TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

Statement of Work (SOW) Course Sharing Technology Platform

SOW No. 781-4-30055

Questions and Answers January 4th, 2024

1. Can you please define the term "SaaS platform" as it relates to this particular project?

RESPONSE: Course Sharing platform will be subscribed to by THECB, vendor will provide support for implementation at participating institutions.

2. Can you please describe how the THECB plans to use the "subscription pricing model" discussed in the RFP?

RESPONSE: THECB will procure the software subscription for the platform and the implementation cost of the platform for participating institutions.

3. Who will be hosting the platform that will be developed via this project?

RESPONSE: The vendor will host the platform.

4. Given the year-end holidays and the fact that many employees will be on vacation during that time, would the THECB consider extending the due date for SOW No. 781-4-30055?

RESPONSE: The due date for SOW No. 781-4-30055 will not be extended.

5. The RFP says "to continue and expand the statewide foundational online course sharing program." What were the success metrics of the course sharing pilot? What were the stated goals of the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

6. How many students completed a shared course in the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

7. How many courses were shared during the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

8. How many students dropped a shared course during the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

9. How many students withdrew from a shared course during the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

10. How many "participating" colleges provided a course to share in the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

11. How many "participating" colleges enrolled a student in the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

12. How many colleges are "participating" in the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

13. How many colleges does THECB want to participate in this initiative post pilot? Please provide a list of institutions, if possible.

RESPONSE: THECB seeks to have at minimum ten institutions participate in the course sharing platform, dependent on institutional interest.

14. What was the price for the courses included in the pilot (i.e what Home Institution paid the Teaching Institution)?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

15. The RFP says it wants "opportunities for collaborative innovative credential development". What credentials were offered in the pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

16. How were the credentials priced in the pilot? Please provide a price list?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

17. How many enrollments were there in each credential

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

18. How many learners completed each credential?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

19. Over how many terms was the pilot offered?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

20. What was the breakdown of enrollments between courses and credentials offered during each pilot?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

21. What is the total cost of the pilot? Please provide a breakdown by party/participant

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

22. We understand Quottly was paid \$525,000 for their services. Are there any other payments to Quottly for the pilot (i.e. travel, subscriptions, etc.)?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

23. Where can we find a copy of the contract for the pilot? Please provide a link.

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

24. Why is price only 10% of the Evaluation Criteria?

RESPONSE: Price is among the factors being used to determine the best value for the state.

25. What is the current integration for the pilot? Please provide any copies of data flows or workflows as well as system specifications.

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

26. What are the expectations for integration post pilot? Please provide any copies of data flows or workflows as well as system specifications.

RESPONSE: This question is not clearly defined.

27. How do this initiative align with HB8? What other Texas legislation does this initiative support and why?

RESPONSE: The successful respondent is expected to comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

28. Quottly (current pilot provider) has been a party to two recent acquisitions. How does this impact their ability to meet the pilot and/or initiative requirements?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.

29. Does this initiative limit participating institutions from course sharing separately, either directly with other institutions or through another program/vendor?

RESPONSE: No

30. What are the stated goals or success metrics of the course sharing initiative? How many students across the state should be impacted by year? What percent increase in completion rates is expected or desired from participating institutions?

RESPONSE: THECB goals of the course sharing program include; expanding interinstitutional collaboration, increasing institutional partnerships and shared services, reducing costs and improving operational efficiency. Success metrics may vary by institutional goals based on their participation as a Teaching or Home Institution. **31.** Is replacing or cutting faculty a goal of this initiative? If so, what are the cost saving projections for the course sharing initiative by year or over the length of the project?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW. As stated in section 1.0 of the SOW, the course sharing platform is to facilitate student access to courses needed for degree completion, progression and/or specialized credential programs not available at the student's home institution. Institution's benefit from through increased enrollment, streamlined degree or certificate completion, access to supplemental and expert faculty, and opportunities for collaborative, innovative credential development.

32. As state entities, participating institutions will have specific policies regarding "payment processing". What are the anticipated requirements for this initiative?

RESPONSE: Existing institutional payment processing systems and policies will be used.

33. As separate entities, participating institutions will have their own transcript release process. What are the expectations of "transcript sharing" for this initiative?

RESPONSE: Transcripts are requested from the Teaching Institution by the student.

34. Will THECB be applying the balance of the GTF grant for DigiTex to this initiative?

RESPONSE: This question is not relevant to the SOW.