Responses to questions:

Q1. Would you consider a non-Moodle, off-the-shelf LMS?

R1. **Yes.**

Q2. What is their current system of records / Process of managing - existing employee personnel/organizational information.

R2. **DHR has Pathlore LMS 6.5 web version to manage a course code system, run GAP analyzer in a limited fashion, post classes, enroll trainees, and record class attendance as well as class completion outcomes. Many classes are held and then class and person data is keyed into Pathlore after the class finishes. LMS Management and data entry is accomplished in three primary Montgomery offices by about five trainers/clericals in behalf of the whole department, so the web potential is not used. Crystal Reports 9.2 furnishes about ten often used reports. We want to keep something like this but realize the need to change some methods as we move to blended learning.**

Q3. What is their current system of records / Process of keeping/reporting - employee training records.

R3. **See R2. Each class has an ID tab with details (name, date, time, location, etc.) and a roster tab with list of attendees and status (enrolled, wait listed, etc.). Each employee has an ID tab with identifying details (job, location, personnel class, etc.) and then a transcript tab with history of successful completion or cancellations, etc. We want to keep something like this but realize the need to change some methods and record formats as we move to blended learning.**

Q4. How big is their course catalog? How many courses and size of an average course? How many curricula?

R4. **There is no course catalog as such. But analysis of activity reports yields this: The last full calendar year of training featured about 65 types classes within eight (8) major categories (curricula?). The shortest class is 1.5 hours, the longest three weeks; a typical class may be given from one to twenty times a year. Trainee attendance numbers at classes ranges from less than five trainees to about 35 maximum, but there are major conferences where several hundred attend. Several years ago, training seats per year were around 6,500. Recent department-wide events, some accomplished through a 'managed 1995 style of distance learning', as well as a major program change increased training seats to around 16,000 in a year. ALSO, See R14.**

Q5. Is any Help desk application / and/or Help desk organization currently in place?

R5. **The Pathlore LMS System comes with Tech Support only, and about three employees use that support as needed. DHR Information Systems Division has a help desk for common software, and internal program divisions have help desks staffed by subject matter experts for end-user telephone support of special program software. The software used for service call logging, etc., is CA Service Desk**

Q6. The employee population indicated (4000-4500) all INTERNAL employees, do they need SINGLE-SIGN ON solution or need LMS application to be part of employee portal.

R6. **Single Sign on is not a requirement, though it is desirable. The application needs to provide a login page if Single Sign on is not available.**

Q7. How much changes/ turnover happen (%) annually on these employees?

R7. **The merit employee turnover rate for FY 08 was 11% for the entire agency. In addition, there are on average 10-20 employees per month who transfer to other units or change personnel classes.**

Q8. How many new courses are added or changed every year?

R8. **Depends on several factors including policy and practice changes. A steady year would probably see 6-10 minor revisions. Last year was very heavy with the total replacement of about eight major courses and modifications of 6-10 more. If DHR obtains an LMS/Distance Learning capability, we would add at least seven classes over time that are not in existence now.**

Q9. .3 COURSE WRITING, PROGRESS TRACKING, AND REPORTS

3.3.1 COURSE WRITING WITH THE AUTHORING TOOL

A. DHR will have a maximum of approximately twelve course authors. But the tool must be SCORM compliant and must allow the Department to assign any chosen number of writers access at a fixed price.

Supplier Question:

What are the twelve authors comfort level with authoring tools and Instructional Development? Are there certain authoring tools the authors are familiar using and would continue to use?

R9. **The department has veteran trainers that do not have experience with distance learning "authoring tools" as such. What they are comfortable with is planning and organizing classroom or meeting style events that last from one to 15 days. In those events, using power point, MS Word handouts, training manuals or policy, TV/DVD productions, poster boards, learning activities, etc. are common. A few of our trainers write tests on class material. There is a small number of trainers writing short 'on demand' webinars as remedial training on specialized program software functions; about 15 of those 12-minute programs are available on our intraweb. And on the second part of the question, only a small number of the total trainers have formal training in Instructional Design, or in distance or "blended learning." DHR has a draft plan to provide such training to help implement an LMS system.**

Q10. Reference Section 2.6.1 Given the repeated emphasis on price and value and our interest in not exceeding planned expenditures, what is the allocated budget for this project?

R10. **The requested information is not available. Vendors should submit their best prices.**

Q11. Reference Section 2.6.2 What are the specific criteria to be used to determine the winning proposal? The RFP states in section 4.2.5.4.3 the contract will be awarded under the State of Alabama standard contract terms. What overriding or additional terms and conditions would be considered favorable to the State of Alabama?

R11. **Refer to Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the RFP document.**

Q12. Reference Section 2.8 and 5.0 The terms Price and Cost are used in a number of sections but it is not clear if the terms are intended to be used in a synonymous or differentiated manner. Does the State of Alabama expect Vendors to disclose both their proposed price as well as their associated costs?

R12. **The terms are used synonymously. Vendors must submit their proposed prices.**

Q13. Reference Section 2.9 The wording of this paragraph is ambiguous. Will all Vendor pricing be publicly disclosed after award? What is the process for a Vendor to guarantee pricing information and trade secrets will not be disclosed? Please define the proper State of Alabama standards and formatting requirements to assure all information not to be disclosed are properly "marked, separated and documented" as defined in Section 2.9?

R13. **Refer to Sections 2.5 Trade Secrets and 2.9 Public Request for Information of the RFP document. Vendors must submit the completed the Trade Secret Affidavit and identify**

pages within the proposal as specified. Vendors will be notified if the Department determines that any of their declarations are not acceptable, at which time proposals may be withdrawn or Vendors will be required to submit a statement withdrawing declarations.

Q14. Reference Section 3.1.1

A. Please describe the peak number of courses to be hosted over the next 3 years. Please breakout the courses by type and include expected storage requirements for each type course type.

B. Paragraph A.1 Will the 4100 or 4500 active users be used to assess the winning proposal?

C. Paragraph A.2 Please outline the State of Alabama security policies for storage, transmission and access to protect sensitive data such as employee's SSN's?

D. Paragraph A.3 Please outline State of Alabama requires for exchanging data related to handling transfers, promotions and departures of people. What is the size of the inactive former employee group?

E. Paragraph A.4 Given the range of expected active users (average 250 – 350) with peaks to 1000 and the strong emphasis placed on existing bandwidth usage (50%) and bandwidth limitations, please provide additional details to fully describe the following:

   a. Does the State of Alabama expect Vendor to also assess and potentially reengineer T1 internet connectivity to support the LMS project? If not, please explain rational for including bandwidth limitations for the planned LMS application?

   b. Capacity of existing facilities used both internally on State's LAN and bandwidth for internet connectivity?

   c. Types of traffic generated by the user community (streaming video, interactive text, flash based content, etc.).

   d. Typical traffic profile summarizing traffic typical traffic mix profile?

   e. Average bandwidth consumption per user?

   f. Average and peak number of users per T1 link?

F. Paragraph A.8 What number of contact employees should the solution be expected to manage in the future?

R14. See bulleted responses below:

A. A realistic prediction is difficult; consider this: Class hour estimates are roughly available; storage estimates are not. DHR has approximately 750 core contact hours in classroom events. Assume roughly 40% of that, 300 hours, can transfer to On-Line learning (which is probably a low estimate). But the 300 hours will be developed within three years. The 300 hours would be cognitive training about using policy and procedures to make business decisions, and content would come from our four major bureaus (four curricula). Also see R4:

   a. 1] welfare policy in children and family services to include child safety, foster care and adoptions, adult safety 2] welfare policy in family resources such as child support, food assistance, jobs training, day care, 3] department management and administration to include supervision and leadership, 4] fiscal, accounting, and personnel management rules.

B. No. An evaluation group will be convened.

C. All Employee personal data will be transmitted either on DHR LAN/WAN links or in encrypted format on external internet links. Security of employee data must be addressed in the Vendor's security plan

D. DHR will periodically pare down the inactive employees as needed to stay at or below 6,000 names total (for starters, say 4,300 active and a maximum of 1,700 inactive = 6,000). Additionally, each active employee has a history which could be pared down for database storage requirements.

E. See below

a. No reengineering is envisioned. The solution needs to be able to run on existing network without degrading the performance of the network.

b. All sites are connected to the state central router, thence to the internet gateway, by a T-1 link or 10 Mbps Metro-E link

c. Most WAN traffic is internet, e-mail, mainframe terminal sessions and web-based application traffic.

d. Not available.

e. Not available.

f. Average and peak not available, but total users on a link ranges from ~20 - ~100

F. For planning purposes, assume DHR will periodically cull the total employees in the database so as not to exceed the 6,000 number (i.e. active + inactive + contract [other] < 6,000).

Q15. Reference Section 3.2.1

A. Given the T1 bandwidth limitations within the State's network, how does the State envision the requirement for "a distributed solution" will help ease the State's bandwidth concerns?

B. Does the current 50% bandwidth utilization include traffic for the existing implementation of an existing LMS solution supporting these RFP requirements? If so please describe the existing LMS solution (Software, hardware, database and other details)

C. How does the State envision adding any traffic to the current network without further performance impacts? Please describe any network traffic prioritization plans or other strategies to be used to guarantee no performance impacts to existing traffic?

D. Given the stated bandwidth limitations, what performance metrics has the State determined to be acceptable in the current network environment in terns of end user perceived delays, application accessibility and other key State defined criteria?

E. What type of web browsers should be supported and what PC configuration is typical for the average State of Alabama user? PC's? Mac's? Linux based?

F. What LMS system availability and system reliability parameters has the State defined for the required LMS? Please explain if the requirement for a distributed solution" is part of the State's strategy to achieve targeted availability and reliability metrics?

G. What are the State's standards for maximum system unavailability to one or more State offices irrespective of the source of failure? State's LAN, Internet connectivity, other?

H. What network support windows are required by the State from the requested Vendor "help desk"? Monday - Friday Business hours? Business days 7/ 24? Other?

I. Please provide details for the State's standards for all security measures, including but not limited to software updates, antivirus measures and all other pertinent related detail.

R15. See responses below.

a. Having a distributed solution would store large files, such as streaming video, etc., at the local sites. These files would then only have to traverse the local LAN when being played back, as opposed to the WAN's T-1 links. b. No.

c. Traffic can increase, as long as the increase does not significantly impact the performance of the network.

d. Bandwidth utilization mustn't exceed 75% except for short (~<1 or two seconds) spikes. Users of other applications mustn't experience significant increases in access times or page refreshes.

e. PC's IE6 and above. No MAC. No Linux. Most users have a PC with 1GB RAM, Intel Core2 2.6 GHZ CPU

f. Vendors must determine, describe and be able to support attestations regarding of the reliability of proposed systems.

g. The State currently requires WAN connectivity, but there is no consolidated standard.

h. M-F Bus. Hours

i. Any device installed must be updated regularly with antivirus and operating system software updates, in accordance with industry-standard security practices. Software updates should be scheduled to minimize impacts on system availability. Details of the Vendor plans for updates should be included.

Q16. Reference Section 3.3

A. Is the course writing with authoring tool intended to be an integral part of the LMS system? Or is it intended to be a separate Course writing and authoring tool? What tool is currently in use today? What tools have the State's employees be trained to use? Any Vendor preferences?

B. Paragraph E.1 Please elaborate on "In addition to allowing a variety of test questions, the tool should also automatically provide cumulative test item analysis data such as ease index and differentiation index." Is this requirement effectively asking for the ability to generate SCORM complaint modules? If so, what version of SCORM is the State standard?

R16. See responses below.

A. **The business need is for the Course Writing and LMS System to be compatible: write and deliver on-line training and create an employee record of training completions. From an end-user view, Vendors may propose an incorporated LMS and Tool System or two separate soft wares that work efficiently together as one. DHR employees have not been trained on any authoring tool or LMS system.**

B. **The quoted phrase from Paragraph E.1 is not connected with SCORM; please see other sections for SCORM details. Rather, the quote is about the numerical analysis of trainee responses to each quiz or test item in the curriculum; this analysis is done by trainers as one part of deciding the difficulty, usefulness, and quality of test items. We would like the**

LMS system to either compute some test analysis numbers for us, *OR* collect raw test item data from its system and display or export the data in a format so that trainers can easily calculate the test analysis data, perhaps on a spreadsheet. So, this issue is connected with DHR's future plans in instructional design. "Ease Index" measures a test item's difficulty by counting the total number of trainees who answered a test item correctly, dividing that by the total number who answered that item, and displaying the answer as a percentage. The "differentiation index" is also a ratio typically calculated by rank ordering of all trainee final scores on the whole test, and then for each test item take the number of top-third trainees who got the item correct minus the number of bottom-third trainees who got the item correct, and divide that by total number of trainees. If your LMS has no components which will typically calculate such data, please submit ideas you may have on how we at DHR could efficiently collect the raw test item data from the LMS and calculate useful industry standard test item analysis data.

Q17. Reference Section 3.3.2

A. Paragraph B GAP analysis? Please define.

B. Paragraph C Number of required State reports?

R17. See responses below.

A. Gap analysis is part of training management or administration. It is a process to cull the LMS database and report trainee names who have not completed necessary training, or report progress on an assigned curriculum sequence. Suppose there are 400 employees in a DHR division with the job title "case manager 1" and they were all assigned two short courses (A & B) to complete within the next three months. At the end of the first month, the gap analysis report would list the names of "case manager 1" employees who had not finished Course A and a list not finished with Course B. For proposals, please include such a gap analysis or suggest an alternative function you have to identify 'targeted trainees' and track their progress against curriculum requirements.

B. A new LMS system will likely modify our reporting needs, but here are common reports used now from either Pathlore or Crystal Reports: 1] supervisor names by county, 2] trainee count – numbers enrolled, cancelled, finished for both past and future schedule classes for any given time period, 3] class roster for trainers and trainee sign-in sheet for travel verification by accounts payable, 4] list by county of names of finished trainees in given class, 5] trainee transcript, 6] names eligible for a given class but not enrolled, 7] employee names listed by county of a certain personnel class or code, 8] modified lists formatted to enroll group of our trainees in class sponsored by another agency. See R47.

If the LMS in your proposal has a report design feature, or standard reports available, then basic training for our course writers on how to construct the reports can meet the requirement without the Vendor having to create all the reports beforehand.

Q18. Reference Section 3.3.3

Please provide more detailed requirements for the monitored forum feature. Define "monitored". Ability to partition forums? Controlled access to forums? Trainee only forums? Instructor only forums?

R18. We want to make it easy for trainees to communicate with their course instructor and with other trainees in the same course by text messages in a 'chat' or 'forum' environment. We hope the LMS can provide perhaps a direct link to the instructor for private email communications; and there is a "monitored" chat room where trainees can discuss course content among themselves and the instructor can read and participate in the dialog. We

would like to limit access to such rooms to appropriate employees, say only those in the specific class and assigned mentors. Perhaps we will have separate chats for categories of trainees (trainees in the north region chat separate from the south because north trainees go to the classroom in Birmingham and south go to Montgomery.) In your proposal, it is OK to suggest industry accepted methods to fulfill the requirements: trainee interacts with course content and an easy method to dialog with both the instructor and classmates.

Q19. Reference Section 3.3.4

A. Paragraph A Is the Webinar of web conferencing a winning proposal criteria since it is s future consideration?

B. What is the expected timeframe for Webinar of web conferencing use by the State?

R19.

A. No, the incorporation of live webinars is not needed to "win." Other issues come first. If in the future the DHR LMS will not incorporate webinars easily, we will work around that by administering the webinar the same way we do a classroom event.

B. DHR is experimenting with both approaches and there is not a planned timeframe. We do not know of specific State plans.

Q20. Reference Section 4.0 The RFP document states: "Statements that the Vendor understands, acknowledges, or can comply with the requirements/specifications and statements paraphrasing the specifications are considered inadequate as are phrases such as "industry standards will be adhered to" and/or "standard procedures will be implemented", or "researchbased models will be used". Proposals must clearly and adequately describe the concepts and methodologies to be implemented by the Vendor. Information must be clear, succinct, and easily understandable."

This requirement is requesting a very specific and detailed response. Traditionally we have seen RFP's request such detail as part of the implementation process. ARI has the skills and expertise to architect and implement simple to complex solutions. In order to fulfill this RFP requirement Vendors will need full disclosure of the Alabama Dept of Human Resources complete IT and network infrastructure with details of all hardware & software for Operating systems, databases, security, etc.

R20. This requirement reference the Vendor's proposal in its entirety. Vendors are expected to describe their concepts and methodologies as clearly and adequately as possible. However, if clarification is needed the Department reserves the right to contact Vendors for said clarification.

Q21. Reference Section 4.2 Proposal Format

Should the RFP be structured to include all paragraphs from the RFP with the Vendor's response to that specific section below each paragraph?

R21. No.

Q22. Reference Section 5.0 Cost Proposal

Does the State expect to purchase all required hardware even for Hosted solutions? If this is the case for hosted solutions how does the State propose to manage ownership rights and other rights as related to hardware and or software ownership and any upgrades required to assure all system prerequisites are fully met in a timely manner to allow the system to perform as intended?

R22. Vendor-hosted solutions will not have equipment purchased by DHR.

General questions

Q23. If there is a system already in place for this application what role will the selected Vendor be expected to play? Should the Vendor role also be priced as a separate line item in the RFP response?

R23. There is no system in place. See R2.

Q24. P. 15 Section 3.1.1 B Can you elaborate on what you mean by "gap analysis function"? Is this referring to employee grouping and enrolling in multiple courses (curriculums), or something more elaborate such as competency plans?

R24. It is referring more closely to the first (sorting trainees according to criteria and then grouping the selected trainees to enroll in courses/curriculums in an efficient method); it is related also to tracking progress of the group along the curriculum path, and generally not related to the more elaborate competency plans. See R43.

Q25. P. 16 Section 3.3.1 Does the scope of work include instructional design for courseware or any courseware assembly? I am assuming that the Vendor is only providing the authoring tool, and DHR will use their own writers and instructional designers, but training and support will be needed on the tool.

R25. No, the scope does not include instructional design for courseware or courseware assembly. It does include providing basic training on the authoring tool and LMS operations to selected home office staff. See R9.

Q26. P. 20, Section 4.2.5.3 Does DHR have an anticipated or target date for launch of the LMS?

R26. The selected Vendor is expected to begin work on the system on October 01, 2009 and the system is expected to be fully functional by February, 2010.

Q27. P. 21 Section 4.2.5.3.3 Is the Assessment of Benefits and Impact a post-implementation analysis based on DHR's already established goals? We are assuming that this will be a **joint** process of determining the scope of work beforehand and setting up metrics to measure "success."

R27. Vendors must describe anticipated benefits and impact based on their proposed approach and methodologies.

Q28. Under Section 4.2.1 – Cover Sheet, page 18. The instructions stated the first page of every proposal must be the completed Cover Sheet (RFP Cover Sheet). May we include our own cover sheet in front of the RFP cover sheet?

R28. No.

Q29. Under Section 4.2.5.2-Vendor Financial Stability, page 20. The instructions stated Vendors must submit an audited financial statement for the past year and letters from auditor(s) who performed the previous two (2) financial audits immediately preceding the issuance of this RFP. Our question is, since we are a private company, will an unaudited financial statement by CPA be sufficient?

R29. Yes.

Q30. Section 3.0 (Page 15): The last sent sentence states the "system must include provisions for a help desk…" What is the purpose of this "help desk" and for whom would it be provided? For example, is it for DHR employees to contact DHR LMS administrators/course owners, or is it for DHR LMS administrators to contact the contractor if technical issues occur?

R30. I think it should include the ability for at least some DHR administrators to contact the Vendor if technical issues occur especially if we own it for first year.

Q31. Section 3.1.1, Item A.1 (Page 15): Please confirm whether the LMS database will be separate from the State database.

R31. Yes the LMS database for DHR will be separate from the State of Alabama personnel database and any other department's database.

Q32. Section 3.1.1, Item B (Page 15) & Section 3.3.2, Item B (Page 17): How does the DHR envision using the GAP analysis function/feature? Who will use it (e.g., course authors, LMS administrators)?

R32. Only course authors and LMS administrators will have access to the Gap Analysis feature. Also, see R17 and R24.

Q33. Section 3.2.1 (Page 16): It is stated that each DHR site has a T1 line. How many sites are there? What is the average number of users at each site?

R33. There are 102 sites? Average number of users per site, unknown.

Q34. Section 3.3.1, Item B (Page 16): Is the contractor required to develop and deliver a training course that addresses use of the LMS and its course writing/authoring tools?

R34. Yes. See R9 and R25.

Q35. Section 3.3.4 (Page 17): As part of future capabilities, would Section 508 accessibility become a requirement? Is it a requirement to consider for this RFP?

R35. Section 508, Title II, Paragraph III accessibility as regards employees is currently a requirement. No plans exist beyond that at this time.

Q36. General Question: Does the DHR have, or planned to develop, policy and/or procedure documents to accompany implementation and use of the LMS? If not, will the contractor be required to develop such documents?

R36. No. See R34.

Q37. General Question: What is the DHR's annual expenditure for training/professional development per active merit system employee?

R37. The data requested is not available.

Q38. General Question: Does the DHR currently employ, or have under contract, any personnel to support distance learning capabilities? If personnel are contractors, with what company(ies) are they associated?

R38. To accomplish on-line training design and course writing, there are no contract employees. DHR has a number of active classroom trainers (state employees) who will be taught distance learning skills to help them with their future curriculum development.

Q39. Section 3: Scope of Project 3.0

Learning Management System

Questions:

A. If a Vendor chooses the DHR hosting option, is it satisfactory for the Vendor to provide instructions, processes, and supporting interfaces to meet the following requirement: "…the system must include provisions for a help desk, LMS upgrades, nightly backups, semimonthly updates from the state database … and emergency restoration."?

B. In other words, does the Vendor need to staff the help desk and perform the system maintenance?

R39.

A. **For a DHR-hosted option, the Vendor would not perform maintenance but train DHR tech support to maintain the system with backups and restore procedures, etc.**

B. **DHR's help desk can support the application's normal users, but only if appropriate training is provided to help desk technicians. There should be Vendor support for technical support questions for the administrators.**

Q40. Section 3.0, Page 15 – Is any LMS in use at DHR right now? If not, how are training records currently managed?

R40. See R2 and R4.

Q41. Section 3.0, Page 15 – Please provide additional detail about the "hosting" of the LMS. Does this include hosting from a technical standpoint (managing the servers and technical infrastructure) as well as providing day to day operational support of the LMS, (i.e., supplying an LMS administration team)?

R41. This would be a situation where a Vendor provides everything at their facility and DHR connects to their equipment via the internet for training. Course development would be a DHR function.

Q42. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item A.5. – Please provide a more detailed description of batch entry. Does this mean that an administrator should be able to enter information on multiple employees at one time, or that there should be a batch load of a text file with this type of data into the LMS?

R42. 'Batch entry' here refers to the administrator being able to make changes or complete registrations on multiple trainees or classes all at once in some efficient way. For example in our database, suppose we have a 3-hour training on a Child Support Policy change ready for distance modules or classroom enrollments; we would like the administrator to automatically enroll the proper employees or automatically send them an email to enroll themselves for distance learning, etc. The process might be something like this: administrator selects the class on the LMS, then selects trainees (LMS trainees to enroll: 1] sort county code for 1-67, 2] sort personnel class for FSW, 3] sort PEC code for 07) and that process should yield a list of the state-wide target trainees who would then be enrolled by the home office or notified to enroll by some efficient method. Again, we would like proposals for an LMS with some capability to find and manipulate groups of target employees or classes.

Q43. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item A.6. – Will all test scores be calculated by the LMS, or will there still be paper-based tests where the scores are manually calculated and need to be entered by an administrator?

R43. The vision is for the vast majority of knowledge testing to be done by the LMS system, but the future vision includes the possibility of performance ratings to be done on the job and entered in a tracking record.

Q44. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item A.7. – Are there any defined requirements for the types of LMS roles that need to be created? It would help to know the types of information that certain people should be allowed to access while others should be restricted.

R44. LMS roles are not precisely defined, but here is an ideal: trainees can see their own record only and see a list of all folks in common courses during a chat room discussion; trainers and course writers can access the authoring tool and LMS 'sorting' reports (e.g. how many total trainees have I got for this topic state-wide and what are their names by county) and all trainee transcripts or progress tracking; 67 county directors, managers could see any report or transcript of their employees' activity and authorize or prevent enrollments (e.g. for starters there would be a core curriculum necessary to job performance, but eventually

there could also be an enrichment curriculum helpful for professional development); home office administrators in the four major bureaus could access everything.

Q45. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item B. – Who should be provided access to advanced curriculums and optional enrichment curriculums? Is that based on a certain piece of data from the State database?

R45. To be decided – and the decision might include several routine data items but not a "certain" item (e.g. longevity and having successful prerequisites might be considered). Possibly.

Q46. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item B. – Does DHR currently have a tool that provides a gap analysis? If so, ***can we see an example of what it looks like?***

R46. DHR has Pathlore LMS 6.5 web version which has a gap analysis feature. For an example, the basic curriculum for new supervisors has three separate classroom topics and each topic is one training day. Supervisors and managers have an identifying field marked in the database. Gap analyzer runs all the supervisor/manager names against the three basic class course codes and prints out a supervisor list by county and by topic of those who have not had the required event(s).

Q47. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item B. – Are there any examples of reports that would be needed? If no examples are available, is there a list of titles and descriptions?

R47. See R17 as well. Some current reports: 1] supervisor names by county shows counties alphabetized, supervisor names with personnel class by county. 2] trainee count – numbers enrolled, cancelled, finished for both past and future schedule classes for any given time period; this shows classes in course code order with class names/locations in date sequence, then the count of each category (enrolled, wait list, cancel, finished, etc.), 3] class roster for trainers shows enrolled names and personnel class by county then alphabetized name; and trainee sign-in sheet for travel verification by accounts payable shows the same roster but a different format: trainees in alphabetical order with other ID parts from the database after each name, 4] list by county of names of finished trainees in given class prints out class in question with alphabetized list of county, then graduates, 5] trainee transcript – date of class, code, class name, date of class 6] names eligible for a given class but not enrolled, see R46 7] employee names listed by county of a certain personnel class or code.

Q48. Section 3.1.1., Page 15, Item B. – Who should have access to reports?

R48. In general, training managers assigned to State DHR can see and create all reports. County directors can see transcripts of their employees.

Q49. Section 3.2., Page 16, Items 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 – Does DHR have a preference for Vendor-hosted or DHR-hosted solutions? What is the percentage of applications that are currently hosted by a third-party Vendor for DHR?

R49. Currently all DHR applications are hosted by DHR, with the exception of e-mail, which is hosted by another state agency. There is no preference either way.

Q50. Section 3.3.1, Page 16, Item A. – Do the twelve course authors currently use any authoring tools to develop web-based training? If so, which tools are they familiar with? If not, what type of training do they currently develop (e.g., ILT, quick reference cards, paper-based manuals, etc.)?

R50. DHR does not use an authoring tool or web based training. See R9.

Q51. Is Moodle a mandatory requirement of install?

R51. No.

Q52. To confirm, can a user self register or is the user feed coming directly from the state database?

R52. We'll take whatever works, but the key concept is State DHR has control or administrative oversight to registration for required job-related training. Perhaps State DHR trainers identify and register all the target audience a specific course and the LMS sends an auto email to each registrant telling them what to do. Or, maybe we have some other efficient way to tell the target audience they need to enroll themselves and State DHR can track over the period of a week that registration is happening for each identified trainee. As curriculums get deeper and more sophisticated, open enrollments will be accommodated within technical and monetary limits. (EXCEPTION: we need to create a process to enroll brand new employees for on-line orientation classes; at this time the state main frame import of employee changes or new employee names occurs 2 – 4 weeks after the event.

How can we temporarily register someone to get them started and match up their temporary record to the official record once we have all the data.)

Q53. Page 15 at top talks about a hosted solution, but section 3.21 and 3.2.2 talk about an on premise. Please confirm the appropriate solution and the specifications required.

R53. The choice of a hosted or on-premise system is up to the Vendor.

Q54. What type of collaboration tools are you interested in?

R54. We would like course writers to be able to see the same class under development, a limited group of trainees to validate a new course, course writers and trainers to be able to communicate easily (which could be our own email?), for trainees and instructors in the same class or longer course to communicate in a forum.

Q55. Are other languages required other than English?

R55. No.

Q56. Would pre-built courseware be desired?

R56. If it means we could get a set of pre-built templates that makes our course writing easier – maybe. If it means topic courseware is available for purchase, say on business communications, customer service, or the functions of management, then the answer is no.