



City of Lawrence
Office of the Purchasing Agent
City Hall Room 301
200 Common Street
Lawrence Massachusetts 01840

DANIEL RIVERA
MAYOR

RITA V. BROUSSEAU
CHIEF PROCUREMENT
OFFICER

TEL: (978) 620-3240
FAX: (978) 722-9120
www.cityoflawrence.com

BID ADDENDUM #1

To: All Bidders
From: Rita V. Brousseau, Chief Procurement Officer
Date: September 19, 2017
Re: Integrated Student Data Warehousing & Dashboard Creation System RFP

This Addendum modifies and forms a part of the Bid Set documents dated September 11, 2017.

This Addendum consists of the following: five (5) typed pages.

Where any items called for in the bid documents are supplemented here, the supplemental requirements shall be considered as added thereto. Where any original item is amended, voided, or superseded here, the other provisions of such items not specifically amended, voided, or superseded shall remain in effect.

I. The following items are the City's responses to Bidder questions:

1. **Question:** We understand that Lawrence currently uses Schoolzilla for many of these functions. Is that correct?
Answer: Yes
2. **Question:** Is the district happy with the current Schoolzilla solution?
Answer: Yes
3. **Question:** Is LPS looking for this solution to replace Schoolzilla, or will this be in addition to Schoolzilla?
Answer: Replace
4. **Question:** What aspects of Schoolzilla does LPS love and hope the new solution will continue?
Answer: NA
5. **Question:** What concerns, issues, or shortcomings has LPS had with Schoolzilla?
Answer: NA

6. **Question:** We note that one feature desired by LPS is the system including "dashboard creation software." Will LPS consider solutions that do not include such software? Our solution includes powerful, customizable tools for educators to view information, and otherwise seems to meet LPS's vision; however, our solution does not include "dashboard creation software." We are hoping to understand whether it is worth bidding, or whether this particular feature is so essential that a solution without this feature will not be considered.
Answer: We will consider Power BI, Tableau, Si Sense, or Built-in

7. **Question:** Is this system intended to provide student-level information (for example, a teacher can see a complete picture of how a student is doing), or is the system intended primarily to provide school and district-level aggregate information?
Answer: District/School-level aggregate information.

8. **Question:** Who are intended to be the most frequent users of this tool? Are there specific functions, processes and meetings for these users that are especially important for the success of this tool?
Answer: District-level administrative staff

9. **Question:** What is the anticipated budget for the Integrated Student Data Warehousing and Dashboard Creation System?
Answer: NA

10. **Question:** What is the targeted start date for this contract? When are the dashboards targeted to be available to end users?
Answer: Early to mid-October, 2017

11. **Question:** What percentage of the 1500 end users will be expected to develop and distribute their own dashboards within the first year? Second year? Third year?
Answer: 1st yr <20, 2nd yr 0, 3rd yr 0

12. **Question:** What is meant by the solution's "Compatibility with major applications such as Microsoft Office and other ODBC compatible applications"? Is this in terms of sourcing or feeding data, or both?
Answer: Both

13. **Question:** One of the specifications is "an option to request start-to-finish dashboard creations from the vendor for specified custom visualizations". How often is this expected? (e.g., X number of new dashboards per month) Also, will dashboard requirements documents be provided or will the vendor need to gather them from stakeholders as requests arise?
Answer: Initially <10 during implementation, afterwards, 1 or 2 a month. Information for the dashboard creation will need to be gathered from stakeholders as requests arise.

14. **Question:** When the term "real time data" is used, is there an expected latency (lag) in the source data updates? How often should the dashboard data be updated? Or is a live connection to the database expected? Please clarify the district's expectations.
Answer: Nightly Refreshes

15. **Question:** Does the City or School District have a preference for either cloud or on premise deployments of the data warehouse and dashboard solution? What factors are weighing in that decision?
Answer: Cost, features, and implementation.

16. **Question:** What is meant by the criteria of providing "written evidence that the system has been successfully implemented and maintained in at least ten (10) school districts"?
Answer: Proof that your solution has been successfully implemented in at least 10 schools. List the names and contact information for each.

17. **Question:** Will the school district's Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) be available for discussions and requirements gathering during the development phase of this project? How about during the support and expansion phases?
Answer: Yes.

18. **Question:** Does the district use DIBELS?
Answer: No

19. **Question:** Does the district use Fountas and Pinnell?
Answer: No

20. **Question:** What Assessment System is the District currently using outside of iReady and NWEA for formative/benchmark assessments?
Answer: None

21. **Question:** How many years of existing historical assessment data does the district intend on having loaded into the platform during implementation?
Answer: 2012- Present for MCAS

22. **Question:** Will you equally consider bids for a custom developed web based software solution that meets all requirements instead of an off the shelf software package?
Answer: Yes

23. **Question:** When would the new system need to be live?
Answer: Early to mid-October

24. **Question:** Have you evaluated existing off the shelf software solutions for all or part of this and do you have any strong preferences?
Answer: No

25. **Question:** Will this system be replacing in whole or in part any existing systems?
Answer: Whole

26. **Question:** Will any existing redundant systems continue to be used in any capacity?
Answer: No

27. **Question:** What other systems, in addition to PowerSchool but not mentioned in the RFP will the new platform need to integrate with?
Answer: No

28. **Question:** What is the budget for the implementation, support, hosting and translation if separate?
Answer: NA

29. **Question:** Have any detailed requirements gathering or design been conducted internally outside of those listed on the RFP?
Answer: No

30. **Question:** Are there existing or known report criteria we could pre-format?
Answer: Enrollment Summary, Attendance Summary

31. **Question:** Can you describe the level and types of custom or ad hoc reporting the system would be required to support?
Answer: NA

32. **Question:** Will there be stakeholder involvement from IT, Marketing, Business/ PMO groups throughout this process, but specifically in the design and planning phases?
Answer: Yes

33. **Question:** Will there be opportunity to validate with additional stakeholders such as end users?
Answer: No

34. **Question:** Can you share the key systems in the technology stack the system would be living on and integrating with?
Answer: Yes

35. **Question:** In addition to a Windows Based Environment, please share the technology preferences/ constraints we must or should adhere to including IT staff language expertise. Would this staff need to be trained on maintaining the system, or do you expect to fully outsource this to the vendor?
Answer: Staff would need to be trained on maintaining the system depending on how custom it is.

36. **Question:** Will any existing technical resources from the City of Lawrence be available for development, or just as a review/ approval capacity? School Department IT staff will be available to assist. 508 Compliance- what level of compliance is acceptable for this solution?
Answer: Java, Macintosh and Windows Accessibility

37. **Question:** Please share existing security and privacy policies. Would any of these be updated as part of this process?
Answer: CIPA

38. **Question:** Is the City of Lawrence's digital brand fully defined with style guides and assets we can leverage for this effort?
Answer: Yes for School Department

39. **Question:** Can you describe the current design and size of the BOD meeting books and materials, as well as the expected volume of creation, distribution and collaboration will be required by how many users?
Answer: None

40. **Question:** Can you please describe the end user of the system, such as numbers and information access levels?
Answer: None, currently it's a district-level program for data staff only.

41. **Question:** How does the City of Lawrence currently authenticate users and would be expected to leverage this method?
Answer: Windows LDAP

42. **Question:** Will external hosting be required or allowed?
Answer: Open to both internal and external hosting solutions.

43. **Question:** What version of PowerSchool is your district currently using?
Answer: Version 11.0.1.01275125

44. **Question:** Given your current integration with SIF was the Ed-Fi framework consider as a choice for part of the integration? Or was the decision driven by the state reporting requirements?
Answer: State reporting requirements.

45. **Question:** Are there any current data warehouse components, architecture or data in place that the district would need migration to the new system? Or all the historical data will be acquire from

current raw sources such as, all data in PowerSchool and all prior year assessment data from raw files?

Answer: Historical data would be Oracle DMP files from Powerschool.

46. **Question:** What are the preference for hardware/appliance hosting: physically or cloud?

Answer: No preference

47. **Question:** Is the Lawrence Public Schools amenable to an open source solution, such as the Michael & Susan Dell Foundation's Ed-Fi multi-year temporal Operational Data Store?

Answer: Open

48. **Question:** If so, is the school district aware that imminent grant funding is available to help implement this solution?

Answer: (We have provided the following link for context: <https://www.msdf.org/cta/implement>)
No

49. **Question:** Is the school district open to connectors other than SIF (i.e. Ed-Fi's API structure)?

Answer: Yes

50. **Question:** Which assessment vendors are expected to be connected to the data warehouse (NWEA, Curriculum Associates, etc.)?

Answer: MCAS

51. **Question:** Can you provide a comprehensive list of assessment types that are to be imported into the data warehouse (i.e. ACT, SAT, state summative tests for math, science, language arts, etc.)?

Answer: All MCAS tests and potentially others in the future.

52. **Question:** Can you provide a comprehensive list of vendor systems that are expected to feed data into the data warehouse (such as Food Services, textbook management system vendors, etc.)?

Answer: HealthOffice

53. **Question:** Is the system expected to feed other systems (such as transportation, food services, etc.)?

Answer: HealthOffice, LunchBox and potentially others in the future.

NOTE TO ALL BIDDERS: YOU MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF ALL ADDENDA ON YOUR BID SUBMISSION FORM WHERE INDICATED.