Faculty Activity Reporting & Evaluation Solution
The University of Toledo
RFP #FY26-10

March 11, 2026

ADDENDUM #1

THIS ADDENDUM COVERS QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS REFERENCED ABOVE.

Clarification Questions

Section 3.15 References

1. Are you requesting 3 references where we successfully implemented the product being offered over the last three calendar years AND if possible, 3 additional references from other academic institutions using this product with Banner? *UT Response: Respondents should include three references for implementation completed in the last 3 years. Ideally the references should be from other academic institutions that have utilized the proposed solution in conjunction with Banner. We are particularly interested in examples from public institutions, with a preference for regional implementations or implementation at Ohio IUC schools.*

Section 3.17 & 5.6.1 Accessibility

2. For WCAG 2.1 AA compliance, do you have specific testing tools/standards (screen readers/browsers), and is a VPAT required at proposal submission or pre-award? *UT Response: We use a variety of testing instruments both electronic and direct review. Our standards are in line with WCAG 2.1. Yes, a VPAT is required with the proposal as noted under Section 3.8 RFP package requirements checklist.*

Section 5.3.1 Required elements

3. For Banner, what is the expected integration scope (identity, appointments, departments, courses taught, workload), and what integration method is preferred (API, DB views, file extracts, middleware)? *UT Response: Identity (biographical/demographic), Appointments (title, rank, tenure status, start dates), Departments (organizational hierarchy), and Courses Taught (course prefix, title, credit hours, enrollment). It should include grants data (Grant ID, Faculty Bio, Award Status, Funding Agency, Proposal Numbers). It should include a Workload data integration which is desired if supported. We can either do SFTP or REST API.*

4. For ETL pipelines (SFTP/REST API), do you have standards for formats (CSV/JSON), encryption, scheduling/orchestration ownership, and error handling? *UT Response: While we utilize standard internal templates for SFTP, exact data formats can vary by project. We expect the vendor's system to flexibly support standard data formats (CSV, TXT, XML) depending on the specific pipeline. Specific encryption methods are typically determined by the integration code and the classification of the data being transferred. At a minimum, we require standard modern protocols. Scheduling frequency varies heavily based on the specific business need. UT IT will control the scheduling of outbound extracts. The vendor's system must support flexible ingestion schedules, provide automated error reporting, and trigger alert notifications to UT administrators upon failed jobs. If not, UT may create its own failed error logs and notifications.*

5. Are there any workflows or form configurations within FAR or RPT that are particularly complex or non-standard? *UT Response: Our workflows are straightforward and standard. Our faculty evaluation processes follow negotiated language in our bargaining agreements. These processes can include 5 day response periods, requests for reconsideration, and addition of materials or rebuttals before evaluations move to the subsequent review level.*

6. Does the University expect vendor-provided training for staff, or will internal enablement resources be prioritized? *UT Response: We expect the vendor to provide training resources. We are open to consideration of various training models, including online resources, direct training sessions, train the trainer models, etc. The training resources provided and evidence of the efficacy of these resources will be one of the considerations in our review.*

Section 5.3.1; Section 5.3.2 Required elements; Desirable elements

7. Approximately how many distinct RPT workflows exist today (by college/department), and do you expect administrative configuration with or without vendor involvement? *UT Response: For annual evaluation, we have a total of 43 departments not including the college of medicine (COMLS). We create templates for annual evaluations for each departments; different templates for lecturers and T/TT faculty. We create sabbatical templates based on dept. as we receive the faculty names which is a numbers that differs yearly. Templates for tenure and promotion, year 1-2, years 3-5, five year post-tenure, are also created based on faculty in each department and college. COMLS has 19 depts. We create templates for their T&P faculty and 5 year post-tenure reviews. Next year, COMLS annual reviews will also be completed in the system. Our goal is to receive appropriate training and complete as much administrative configuration as possible with limited or no vendor involvement.*

8. What exact objects and formats will be available from Interfolio for migration (packets, workflow history, templates, letters, metadata), and what must remain searchable in the new system? *UT Response: UT expects to provide structured FAR data via Interfolio CSV exports or possibly API. For RPT, UT should be able to export packets and metadata. At minimum, the new system must retain searchable metadata for cases (Faculty Name, Templates, Letters, Voting, Year, Case Type, Final Decision).*

9. For Web of Science/Clarivate, is the expectation a real-time search, a scheduled sync, or a user-driven import - and what fields/identifiers are required? *UT Response: A scheduled, automated sync from Web of Science mapping directly to UT faculty profiles is highly preferred, supplemented by user-driven imports via standard identifiers (DOI, ORCID, WoS). For scheduled sync, faculty should receive a list of possible publications to 'claim' or 'accept' as theirs when they log in, otherwise providing a real-time search and import initiated by the faculty member. would work (that's how Interfolio does it).*

10. Can you confirm the required role types (faculty, candidates, committee members, chairs, deans, provost, admins, external reviewers) and any segregation-of-duty requirements? *UT Response: The list of required role types appears to be complete. Segregation should be present. Administrators should not be able to alter committee votes. Candidates must not have access to external reviewer letters or internal committee notes unless explicitly shared via a formal workflow.*

Section 5.3.2 Desirable elements

11. For proxy/emulation access, what guardrails are required (logging, approvals, visibility/notification to the impersonated user)? *UT Response: Emulation should be restricted to higher-level administrators or support accounts. All proxy actions should be strictly captured in an unalterable audit log indicating the true user identity. A visual indicator should remain on-screen while in proxy mode.*

12. How many years/cycles of historical evaluations must be migrated, and is full-text search required versus metadata-only? *UT Response: Full-text search is not required, and metadata-only search for historical evaluations is acceptable, provided the associated PDF documents are linked to the faculty profile and can be easily viewed.*

13. Are there required retention schedules or legal hold requirements for RPT artifacts, votes, and audit logs? *UT Response: The CBA requires that results of all evaluations be entered into the personnel file maintained by the Provost Office. There is no retention schedule and presumably should last for the duration of the faculty member employment.*

14. For packet and letter generation, are there required templates/output formats (PDF/Word), and do letters require e-signature or only generation + storage? *UT Response: We can be flexible on the letters and e-signation. We do have templates for the letters.*

15. Can you provide a list of "must-have" reports (including accreditation reporting) and whether ad-hoc querying by business users is required? *UT Response: We do not have any required accreditation reports nor is ad hoc querying required. However, the inclusion of such features is desirable and will be factored into the proposal review.*

16. What audit events must be captured at a minimum (proxy actions, votes, workflow transitions, document access/download), and what is the required log retention? *UT Response: It depends on required versus optional. Required: Login/Logout, permission changes. Preferred: proxy actions, document access and downloads, votes. Active logs must be accessible in the UI for at least 4 years. It could extend to 7 years depending on external mandates.*

17. What is the approximate annual volume of external reviewers and external review submissions, and do reviewers need time-bound/limited-access portals? *UT Response: We average around 50 tenure and promotion cases each year including the college of medicine. Each case requires a minimum of three external recommendation letters. Time and access limits are produced once the review moves on to the department committee level.*

18. How important is the ability to embed and integrate agentic AI capabilities into the future system? Are there specific use cases or functions where AI-driven decision-making, automation, or predictive analytics would be desired to enhance overall effectiveness? *UT Response: There may be areas where agentic AI capabilities could be utilized, including backoffice functions on template generation and queries, and optional tools for faculty to generate review packets, and providing summaries of faculty performance and productivity to help reviewers draft responses.*

19. “Ability for faculty to upload activity from external scholarly databases." Can you elaborate on this requirement? *UT Response: faculty should have the ability to import their scholarly works - published manuscripts, funded and submitted grant proposals, conferenece presentations, etc. - directly from established databases through a seamless interface. At a minimum, would include BibTeX, RIS, or other citation management format (both here and in Q25). Import from ORCiD, eRA Commons, Google Scholar, Crossref, Lens, etc. would be some of the desired databases.*

20. Are there specific escalation paths or troubleshooting SLAs that must be covered in post-implementation support? *UT Response: Yes. Due to past experiences, UT requires strict SLAs such as critical system outages that must be acknowledged within 1-4 hours of the incident occurring or being discovered. We prefer a dedicated Customer Success/Account Manager, a clear escalation path, and periodic business reviews with UT support staff. Support should be included in the base cost. You can modify the SLA number of hours mentioned earlier. It is expected that the contract will have specific language on this.*

Section 5.6. Technical Specifications

Section 5.6.1 Required elements

21. Which HECVAT version is required (Lite vs Full), and are there additional UToledo security questionnaires beyond HECVAT? *UT Response: Because this system handles sensitive employee data, performance evaluations, and PII, a HECVAT Full is required. UT IT Security Office requires a formal security assessment prior to purchase, which utilizes the HECVAT. Vendors must be prepared to answer supplemental clarifying questions from the IT Security team based on the HECVAT responses.*

5.6.2 Desirable elements

22. Are there existing disaster recovery or backup systems that you would like to integrate or align with the new solution? *UT Response: We expect the vendor to provide a fully managed backup and disaster recovery strategy.*

23. For SSO, is Azure Entra (SAML + MFA) required or preferred, and do you support multiple IdPs for affiliates and external reviewers? *UT Response: Azure Entra ID (SAML) with MFA is highly preferred and effectively required given the sensitive nature of faculty data. Any exemption from the MFA requirement would necessitate justification and approval from the university IT Security Office. Regarding multiple IdPs, UT operates as a single IdP. If your solution supports multiple IdPs for external reviewers or affiliates, your application must manage that on the Service Provider (SP) side. We can allow multi-tenant access, but we do not manage adding additional IdPs to an SP.*

24. For the “desirable” integrations (Blackboard, WebExtender, Dynamic Forms, Qualtrics), are any effectively mandatory, and what is the priority order? *UT Response: none are mandatory. Our priority would be 1 Qualtrics course evals 2 dynamic forms / workload docs and 3 Bb course*

materials such as syllabi. We don't anticipate much need for WebExtender integration at this time.

25. "Ability for faculty to upload activity from external scholarly databases." Can we assume this will be done by Importing data from Excel? Or via APIs? *UT Response: Both Excel or API.*

Section 5.7. Compensation and Fee Schedule

26. Is there a format or form you'd like for the pricing proposal? *UT Response: No, there is no form or format for the pricing proposal. However, we request detailed costs for all the stated requirements.*

27. The RFP references approximately 1,000 FTE—does that represent faculty only, or total users including admins/committee members? *UT Response: The 1,000 FTE figure represents the approximate number of active Faculty profiles subject to reporting and review. To account for all users and inactive faculty, approximately 1,500 FTE is a more accurate number.*

28. Does the University have a strong preference for cloud, on-prem, or hybrid hosting? If cloud hosting, are there specific regional or compliance restrictions (FERPA, HIPAA, data residency)? *UT Response: Cloud (SaaS) hosting is preferred. However, we have several software at UT that is on-prem. We can accommodate both. The solution must comply with FERPA and HIPPA (if documents contain PHI from areas like COMLS).*

29. Are there performance or scale expectations (peak concurrent users during review cycles, response time targets, batch processing windows for imports/packet generation)? *UT Response: We have processes including annual performance review that will results in peak usage before submission and review deadlines. Out of the ~1,000 active FTE, we would expect a peak concurrency of approximately 200-300 users during critical submission deadlines. UI navigation should be highly responsive. The generation of large RPT packets (PDF compilation) or complex data exports must process efficiently without causing browser crashes or timeouts. Automated data integrations (SFTP/ETL) are typically scheduled to run overnight between 12:00 AM and 6:00 AM EST. Routine system maintenance or batch processing must not disrupt standard daytime operations.*

30. Do you have estimates for annual document/storage growth and any archiving expectations over the contract term? *UT Response: As we are migrating from a fully cloud-hosted environment, we do not track on-premise storage metrics for this data. We expect the vendor to provide a standard "fair use" pooled storage model or storage appropriate for an institution of ~1,000 active profiles, consisting primarily of PDF documents, CVs, and standard review packet materials. Archiving expectations include the ability to retain records for faculty who have separated from the university for a minimum of [not sure on the # of years here] years without counting against active user license caps.*

Miscellaneous

31. Does the university have a preference for a custom-built solution tailored to its specific needs or is it more inclined toward purchasing an off-the-shelf solution that may require costly customization? *UT Response: We are willing to consider either option. We will balance cost vs. flexibility in our review of proposals.*

32. We have two additional modules: one focuses on a high-level view of career path and the other allows for faculty data integration onto your website). This is not mentioned in the RFP; would you be interested in these options. *UT Response: Currently, we are only focused on Faculty Activity Reporting and Evaluation Solution.*

33. Are you open to AI if faculty can opt out of using it? *UT Response: Yes*

No other changes.

LATE BIDS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

This clarification must be signed and returned with the requested forms listed in the RFP.

_____

Company Name Signature of Authorized Representative Date

Sharon Hunt

Contract Manager

419-383-5714