



Procurement Services

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

2801 S. University Ave., Little Rock, AR 72204-1099 | (O) 501.916.3144 | (F) 501.916.3425

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Responses are below in **RED**

Q 1: Ref: Section 2.2.2 / Financial Proposal Packet: Approximately how many transfer transcripts does the Registrar's Office receive and evaluate annually as part of the application process?

A 1: 2,000

Q2: Ref: Section 2.2.1 / Financial Proposal Packet: Approximately how many prospective students does the University expect to upload transcripts to the student-facing portal annually?

A2: 3,000 to 4,000

Q 3: Item 2.2.1.C: Degree requirements:

How detailed should the degree requirement evaluation be? Should students see how each prospective transfer course applies to major, general education, degree, residency, and elective requirements, or is a higher level estimate of applicable credits enough?

A 3: Should map to major, general education, and degree requirements.

Q 4: Item 2.2.1.C: Multiple academic major pathways

What does "model credits against multiple academic major pathways and degree requirements simultaneously" mean in practice? Should students be able to compare multiple programs side by side, or switch between programs in the same session without uploading their transcript again?

A 4: Students should be able to see how their incoming credits will count toward all degree programs. For example, 50% towards a business degree, 30% towards an education degree etc... We want them to be able to "degree shop."

Q 5: Items 2.2.1.B–C: Preliminary versus official evaluation

Should the prospective student evaluation be considered preliminary, with an official evaluation happening after admission? Or should UALR be able to stand behind the equivalencies and degree applicability shown to the student?

A 5: Preliminary

Q 6: Item 2.2.1.B: Registration requirement

The requirement notes that students should not have to register on a third party consumer marketplace before getting results. Would lightweight authentication, such as email verification or social login, be acceptable after transcript upload so students can securely retrieve, save, or email their results?

A 6: Yes

Q 7: Items 2.2.2.B–C: Human review

When is staff review required: for every student evaluation, only for unmapped courses or proposed new equivalencies, or only before a newly approved rule is used in future evaluations?

A 7: All new equivalencies.

Q 8: Item 2.2.2.C: Provisional credits

When an unmapped course is found, how should provisional credit be handled? For example, should the source credit hours carry forward as potential elective credit, should the system estimate where the course may apply, or does UALR have another approach in mind?

A 8: We would like for your system to flag/alert the course to us. We will go in and articulate and map to the appropriate degree plan.

Q 9: Item 2.2.2.E: Credit cascade

Could you share an example of how UALR expects credits to cascade between major, general education, degree, and elective requirements? Should this follow the full degree audit logic, or a simpler model for prospective students?

A 9: We would like it to follow the full degree audit logic.

Q 10: Item 2.2.3.A: Slate integration scope

What information should flow between the platform and Slate? It would be helpful to understand the expected scope across prospect records, source institutions, transcript files, parsed coursework, articulation results, program interests, communications, and portal engagement.

A 10: Ideally as much information as possible should flow from the platform to Slate. The platform should be able to acknowledge and “crunch” all the information you listed in your question.

Q 11: Item 2.2.3.A: “Real time” integration

What does “real time” mean for UALR in practice? For example, would an API or webhook update completed within a few minutes meet the requirement?

A 11: Yes

Q 12: Item 2.2.3.A: Slate ownership

Which system should be the source of truth for prospect identity, contact information, program interests, transcript documents, and evaluation status? How would UALR like duplicate or existing Slate records to be matched and reconciled?

A 12: UA Little Rock will be the source of truth (SIS data). We would like the vendor to use as many data points as possible to match or reconcile (name, date of birth, etc...)

Q 13: Item 2.2.3.B: Workday Student

Could you share where UALR is today with its Workday Student implementation? In particular, which transfer credit, curriculum, catalog, and student record capabilities are already live, and which APIs or integration endpoints are expected to be available during implementation?

A 13: We have fully implemented Workday Student. All courses that we have accepted credit from are in Workday, the course catalog and student records are all live in Workday.

Q 14: Item 2.2.6.A: Eight week launch

For the eight week production timeline, does UALR expect everything to be live at once, including Slate and Workday integrations, historical equivalency migration and cleanup, graduate rules, AP/CLEP/IB/ACE support, and full degree requirements? Or would a phased launch be acceptable, starting with the prospective portal and existing equivalencies?

A 14: Yes, we expect it to be live within the 8 week timeframe.

Q 15: Items 1.1 and 2.2.5.A.1: Graduate scope

Approximately how many graduate programs and graduate transfer equivalency rules are in scope? Do graduate evaluations follow different policies from undergraduate evaluations or require departmental review?

A 15: Zero. We want the ability to add graduate into the fold as we go.

Q 16: Item 2.2.2.D: Existing rules

Where are UALR's current transfer equivalencies maintained today, and in what formats? If available, could you also share approximate counts for active rules, source institutions, historical evaluations, and unmapped courses?

A 16: The Office of the Registrar maintains equivalencies. We are not able to share counts, rules, etc...

Q 17: Item 2.2.6.B: Data hygiene

Are there known data quality issues in the current transfer tables that we should plan for? What would UALR like the hygiene review to identify, such as duplicate rules, expired rules, overlapping effective dates, missing credits, or inconsistent subject and course identifiers?

A 17: No known data quality issues. We would like to review to identify as many as possible.

Q 18: Item 2.2.5.A: Prior learning sources

At launch, does UALR expect AP, CLEP, IB, military, and ACE documents to be parsed directly through OCR? Or could those credits initially be entered manually or imported from existing institutional data sources?

A 18: Credits can be manually entered.

Q 19: Item 2.2.4.A: Staff assisted evaluations

Should staff created evaluations follow the same preliminary workflow as self service evaluations, or should staff have additional capabilities such as editing OCR results, overriding preliminary matches, requesting departmental review, or publishing results?

A 19: Yes, staff should have override ability.

Q 20: Item 2.2.4.B: Analytics

Which funnel stages and outcomes matter most to UALR? For example: transcript started, transcript processed, results viewed, program selected, inquiry created, application started, admitted, or enrolled.

A 20: All of the above

Q 21: Item 2.2.4.B: Credit loss reporting

How does UALR want to define “credit loss”? Should it include credits with no UALR equivalency, credits that do not apply to the selected degree, credits accepted only as electives, or should those be reported as separate measures?

A 21: Reported as separate measures.

Q 22: Item 2.2.7.C: Sandbox requirement

Does UALR need a dedicated institution specific staging environment available at all times, or would a controlled environment for previewing and validating releases meet the requirement? Should that environment also include active Slate and Workday test integrations?

A 22: Yes, we want the ability to test anything before we put it into production.

Q 23: Item 2.2.8.B: Time and cost estimates

How should tuition savings and time to degree estimates be calculated? Should they account for factors such as actual course availability, residency requirements, and the sequencing of remaining terms, or is UALR looking for a simpler estimate?

A 23: Simpler estimate

Q 24: Item 2.3 / Table B: KPIs

How will UALR measure the stated 85% effectiveness standard? It would be helpful to understand the specific KPIs, how each is calculated, the measurement period, any dependencies on UALR, and whether the standard applies to each KPI individually or across the KPIs overall.

A 24: OCR accuracy should be at 85% regardless of the measurement period (one week, one month, or one year.)

Q 25: Sections 1.1 – Introduction; 1.2 – Objective and Goals; and 1.3 – Current Environment: Can you describe why you are proceeding with an RFP to procure services? Are there different/new services you'd like a new vendor to provide?

A 25: N/A

Q 26: Reference: Section 1.13(A) and Section 1.13(C) – Response Documents: Section 1.13(A) states that the response to the Information for Evaluation section should be included in the Technical Response Packet; however, Section 1.13(C) states that “Information for Evaluation should be a separate file on the PDF.” Could UALR please clarify whether the Information for Evaluation should be included within the Technical Response or submitted as its own separate PDF file?

A 26: The information for evaluation should be included in the Technical Response Packet, and when adding the PDF files to the USB, just make sure it is its own file (separate from the Financial Proposal Packet)

Q 27: Section 1.13 (A) – Technical Response Packet, Items b.1–b.2: Are you willing to accept an electronic signature in lieu of a wet ink signature on all forms?

A 27: Yes, electronic signatures are allowable on all submission documents. An addendum has been posted to address the note of “Use Ink Only” on the Financial Proposal Packet.

Q 28: Section 1.14 – Additional Terms and Conditions: Would UALR allow vendors with existing pre-negotiated terms for similar services to rely on those terms, if awarded, rather than including new exceptions/redlines to the Terms and Conditions included in the RFP as part of the proposal submission?

A 28: We would negotiate terms during the contract review process. We cannot rely on pre-negotiated terms with another vendor because as an instrumentality of the State of Arkansas there are certain terms that we cannot agree to.

Q 29: Section 1.13 – Response Documents: Our printing service does not currently offer fully recyclable materials; would UALR accept responses on USBs shipped to your location in lieu of hard copies?

A 29: Suppliers must follow submission procedures specified on the bid documents.

Q 30: Section 2.2.1 – Prospective Student Experience Portal, Item 2.1.A: Can you elaborate on what you mean by “embedded directly within the university’s web domain”?

A 30: The vendor's portal should not redirect to a 3rd party site.

Q 31: Section 2.2.1, Item 2.1.C – Prospective Student Experience Portal: What system do you plan to build and store degree requirements?

A 31: Workday

Q 32: Section 2.2.3 – Enterprise System Interoperability, Item 2.3.A: You state “The platform must feature a production-grade programmatic integration with Technolutions Slate, supporting the bidirectional synchronization of inquiry profiles and recruitment data, with configurable filtering to exclude unneeded course or college files.” – What data would you want to feed back into the transfer portal?

A 32: Any and all data relevant to the completion of a degree program.

Q 33: Section 2.1 – Prospective Supplier Minimum Qualifications, Item 2.1.4: Is the full HECVAT/SOC 2 documentation required with the proposal, or is confirmation sufficient, with the full report provided to the University under NDA prior to final contract execution?

A 33: Proposers are not required to submit the full, unredacted SOC 2 Type II audit report with their initial proposal packet. For proposal submission, proposers must provide either a certified confirmation (such as an auditor's opinion letter or executive summary) verifying a current SOC 2 Type II audit or a completed HECVAT document.