Section 6 (Proposal Submission) and Attachment H (Technical Proposal Submission Topic Areas). |
| 29. Are there specific section headings that must be included? | Please read the bid document in its entirety. Please review Section 6 (Proposal Submission) and Attachment H (Technical Proposal Submission Topic Areas). |
| 30. Are there any specific terms or conditions that proposers should be aware of regarding contract renewal or termination? | Please read the bid document in its entirety. Please review Section 1 (Proposal and Contract Information) and Attachment F (General Conditions and Instructions). |
| 31. How flexible is the pricing structure? Will there be opportunities for negotiation based on the proposed services? | Please read the bid document in its entirety. Please review Section 1.20 (Contract Pricing). |
| 32. Who was the past incumbent and the total amount of the contract? | Please see the answer to the question 11. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 33. Can you send me how many exams and students that you would like us to propose pricing in our response for the RFP at Montgomery College? | The services will be on an as-needed basis and we are seeking pricing per student/per exam. The approximate number of proctoring services that were used in 2024 is listed in section 2.1 (Background) of the bid document. |

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* End of Questions & Answers \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***