

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CFCC-2018-09-CD-RFP-E-LEARNING MODULES

May 22, 2018

1. What is the specific impact if a bidder does not meet specified interim or final deliverable completion deadlines?

ANSWER: See pertinent provisions particularly Sections 3, 7.2. & 7.5 of Attachment 2, Standard Agreement for the impact in case you failed to meet specified interim or final deliverable completion deadlines

2. In reference to Section 8.2, item iii: Because our firm provides e-learning development services at an hourly rate, we cannot estimate a “not to exceed” total for all work and expenses payable under the contract. Instead, it is our preference to negotiate additional fees in the event we exceed 5% of the estimated hours. Is this an acceptable alternative to providing a not to exceed cost, or will our proposal be disqualified from consideration for taking this stance?

ANSWER: The proposal would be disqualified.

3. Why did the Judicial Council cancel the original solicitation issued in March?

ANSWER: The original solicitation was cancelled due to changes in deliverables and funding.

4. Does the Government have a Learning Management System for hosting purposes or how does the Government anticipate the final courseware will be hosted?

ANSWER: Contractor is not expected to provide a learning management system in addition to the elearning courses. If a learning management system will be required to host the content delivered to the Judicial Council, the contractor should specify in the proposal what software, licenses or LMS will be required for hosting content.

5. Are there any Section 508 requirements for the proposed courseware developments?

ANSWER: Yes, the project must comply with Section 508 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0, Level AA.

6. Regarding Section 2.7.1.2, Does the Government anticipate the Technology Review to take place on-site?

ANSWER: Yes

7. Regarding Section 2.7.1.3, what are the Government's expectations regarding the extent of storyboard developments at the end of this abbreviated Analysis Phase?

ANSWER: It is the responder's responsibility to describe the extent of the deliverables proposed

9. What is the anticipated duration of the Government's prototype review cycles?

ANSWER: This is not determined. If proposer wishes they can recommend a duration of review required for the proposer to meet timelines.

10. What is the anticipated duration of the Government's user testing review cycle?

ANSWER: This is not determined. If proposer wishes they can recommend a duration of testing required for the proposer to meet timelines.

11. Are the Government's stated proposed timelines for the five course's development cycles firm?

ANSWER: Yes

12. Regarding the training requirement for the Judicial Council development technical staff, where does the Government anticipate these training sessions to occur?

ANSWER: At the Judicial Council San Francisco office.

13. Does the Judicial Council development technical staff have previous experience development e-Learning courseware using Adobe Captivate?

ANSWER: Yes

14. Regarding Section 7.0 items e and f, Contractor's representative course list of courses; how many links does the Government require the Contractor to provide for review purposes? Do all the sample courses provided for review need to have a legal focus and/or judicial target population?

ANSWER: Please provide as many links as you wish. The sample courses provided do not all need to show a legal focus and/or judicial target population.

15. Does the Judicial Council seek 5 - 90 min module or 1-90 min module. What is the estimate required?

ANSWER: Sorry, we do not understand this question. Please review the RFP.

16. Is there a portion of payment that will be made before work starts?

ANSWER: No

17. Do hard copies have to be provided or email documents sufficient?

ANSWER: Please review section 6.5

18. Does each module have to be in Spanish AND English (So two of each)

ANSWER: Please review section 2.7.2.2

19. Is level 2- level 3 interactivity assumed?

ANSWER: Responder may specify this in the proposal.

20. We are a business based in Colorado with good standing. Are we allowed to apply with certification that we are in good standing?

ANSWER: Responders do not need to be based in California.

21. At what level of interactivity will the 5 elearning courses be?

Level 1: Page turners with linear progression and minimal interactivity

Level 2: Moderately interactive (50%-60% interactive screens)

Level 3: Highly interactive (75%-80% interactive screens)

ANSWER: Responder may specify this in the proposal.

22. We will provide the final deliverables in the form of a SCORM package and handover the source files of the course too. Judicial Council can use the source files to create fresh courses. Would that be sufficient?

ANSWER: Yes

23. With respect to analytics, what information does Judicial Council want to track?

- Number of users taking the course?
- Course completion?

Please suggest.

ANSWER: Responder may specify the analytics they will provide in the proposal

24. Which of the 5 courses will be localized? Is localization within the scope of this RFP?

ANSWER: This is not within the scope of the RFP.

25. Other than Spanish what other languages do the courses need to be localized into?

ANSWER: This is not within the scope of the RFP.

26. Considering that the content is technical, will the vendor be provided with ongoing SME support?

ANSWER: Yes

27. Are these courses a part of a curriculum or independent units for different audiences?

ANSWER: Independent units

28. Do any of these courses have any pre-requisites?

ANSWER: No

29. Are any of these courses followed by any classroom training or other elearning courses?

ANSWER: No

30. Can we assume that the authoring tool would be Captivate 9?

ANSWER: The responder may specify tools in proposal, Capitivate is allowable.

31. Can we assume that these courses will be hosted on Moodle or Blackboard?

ANSWER: No

32. What is the form of LMS tracking expected? Course/module completion?

ANSWER: LMS capabilities are outside of the scope of the proposal.

33. Will the final deliverable be a SCORM 1.2 package or SCORM 2004 package?

ANSWER: Either

34. Page 3: 2.5 Contractor must document the e-content....

By document do you mean share the storyboards? If not what kind of documentation are you expecting?

ANSWER: Documentation should be sufficient to allow modification of courses and creation of new courses using delivered modules as a template.

35. Page 3: 2.7.1.1, Should we scope in in-person design meeting or would a virtual meeting be adequate?

ANSWER: This meeting can be virtual.

36. Page 4: 2.7.1.2, Again for the technology review, would an in-person meeting be required or would a virtual meeting suffice?

ANSWER: This meeting can be virtual.

37. Page 4: 2.7.1.3 Design proposal review with CFCC, Can the design proposal review be virtual?

ANSWER: This meeting must be in-person.

38. Page 4: 2.7.1.3 Design proposal review with CFCC,

ANSWER: We cannot provide a timeline.

39. Page 4: 2.7.1.3 produce design proposal including storyboards and sketch-ups

For the design proposal are we expected to complete the storyboard for the complete 1 course?

ANSWER: 2.7.1.3 is a review of drafts. 2.7.1.4 is the milestone for all completed parts of the design proposal.

40. Page 4: 2.7.1.5 Produce prototype of all modules...

Are we referring to the alpha build of the complete 90-minute course?

ANSWER: Proposer may describe what the proposed prototype will include.

41. Page 4: 2.7.1.5 Discussion boards with questions and exercises.

E-learning modules do not have discussion boards integrated into them. It the functionality of the LMS. Please explain what discussion boards mean here?

ANSWER: Discussion boards should be considered as a design element that will not be implemented without an LMS.

42. Can the two-day training sessions happen virtually?

ANSWER: No.

43. If the team is expected to be onsite, please specify in what instances it would be absolutely necessary?

ANSWER: For the design review with stakeholders and the in-person training.

44. Can we assume that the timelines for deliverables will change, considering that the contract start date itself is June 18?

ANSWER: No.

45. On what devices will these trainings be taken?

ANSWER: The Judicial Council has a computer lab on-site.

46. Can you share the base content for any of the modules to help us get a sense of the nature of content?

ANSWER: No

47. Will each course have a post-assessment at the end?

ANSWER: The responder is welcome to include this in the proposal.

48. With respect to evaluating learning effectiveness, does CFCC assess level 1 and 2 of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model like:

Level 1: Survey to evaluate the module

Level 2: Knowledge checks and assessment

ANSWER: This is outside the scope of the RFP.

49. Are there any technical restrictions that the vendor should be mindful of when developing this course?

ANSWER: Only those listed in the RFP and this Q&A.

50. Are there any legal restrictions binding the content and can we assume that the SMEs will validate authenticity of the content at every stage of development?

ANSWER: SMEs will be available to validate legal content. None of the content is proprietary.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS