



To: Prospective Supplier

From: Kip Smalligan, Sr Strategic Sourcing Specialist, Procurement Services
Ph 616/331-3211, Fax 616/331-3287, smalligk@gvsu.edu

Date: February 11, 2015

Subject: Request for Proposal #215-26 Web Development for Student to Steward Website **Addendum #1**
Clarification Information in Response to Follow Up Questions.

Question regarding RFP page 4, 4b: Is the content that will be "developed by teachers and students" part of the user process or are these content suppliers a different set of users? That is, will the information provided by a user need to be made public or is it restricted to their own viewing/use? Or does it just need to be passed along to the site administrator(s) for evaluation?

Those who are developing content, have previously created and used it in the classroom. This content will be available for users who have NOT HAD EXPERIENCE IN CREATING AND USING SERVICE LEARNING CONTENT AND METHODOLOGIES who access the website. This information will be made public via the site for those who register and utilize the website.

Question regarding RFP page 4,5a: Are these questions regarding the user's general knowledge or are they related to a particular project the user may have in mind? That is, eventually, the user will be applying for funding regarding a particular project they are considering... are their answers to the questions for each Step reflective of that project or is their project only described and defined during the application for funding?

In levels one and two, it is general knowledge learning and assessment. In completing the application (what we would term as Level 3) they are applying the previous knowledge and creating their own project in order to complete and submit the application. Basically, they application is a demonstration of knowledge acquired and then applied to a specific end objective. (i.e. building a raingarden....or similar)

Question regarding RFP page 4, 6b: How does the user indicate they are "done" with the "Professional Development" portion, but do not need to apply for funding? Is this "details page" or is there some other indicator?

The “details page” is basically the application. If someone completes levels 1 and 2, they could possibly receive notice that they have completed the PD portion of the site. This could be linked to a certificate to be printed for their teaching portfolio. Conceivably, they could be ‘done’ at this point if they don’t want to complete an application for funding. Our assertion is that the site will be used for creating projects that WILL be funded.

Question regarding RFP page 4, 6c: Can you please elaborate on what is intended by "some type of community forum/social connection/ideas & information sharing." Is this focused on service learning in general, on service learning project ideas posted by users, or other? Do you anticipate direct discussion regarding the educational/training aspects of the site?

No, the forum is more for teachers to connect. With the backend of the site and having teacher email addresses, we would do a separate survey of usability of the site and its functions.

Yes, it will be focused on service learning and most likely tied to discussions about prior or existing projects seeking funding. I think our original plan was that the overall site, NOT the application process, would have a forum-type area to discuss service learning and projects. This would be a standard section of the site with possible ‘threads’ which we might predetermine. It could be a tab of the S2S site... ABOUT/CONTACT US/ WHAT IS SERVICE LEARNING/DISCUSSION FORUMS...etc.

Question regarding RFP page 4, 5b: Professional Development component "User can... modify their input." -- this is understandable for the "Professional Development" portion. With regard to the "Funding Application" questions, is it accurate to say there a point when the input is submitted and then locked/archived so it can't be changed? Or can a user constantly refine/adapt/modify the information regarding their application?

In levels one and two, we will have to determine what the “Pass” rate is to level up...such as if someone gets 8 out of 10 correct, they can move on. If they only get 7 out of 10 correct, they will have to review and modify the incorrect answers. Once submitted and reaching the baseline (i.e. 8 out of 10), they can move on. However, levels 1 and 2 would never need to be ‘locked’ per se, since a user might want to go back and answer/review along the way. The information in these levels would also be good background for users.

Regarding the final application (Level 3), they will always be able to Save...or Save/Continue up until the very end. Once “Submit Application” is clicked on, that level IS locked.

Question regarding RFP page 5, 11a: Crowdfunding Source: The initial need for educating and training users ("teachers and students") about being FIERCE with service learning projects seems very different from explaining a project idea to someone else. Do you anticipate a dynamic link (from the user's supplied information to the "approved" entry selected to get crowd funding)? Or is the application a one-time supply of data?

People running a bake sale don't need to know the recipes or ingredients of each item they are selling. They have to sell the baked goods. For us, FIERCE is the recipe that our users need to know. They have to sell their project (baked good) without having to say what went into it.

The overall application components (let's say 6 sections perhaps) might be used to populate the requirements for a crowdsourcing page. It should not be repetitive, but simply cutting and pasting or a functionality that says Crowdsourcing Section A = S2S Application Parts 1 & 2... Crowdsourcing Section B = S2S Application Part 4 and so on. Users should be able to cut and paste their final application at any time into any format of their choice (i.e. a Word document).

Please confirm/correct these statements: Crowdsourcing may be used to fund some of the user-provided ideas for service learning projects; user applications must be evaluated and chosen for funding (it is not an automatic step). Once selected, the project will need a page to explain what they intend and to help them solicit funds.

Ultimately, this is how we envision the site working. That with a solid application, a user can set up a sourcing page to fund their class project. The critical area of being able to do this is ensuring that the development of the application includes measures for checks and balances before moving on. Such as...users can "Save" information, but to "Save and Continue" they might need to review a good application, a bad application, and a Make Sure to Include Here...section. This would help to ensure that the best practices for each application section are completed and included before submitting the final product.

Question regarding RFP page 5, 11d: What is meant by "live-mapping" capabilities?

The choice of wording might be off. We figure that if the site goes live and is used across the state of Michigan, that people could see a real-time map of 'pins' which could be clicked on and it would give a short synopsis of school, project, funded/not funded yet, amount needed, and link to their crowdsourcing page or their project contact. Would provide ability for others to connect if they are doing similar work in another part of the state.