TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-CORPUS CHRISTI

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT 6300 OCEAN DRIVE
CORPUS CHRISTI, TX 78412

RFP Number:

TAMU-CC-RFP-26-0001

Online Proctored Testing

Addendum # 1

The University has received the following questions from vendors. The corresponding department has provided answers for the questions provided within the allocated time to respond. The questions and answers should be considered incorporated as part of this Request for Proposals. Please see below:

1. **Question:** Can we submit the entire proposal package electronically via the SciQuest portal, including all required forms with electronic signatures, or are physical originals of any documents required?

    Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2.

2. **Question:** If electronic submission is acceptable for all components, should we upload multiple PDF files to the portal, or is there a preference for how the "four (4) digital copies" requirement should be fulfilled electronically?

    Answer: Electronic submission is not accepted.

3. **Question:** Are the USB thumb drives still required if submitting via the SciQuest portal, or does electronic submission satisfy this requirement?

    Answer: Submission may not be made by the SciQuest portal. Yes, the USB thumb drive is required.

4. **Question:** Projected Testing Volume - Could TAMU-CC share projected annual testing volumes and expected peak concurrency to ensure accurate capacity and pricing estimates?

    Answer: Faculty members at TAMU-CC have the option to require proctoring for their exams, specifying the type of proctoring required. Numbers vary across the academic year. We can share the number for:

    FY 2025

    - *Fully automated proctoring (institutional pay model): 29,310*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up (student pay model): 5,228*
    - *Exams proctored by third-party textbook publishers: unknown*

    FY 2026 till now:

    - *Fully automated proctoring (institutional pay model): 20,273*

- *Exams with the proctor pop-up (student pay model): 3,995*
- Exams proctored by third-party textbook publishers: unknown

5. **Question:** Proctoring Model Mix **-** Which proctoring models do TAMU-CC expect to use (AI-only, live human, hybrid, identity-only), and for which exam types?

   Answer: Due to existing options, we are currently interested in all types/levels of proctoring for online exams only. Additionally, verifying a student's identity is extremely important.

6. **Question:** Human Review Requirements - Should AI-flagged sessions undergo manual review by the vendor, and does TAMU-CC have an estimated percentage of exams that typically require secondary review?

   Answer: We welcome options available to support faculty in reviewing the accuracy of AI flags. TAMU-CC does not have an estimated percentage of exams that typically require secondary review.

7. **Question:** Evaluation Criteria Weighting **–** Does TAMU-CC have a published scoring rubric or weighting framework for technical, functional, and pricing evaluations?

   Answer: At this time, no we don't.

8. **Question:** Preferred Pricing Model **-** Should pricing be structured per exam, per student, per course/term, or as an institutional unlimited-use license?

   Answer: We currently use a student-pay model, and an institutional pay model for two different proctoring options available on our campus. TAMU-CC would like to be informed of the available options.

9. **Question:** System-Wide Adoption Expectations **-** To ensure accurate pricing and capacity planning, could TAMU-CC clarify whether the contract is intended solely for TAMU–Corpus Christi or if all Texas A&M System Members may procure under the same rate structure? If system-wide adoption is anticipated, will each Member contract individually or through a shared master agreement?

   Answer: At this time, the RFP is solely for TAMU-Corpus Christi. System schools may utilize available contracts to contract individually.

10. **Question:** Multi-Year Commercial Framework - To structure the most cost-effective proposal, could TAMU-CC confirm whether there is a defined budget range or not-to-exceed threshold for multi-year pricing and whether the University prefers a fixed-rate multi-year contract or a scalable model based on forecasted usage and volume tiers?

    Answer: TAMU-CC desires flexible proctoring methods and payment models. We don't have a budget range. It is important for TAMU-CC to have a multi-year contract.

11. **Question:** Implementation Timeline **-** Could TAMU-CC clarify the expected implementation timeline and whether a phased rollout or a single go-live is preferred?

    Answer: We expect implementation for Fall 2026. Historically, we have used a single go-live event, with preparation taking place in Summer 2026, in this case.

12. **Question:** Training Requirements **-** What level, format, and cadence of training is expected for faculty, administrators, proctors, and students?

    Answer: Historically, we used live on-site training or live webinars provided by the vendor, and support website or how to documents. If the training is built into the proposal, please let us know.

13. **Question:** Participating Units / System Members **-** Which TAMU-CC departments or additional System Members are expected to onboard during initial implementation?

Answer: At this time, the RFP is solely for TAMU-Corpus Christi.

14. **Question:** Migration Requirements **-** Does TAMU-CC require migration from any existing proctoring provider or solution?

    Answer: If this service is available, feel free to provide information.

15. **Question:** Mobile Support **-** Should proctored exams operate through a mobile-responsive web experience, or is a native iOS/Android application required?

    Answer: We do not recommend that students take exams on mobile devices. However, if this option is available, we are open to exploring.

16. **Question:** Canvas Integration Scope **-** To scope the integration effort accurately, could TAMU-CC clarify the expected integration depth with Canvas, including required LTI 1.3 / LTI Advantage capabilities and whether features such as deep linking, roster sync, gradebook sync, and analytics passback are expected, along with any additional workflows needed to support testing and reporting?

    Answer: LTI 1.3 with all features

17. **Question:** Proctoring Capabilities & Security Controls **-** To ensure the proposed security configuration meets TAMU-CC's needs, could the University confirm whether the following capabilities are sufficient or if additional controls are required:

    ● Full-screen enforcement, application switching/blocking, multi-monitor detection, tab-out/mouse-out tracking, device configuration checks, bandwidth checks

    ● Screen recording, video/audio session recording, AI-driven live video proctoring, automated or live environment checks, snapshot/tab proctoring

    ● Photo ID verification, IP/location verification

    ● Talking/sound detection, AI-assistance detection, copy/paste restriction, focus/attention tracking, question-level activity logging

    Additionally, are there any other academic integrity controls TAMU-CC requires that are not listed above?

    Answer: TAMU-CC is open to reviewing the proctoring and security controls that are available. Please refer to RFP for minimum technical specifications.

18. **Question:** Performance SLAs **-** Are there defined uptime, latency, data processing, or incident-response SLAs that the solution must meet?

    Answer: Vendors should propose industry-standard SLAs appropriate for a high-availability instructional technology platform, including ≥99.9% availability, defined support response times, documented incident-response procedures, and clear data protection and retention practices.

19. **Question:** Evidence Retention Requirements **–** What is the required retention period for video/audio recordings, screen captures, logs, metadata, and academic integrity evidence?

    Answer: We are interested in knowing what options vendors provide for retention and archiving.

20. **Question:** Retention Format **-** Does TAMU-CC require storage of full session videos, screen recordings, audio, or only flagged segments?

    Answer: Historically, faculty had access to full session videos, screen recordings, and audio.

21. **Question:** TX-RAMP Compliance **-** Which TX-RAMP Level (2 or 3) must the solution meet for production deployment?

    Answer: TX-RAMP level of certification is determined by DIR during the TX-RAMP or FED-RAMP certification process. Our internal security personnel review the product and determine if a RAMP cert is needed or if it is already present. (TAC 202.77), TXReg Text

22. **Question:** Support Requirements **-** Does TAMU-CC require 24/7/365 support for students, faculty, and administrators, and which support channels are expected (phone, live chat, email, ticketing, or video support)?

    Answer: 24/7/365 support for students, faculty, and administrators is preferable in all available channels.

23. **Question:** Can you please clarify the submission process requirements? The title page of the RFP mentions a bid site for submission, but we did not find this opportunity listed on the site. Item 2.3 on page 5 states that bids must be mailed or hand-delivered with multiple copies provided.

    Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2.

24. **Question:** What is TAMU-CC's current enrollment?

    Answer: For Fall 2024, our IPEDS FTE was 8,655. This includes both undergraduate and graduate (master's and doctoral) students.

25. **Question:** How many exams do you anticipate for automated proctoring and Live proctoring?

    Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about proctoring exams and the types of proctoring applied.

    FY 2025

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 29,310*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 5,228*

    FY 2026 till now:

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 20,273*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 3,995*

26. **Question:** What is the estimated volume for each on an annual basis?

    Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about proctoring exams and the types of proctoring applied.

    FY 2025

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 29,310*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 5,228*

    FY 2026 till now:

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 20,273*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 3,995*

27. **Question:** What is the duration of the exams to be proctored?

Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about exam time. Historically, the time varied: from 30 minutes to 3 hours.

28. **Question:** Please describe your top 3 decision criteria for selecting a proctoring solution.

    Answer: Ease of use, seamless integration with LMS, robust student and faculty tech support.

29. **Question:** Is Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi seeking a proctoring solution that prevents programmatic cheating threats – such as virtual machines, remote access tools, genAI apps?

    Answer: In your answer to our bid, please provide detailed information on how the vendor platform addresses known and unknown threats.

30. **Question:** Is Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi seeking a proctoring solution that only relies heavily on AI to flag incidents or alerts proctors?

    Answer: Currently, we have both fully automated and live proctor pop-in solutions. We are willing to consider one solution that might incorporate both or separate solutions.

31. **Question:** Is real-time intervention during the authentication process required? Specifically, validating a test-takers identity and securing the test environment in real-time vs post-test.

    Answer: A robust process of validating test-takers' ID prior to commencement of the exam will be welcomed in the proctored exam environment.

32. **Question:** What 2-3 features are most important in an effective proctoring experience?

    Answer: This may vary by department, college and faculty. With that being said, seamless integration with LMS, faculty's ability to tailor exam guidelines for a variety of uses and accommodations, technical support for both students and faculty, efficient guidance for potential violations during live proctored exams, and availability of practice exams are important features.

33. **Question:** Who is the current provider of remote proctoring services for TAMU-CC at this time?

    Answer: Respondus Lockdown Browser+ Monitor, Honorlock

34. **Question:** Page 10, 3.2.4 Product Integration. Is there a preferred integration for Canvas (LTI or API)?

    Answer: Please provide detailed information on your product's integration capabilities with Canvas.

35. **Question:** Page 10, 3.2.4 Product Integration. What are the internal and external systems the provider will need to integrate with or "work with"?

    Answer: The Internal system is Canvas LMS, and the external systems are textbook publishers.

36. **Question:** How many exams do you anticipate being proctored? How many candidates do you anticipate testing per year?

    Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about proctoring exams and the types of proctoring applied.

    FY 2025

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 29,310*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 5,228*

    FY 2026 till now:

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 20,273*

- *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 3,995*

37. **Question:** Please provide the anticipated testing "go live" date for the program under the new contract?

    Answer: September 2026

38. **Question:** Testing Volume & Usage: Could the university share projected testing volumes or expected concurrency for online proctored sessions?

    Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about proctoring exams and the types of proctoring applied.

    FY 2025

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 29,310*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 5,228*

    FY 2026 till now:

    - *Fully automated proctoring: 20,273*
    - *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 3,995*

39. **Question:** Training Program: Could TAMU-CC clarify whether faculty and staff training is expected as part of implementation, and the level and format of training required?

    Answer: Answer: Historically, we used combination of live on-site training, webinars, and a support website. If the training is built into the proposal, please provide those details.

40. **Question:** Number of Vendors: Does the RFP intend to select a single system-wide vendor, or establish a pool of approved vendors that individual A&M institutions may choose to engage?

    Answer: The RFP is for TAMU-CC only.

41. **Question:** Performance Expectations: Are there defined uptime, latency, or performance SLAs the solution must meet?

    Answer: In the live proctored environment, our biggest concern is incident response time. The expectation is that, should the violation be detected, a proctor will provide timely intervention to correct the behavior. Uptime, latency, and data processing would play a role in the solution consideration.

42. **Question:** Exam Use Cases: Can TAMU-CC provide information on the types of exams and security-level variations the proctoring solution must support? Additionally, is in-classroom proctoring required as part of the scope?

    Answer: TAMU-CC faculty would like flexibility in security levels and proctoring options. We are currently interested in proctoring online exams. With that being said, faculty do use our proctoring resources for onsite or in-person exams.

43. **Question:** Implementation Period: Could you clarify the expected implementation timeline and whether a phased rollout or single go-live is anticipated?

    Answer: We expect implementation for Fall 2026. Historically, we have used a single go-live event, with preparation taking place in Summer 2026, in this case.

44. **Question:** Evidence Retention: What is the required retention period for proctoring records, including video, audio, and academic integrity evidence?

Answer: We are interested in knowing what options vendors provide for retention and archiving.

45. **Question:** Mobile Support: Should the proposed solution support mobile-based proctoring, or is desktop-only support sufficient?

    Answer: We do not recommend that students take exams on mobile devices. However, if this option is available, we are open to exploring.

46. **Question:** Evaluation Criteria Weighting: Does TAMU-CC have a scoring rubric or weighting framework for technical, functional, and pricing evaluation?

    Answer: See Appendix A at the end of the document.

47. **Question:** 3.2.2.4 Describe the implementation process and timeline. Could you share the preferred timeline for the Go-Live?

    Answer: We expect implementation for Fall 2026. Historically, we have used a single go-live event, with preparation taking place in Summer 2026, in this case.

48. **Question:** 3.2.2.7 Do you provide 24/7 support to administrators, faculty, and students? Is Level 1 support expected, or would proposing Level 2 support be acceptable?

    Answer: TAMU-CC provides 24/7 support to administrators, faculty, and students. Proposing levels of support is acceptable.

49. **Question:** 3.2.3.3 Are live proctors U.S. based? Do you require proctors to be provided along with the tool/platform, and should we factor in the cost of proctoring?

    Answer: The involved parties, proctors, and systems need to be U.S. based and comply with all local, state, and federal laws.

50. **Question:** 3.2.4.3 In what ways do you integrate or support third party content (e.g.,Cengage, McGraw-Hill, Pearson) Please clarify the integration use case for proctoring.

    Answer: We expect the proctoring system to work with the 3rd party publisher software through LMS integration. For example, the faculty set an exam in Canvas LMS for students to take on the publisher's website.

51. **Question:** 3.3.2.1 Describe how authentication and security levels can be selected or customized per class or exam by the faculty member. Since integration with Canvas is expected, we assume students will be authenticated in Canvas and use proctoring for Canvas exams. Kindly clarify.

    Answer: Students will be authenticated to log in to Canvas. The proctoring system is expected to have an additional layer of authentication to verify that the student taking the exam is the student enrolled in the course. Such authentication layers may involve verifying student ID, taking a room scan, and others.

52. **Question:** 3.3.2.3 Describe how the product ensures students cannot access resources outside of the testing environment. Given the expectation to integrate with Canvas, we can support integration with both Canvas's testing and production environments through instance configurations. Please confirm if this is the expectation of this requirement.

    Answer: We would expect the proctoring system to prevent students' access to search engines via the internet and any secondary devices, but allow whitelisting of certain sites and programs.

53. **Question:** Could you please confirm whether the RFP submission should be made through the provided portal or mailed to Texas A&M University-Corpus TAMU-RFP-25-0004 TAMU-RFP-25-0004 Purchasing

Department Purchasing Building 6300 Ocean Drive, Unit 5731 6300 Ocean Drive, Room 115A Corpus Christi, TX 78412-5731 Corpus Christi, TX 78412-5731?

Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2. Subsection 2.3 indicates physical delivery and specifies the address(es) to which that can be made. Subsection 2.5 details the Proposal Components.

54. **Question:** How many students are expected to use the remote proctoring solution?

Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about proctoring exams and the types of proctoring applied.

FY 2025

- *Fully automated proctoring: 29,310*
- *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 5,228*

FY 2026 till now:

- *Fully automated proctoring: 20,273*
- *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 3,995*

55. **Question:** Are you seeking only live remote proctoring? Or is TAMCC open to recorded/AI-based proctoring?

Answer: We are open to both solutions, or it can be one system offering both options.

56. **Question:** What types of devices (e.g., desktops, laptops, tablets, Chromebooks, etc.) are students expected or permitted to use for taking exams?

Answer: We expect that the students will be using all the devices mentioned. We do not recommend that students take their exams on mobile devices, but the tablet option is welcome.

57. **Question:** We require the incorporation of our Master Registration Agreement (MRA) as it includes language particular to the exact service provided. As such, please provide information on how the contractual negotiation procedures operate for inclusion of mutually agreeable and requisite terms?

Answer: Please review TAMUCC's General Terms and Conditions included in the RFP as Section 5, the REQUIRED CONTRACT TERMS included as Exhibit D. If you take any exception to these terms and conditions, please include a detailed list of your exceptions. If you require any additional terms and conditions, please include a copy with your response. Once a finalist is selected, TAMUCC will negotiate with the finalist to attempt to come to mutually agreeable terms.

58. **Question:** When we access the link for the TAMCC HSP Form, the only document available is the HSP Declaration of Subcontracting Opportunities. We are not seeing the additional required HSP forms. Can TAMCC please provide the full set of HSP forms or advise if there is an alternative location to access them?

Answer: Due to changes in the State of Texas HUB program, our forms have recently been updated. You may find the current and correct forms at:

https://www.tamucc.edu/finance-and-administration/financial-services/purchasing/hub-program/forms.php

59. **Question:** The RFP first page states that proposals should be uploaded to the website, but on page 5 it states they could be mailed or hand-delivered. Page 6 also includes a requirement (under 2.5 Proposal Components) to provide copies via thumb drive. What is the correct submission method? If it can be

submitted fully digitally via the sourcing website (link on cover page), can the notarized signature for the Non-Collusion Affidavit be submitted only as needed with the award?

Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2. Subsection 2.3 indicates physical delivery and specifies the address(es) to which that can be made. Subsection 2.5 details the Proposal Components.

60. **Question:** The title page of the RFP mentions a bid site for submission, but I did not find this opportunity listed on the site.

Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2. Subsection 2.3 indicates physical delivery and specifies the address(es) to which that can be made. Subsection 2.5 details the Proposal Components.

61. **Question:** Item 2.3 on page 5 states that bids must be mailed or hand-delivered with multiple copies provided.

Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2. Subsection 2.3 indicates physical delivery and specifies the address(es) to which that can be made. Subsection 2.5 details the Proposal Components.

62. **Question:** What is the approximate volume of exams/assessments you anticipate for the upcoming 5 years? Should the quote include the volume-based pricing structure?

Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about proctoring exams and the types of proctoring applied. It is difficult to predict the usage.

FY 2025

- *Fully automated proctoring: 29,310*
- *Exams with the proctor pop-up: 5,228*

FY 2026 till now:

- *Fully automated proctoring: 20,273*

Exams with the proctor pop-up: 3,995

63. **Question:** What is the average length of exams/assessments? Is it a high-stakes exam? Will the mock exams be required in this case?

Answer: Each faculty member makes an individual decision about exam time. Historically, the time varied: from 30 minutes to 3 hours

64. **Question:** Would TAMUCC use its own live proctors' pool, or should this be a part of the service provided by a chosen vendor?

Answer: We expect the proctors to be part of the solution. We are also looking for a fully automated option.

65. **Question:** Prior to issuing the RFP, what vendors did TAMU-CC get information from or see demonstrations from?

   Answer: Several years ago, we participated in the four demos by the TAMUS-approved vendors: Honorlock, Measure Learning, Smarter Measures, and Proctorio.

66. **Question:** What are the current challenges that TAMU-CC is facing in regards to online proctoring from your current vendor?

   Answer: We currently have multiple online proctoring solutions, to meet both faculty and student needs. We are employing both a student and institutional pay model to accommodate the use of multiple systems. Cost to students is always a concern.

67. **Question:** Can you please carify the method of submission for this RFP? On the title page, there is reference to a portal submission, but this bid cannot be found in the portal. In Section 2.3, there is mention of mailing submissions or delivering submissions by hand and also providing a thumb drive with the submission.

   Answer: The statement on the title page about the SciQuest portal was inadvertently left on the page from a prior draft. Please disregard the statement. All responses should be submitted as instructed in Section 2. Subsection 2.3 indicates physical delivery and specifies the address(es) to which that can be made. Subsection 2.5 details the Proposal Components.

68. **Question:** Can you clarify the information in Section 4.4? What pricing models would TAMU-CC be interested in seeing in the proposal? By user, FTE, per exam, or student or institutional pay?

   Answer: We have to accommodate multiple types of proctoring and can only do this by employing a student pay and institutional model. Please provide pricing model options for consideration.

This document and attachments shall be attached to and become a part of the contract documents for this project. This addendum shall be signed for acknowledgement that you have received Addendum #1 and shall be returned with your proposal.

COMPANY NAME: _____

STREET ADDRESS: _____

CITY/STATE: _____

TELEPHONE AND FAX: _____

SIGNATURE: _____DATE: _____