KENTUCKY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM

SOLICITAION NO.:	RFP-0342
ADDENDUM NO.:	1
RFP ISSUE DATE:	October 26, 2026
ADDENDUM DATE:	November 11, 2026
OPENING DATE:	**November 23, 2026 @ 4:00PM ET**

The following information is being provided in response to written questions submitted for this RFP:

1) In Section A, the RFP specifies authenticating the student's identity during the assessment. Could the committee clarify whether this requires continuous, automated identity monitoring throughout the entire duration of the exam, or if periodic/event-triggered re-authentication meets the requirement?
    a. Periodic or event-triggered re-authentication is acceptable following initial identity verification. Continuous automated identity re-verification throughout the entire examination is not required.

2) In Section F, you have provided information that KCTCS administers proctored exams in approximately 100 - 225 courses. What is the average number of students per course?
    a. Enrollment varies by course. Typical course enrollment caps are approximately 20 to 30 students. KCTCS does not have a reliable systemwide average specific to courses using proctored assessments.

3) **Exam-session volumes:** How many individual proctored exam sessions were delivered over the past 12 months, and what annual volume is anticipated under the new contract? Does the estimate of 100–225 courses per semester cover all 16 colleges?
    a. Fiscal year 2025-26 data indicates 30,400 (estimated) seats utilized within the Blackboard LMS and four third-party vendor platforms. The 100–225 course estimate in Section 4 refers to KCTCS Online. Separately, the solution must support all 16 KCTCS colleges, which share a single Blackboard instance. KCTCS does not currently have sufficient information to provide a definitive annual volume projection. This historical data is provided for informational purposes and should not be interpreted as a guaranteed annual volume under the resulting contract.

4) **Proctoring mix:** What proportion of sessions is expected to require continuous live monitoring versus recorded sessions reviewed after the exam? Please identify any programs where live monitoring is mandatory.
    a. No data exists currently around use cases requiring continuous live monitoring. The vast majority of known use cases are reviewing recorded sessions post-facto.

5) **Browser and device requirements — Sections 4.E and 15.C:** Are secure browsers and browser extensions acceptable, given the references to both browser-based delivery and installed software? Must every proctoring mode support all listed browsers and devices, including Chromebooks and iPads? Does Blackboard mobile-app support mean completing the exam on a mobile device or simply accessing and launching the service?
    a. Secure browsers and browser extensions are acceptable where appropriate. The requirements in Section 4.E apply to the solution as a whole. The solution must support the current versions, plus one previous version, of Firefox, Chrome, Safari, and Edge, as well as macOS, including iPad, Windows, and Chrome OS/Chromebooks. KCTCS recognizes that not every proctoring mode may operate on every supported device. Each listed browser and device type must be supported by at least one proctoring mode, and offerors should identify compatibility by mode in the Section 15.C matrix. Offerors should also describe functionality available on district-managed Chromebooks without requiring KCTCS to deploy software to those devices.

6) **U.S.-only data requirement — Section 45.05:** Does this restriction also prohibit remote access by authorized proctors, reviewers, or support personnel located outside the United States when all underlying data remains hosted in the United States? Would such access be considered with KCTCS's written approval?
    a. KCTCS can consider approving remote access for authorized offshore proctors, reviewers, or technical support personnel on an as-needed basis upon formal written request, provided all underlying data remains hosted strictly in the U.S.

7) **Blackboard reporting — Section 15.C:** Which information must return directly to the Blackboard gradebook—scores, proctoring completion status, and/or integrity flags? Would detailed proctoring results and incident reports accessible through an integrated instructor dashboard satisfy this requirement?
    a. Scores and attempt/completion status must return directly to the Blackboard gradebook. Integrity flags and supporting proctoring information may be presented through an integrated instructor dashboard. Offerors should clearly describe how integrity flags, incident information, and supporting evidence are made available to faculty.

8) **Source-code escrow and ownership — Sections 39, 45.02, and 48:** Does source-code escrow apply to an existing commercial SaaS platform or only to custom-developed software? Please also confirm whether the ownership provisions exclude the vendor's pre-existing software and intellectual property.
    a. Source-code escrow applies solely to custom-developed software or on-premise installations; it does not apply to off-the-shelf, commercial SaaS platforms where no custom software is installed on KCTCS systems or built specifically for KCTCS.

       Regarding ownership: KCTCS retains full ownership of all KCTCS Data and institution-generated content. Standard vendor pre-existing software, background IP, proprietary platform code, and commercial SaaS enhancements remain the exclusive property of the Offeror.

9) What is KCTCS's estimated annual volume of proctored sessions, i.e. the total number of proctored exam sessions expected per year across all assessments and all students?
    a. Fiscal year 2025-26 data indicates 30,400 seats utilized within the Blackboard LMS and four third-party vendor platforms. The 100–225 course estimate in Section 4 refers to KCTCS Online. Separately, the solution must support all 16 KCTCS colleges, which share a single Blackboard instance. KCTCS does not currently have sufficient information to provide a definitive annual volume projection. This historical data is provided for informational purposes and should not be interpreted as a guaranteed annual volume under the resulting contract.

10) Section 4 states that 100–225 courses per semester use proctored exams. Could KCTCS share the average and maximum enrolment per proctored course, and the total number of unique students using proctoring each semester?
    a. Typical course enrollment caps are approximately 20 to 30 students. Actual enrollment varies by course and term. KCTCS does not maintain a reliable count of unique students who use proctoring each semester because proctoring is enabled by individual instructors at the assessment level.

11) Of these courses, approximately how many require one proctored exam and how many require two? Are any quizzes or other assessments proctored, in addition to mid-term and final exam?
    a. KCTCS does not maintain a reliable breakdown of courses and course-level analytics over usages of one versus two proctored assessments, etc.. Instructors may elect to proctor any assessment within any course. Accordingly, proctoring is not limited to midterms and final examinations and may include quizzes and other assessments as deemed appropriate by the course instructor.

12) Could KCTCS share historic proctored session volumes per term (Fall, Spring and Summer) for the last two to three years? Is the Summer term in scope?
    a. Fiscal year 2025-26 data indicates 30,400 seats utilized within the Blackboard LMS and four third-party vendor platforms. The 100–225 course estimate in Section 4 refers to KCTCS Online. Separately, the solution must support all 16 KCTCS colleges, which share a single Blackboard instance. KCTCS does not currently have sufficient information to provide a definitive annual volume projection. This historical data is provided for informational purposes and should not be interpreted as a guaranteed annual volume under the resulting contract.

13) Approximately what share of proctored exams is delivered through third-party publisher platforms (e.g. Pearson, Cengage, McGraw-Hill), as opposed to Blackboard?
    a. KCTCS does not have a reliable reportable percentage of proctored assessments delivered through third-party publisher platforms. Individual instructors determine whether assessments are delivered through Blackboard or publisher platforms, and KCTCS does not centrally track proctored assessments conducted within those third-party platforms, nor does KCTCS does maintain a count of unique students who take proctored assessments each semester.

14) Does the 100–225 course figure cover KCTCS Online only, or could individual colleges or dual-credit programmes add volume during the contract term?
    a. The estimate of 100–225 courses in Section four (4) refers to KCTCS Online. The proposed solution must also support the 16 KCTCS colleges that share the system's Blackboard instance and must be capable of supporting

Blackboard courses at individual colleges. Accordingly, usage may extend beyond the KCTCS Online course estimate during the resulting contract and may include dual-credit course assessment proctoring.

15) What is the expected peak number of concurrent test-takers during mid-term and finals weeks
    a. KCTCS does not have a reliable figure for the peak number of concurrent test-takers during midterm or final examination periods. Offerors should propose a solution capable of accommodating fluctuations in demand during peak academic periods.

16) Are exams typically delivered at a fixed start time, or within an open window (e.g. available over several days)? If windowed, what is the typical window length?
    a. Both approaches are used and vary by course and instructor. Some examinations begin at a fixed time, while others are available during an open testing window. KCTCS does not prescribe a standard testing-window duration; the length is determined by the applicable course and instructor.

17) Does KCTCS have any policy restrictions on facial detection or biometric analysis of students?
    a. KCTCS does not currently have a policy that expressly prohibits facial detection or biometric analysis of students. Any proposed use would need to be evaluated based on applicable legal and privacy requirements and whether use of the platform is in the best interests of KCTCS.

18) What retention period does KCTCS require for session data after an exam (video and audio recordings, screen captures, ID images, integrity flags and reports)? Does a KCTCS or Kentucky records retention schedule apply?
    a. KCTCS follows the records retention schedule allowable for all public higher education entities in Kentucky: https://teams.public.onecdn.static.microsoft/evergreen-assets/safelinks/2/atp-safelinks.html

19) Should retention be configurable by KCTCS at system, college or course level, and who should be authorised to request early deletion?
    a. KCTCS expects retention settings to be configurable at the system level. It is also desirable for the solution to support hierarchical configuration so that settings may be applied at the system level and, when appropriate, at subordinate organizational levels. System-level Blackboard LMS Admins and online learning executive leadership working on behalf of the colleges, college-level proctoring technical personnel, in addition to the 16 Chief Academic Officers should be authorized to request early deletion.

20) Is AI-only (automated) proctoring with faculty review of flags acceptable as the primary model, or does KCTCS expect human review of flags or live proctoring for some exams?
    a. AI integrations can be accepted as complimentary, not a primary driver/model.

21) If live proctoring is required, we assume that a 1:10 proctor-to-candidate ratio (one live proctor monitoring up to 10 candidates simultaneously) would be sufficient. Could KCTCS please confirm whether this ratio is acceptable? If not, please specify the required proctor-to-candidate ratio and whether it varies based on exam type or security level.
    a. KCTCS is not requiring live proctoring as a baseline solution; however, at this time there is no reliable credential-related or external testing analytics available that would denote a stricter ratio requirements for specific program specific proctoring. If Offeror is planning to propose live proctoring, the 1:10 ratio is acceptable and sufficient. KCTCS is seeking cost-effective proposals to scale across KCTCS' 16 colleges. Please provide best financial offer on cost worksheet.

22) Does KCTCS use Ultra Course View exclusively, or are some courses still in Original Course View? Which SAML identity provider does KCTCS use?
    a. KCTCS uses the Ultra Course View exclusively; no courses remain in Original Course View. KCTCS uses Microsoft Azure (Entra ID) as its SAML identity provider for single sign-on to Blackboard.

23) Approximately how many managed lab computers and Chromebooks would require silent deployment, and which management tools are in use (e.g. Intune, Configuration Manager, Google Admin)?
    a. Devices are managed by the 16 individual KCTCS colleges rather than centrally. Colleges may use software-deployment tools for college-owned Windows devices, but KCTCS does not have a reliable systemwide count of devices that would require silent deployment. Offerors should describe supported deployment methods for institutionally managed Windows devices and Chromebooks.

24) For a cloud-hosted (SaaS) solution with no software delivered to or developed for KCTCS, does the source code escrow requirement in Section 45.02 apply?
    a. It does not apply.

25) Pricing volume basis (RFP Section 4 and Financial Cost Worksheet): Section 4 states that KCTCS Online may proctor approximately 100 to 225 courses each semester with exams of about one hour. To make Year 1 and Year 2 pricing comparable across offerors, what number of students per proctored course, exams per course, and total annual exam sessions should offerors assume?
    a. Based on the additional information provided in this addendum, KCTCS updated the Cost Financial Worksheet which allows Offerors to provide annual fixed pricing which is deemed as a common pricing model for higher education and K-12. Please see **REVISED** worksheet for new pricing structure.

26) Pricing structure (Financial Cost Worksheet): The worksheet states that offerors may not propose minimum requirements and that alternative cost structures will not be considered. If our solution is priced per proctored hour or session, may offerors state a unit rate, apply it to the volume KCTCS specifies to derive the annual cost, and confirm the same unit rate for any additional usage? Please advise how usage-based pricing should be entered on the worksheet?
    a. Based on the additional information provided in this addendum, KCTCS updated the Cost Financial Worksheet which allows Offerors to provide annual fixed pricing which is deemed as a common pricing model for higher education and K-12. Please see **REVISED** worksheet for new pricing structure.

27) Breach notification timing: Section 44 of the RFP requires notice within 72 hours, Section 60 requires a report within two business days, and paragraph 10 of the sample Data Sharing Agreement requires notice within 24 hours. Which period governs?
    a. The applicable notification timeframe depends on the type of data involved.

28) Data location and access (Section 45.05): Does the prohibition on storing, maintaining, or transmitting KCTCS Data outside the United States also apply to remote access to that data by an offeror's personnel or support staff located outside the United States?
    a. Yes. The prohibition still applies. However, remote access can be reviewed/approved on an as needed basis for requiring technical assistance or troubleshooting by support staff.

29) Subprocessors: Are third-party infrastructure or hosting subprocessors acceptable if they are disclosed in the proposal and the Data Sharing Agreement, and if the data they hold remains within the United States?
    a. KCTCS will permit third-party subprocessors. However, KCTCS prefers USA-based entity infrastructure and enforcement of USA data residency.

30) Data Sharing Agreement and data return (Sections 45.04 and 51): The RFP index states that the DSA will be negotiated with the successful offeror. May offerors propose edits to the DSA with their proposal? Please also confirm whether an offeror's standard data retention schedule is acceptable provided all KCTCS Data is exportable and returned or destroyed on request.
    a. Offerors may propose edits to the DSA, which KCTCS will review as part of the negotiation process with the successful offeror. Acceptance of any proposed edits, including provisions related to an offeror's standard data retention schedule, will be determined based on applicable legal, contractual, audit, and KCTCS data return or destruction requirements.

31) Required documents at submission (Sections 49 and 60): Should the SOC Type II report and the Certificates of Insurance be submitted with the proposal, or only upon award or before work begins? Will KCTCS consider other independent security attestations if a SOC Type II report is not available?
    a. KCTCS requests for submissions with the Offeror's proposal. KCTCS may consider comparable security attestations in lieu of a SOC Type 2 report.

32) Exam scheduling (Section 15.C): The proposal considerations ask how students schedule and modify exams and receive appointment reminders. For a solution launched on demand from within a Blackboard course, is appointment scheduling a required capability, or may offerors describe the on-demand launch process?
    a. Appointment scheduling is not required when the proposed solution permits students to launch the proctored assessment on demand from within their Blackboard course. Offerors may describe their on-demand launch process and should identify any available scheduling, rescheduling, and reminder functionality.

33) Blackboard mobile app (Section 4.E): The RFP requires support for the current versions of the Blackboard mobile app (iOS and Android) and one previous version. Please clarify the expected scope of this requirement, for example whether students must be able to launch and access the proctored assessment from within the mobile app, and which exam-session functions KCTCS expects to be available on mobile devices.
    a. At a minimum, students must be able to access the assessment through the supported Blackboard mobile app and be directed to launch or continue to the proctored session. KCTCS does not require the complete proctoring session to operate within the Blackboard mobile app itself. Offerors should describe which functions, including launch,

scheduling, reminders, identity verification, monitoring, and completion, are supported on mobile devices and which require computer/laptop access.

34) Gradebook integration (Section 15.C): The RFP asks how scores, attempt status, and integrity flags return to the Blackboard gradebook. Which Blackboard-supported services does KCTCS expect offerors to use for this (for example, LTI 1.3 Assignment and Grade Services), and is KCTCS expecting integrity flags to be written into the gradebook, or to be reported and reviewed within the proctoring platform?
    a. Any Blackboard integration using LTI must use LTI 1.3 as supported by Blackboard. Offerors should use appropriate Blackboard-supported LTI 1.3 services for returning scores and attempt status, such as Assignment and Grade Services (AGS), and should describe how integrity flags and supporting information are reported. Integrity flags are advisory; KCTCS faculty retain responsibility for academic-integrity determinations.

35) In the proposal instructions, it says that, "each Proposal(s) should be kept to a maximum of 75 pages" It also says, "Electronic files (submitted through Bid Locker) should not contain imbedded links for additional documentation unless requested in the RFP criteria. Full response should be included in submitted proposal documents and counted in the page count." Some of the documents requested for the response (accessibility documentation, additional terms from the Offerer, etc.) are dozens of pages long. Is it acceptable to link to documents on our website instead of including them in their entirety in the RFP response? If we have to include all of the documentation requested, it would impact our ability to respond to the proposal requirements for the solution itself.
    a. Offerors may provide imbedded links in proposal documents for additional information; however, it is possible for an evaluator to miss a link, so please proceed at Offeror's discretion to ensure important information is included in the 75-page proposal while supporting documentation is provided in links.

36) Section 4, Scope: Which online proctoring solution(s) do KCTCS Online and the individual KCTCS colleges currently use, and when do those agreements end?
    a. This information may be obtained through open records request. records-request.aspx

37) Section 4, Scope: What are three things KCTCS values about its current proctoring solution, and three things KCTCS would most like to change?
    a. The requirements of the solution desired by KCTCS are included in the RFP.

38) Section 4, Scope (page 5): The RFP estimates 100 to 225 courses per semester. Please provide the estimated number of unique students, enrollments in proctored courses, and proctored exam attempts per term, including summer.
    a. KCTCS does not maintain a reliable count of unique students who use proctoring each semester because proctoring is enabled by individual instructors at the assessment level.

39) Section 15.G and Financial Cost Worksheet: The worksheet requests a fixed annual cost with no minimums and no alternative cost structures, while Section 15.C asks offerors to describe pricing for courses with one or two proctored exams and multiple payment options, including student-paid. Should the worksheet reflect a single fixed annual cost covering all KCTCS usage? May offerors explain the basis for that cost (for example, a per-exam rate applied to the projected volume) within the fee document?
    a. Based on the additional information provided in this addendum, KCTCS updated the Cost Financial Worksheet which allows Offerors to provide annual fixed pricing which is deemed as a common pricing model for higher education and K-12. Please see **REVISED** worksheet for new pricing structure.

40) Financial Cost Worksheet, Sections 1 and 2: Should Section 1 include only the proctoring option(s) KCTCS expects to deploy at scale, with other proctoring options listed as optional services in Section 2?
    a. Section one (1) should only include the solution the Offeror is providing in response to the requirements of this RFP. If the Offeror has other products or optional services that KCTCS should know about or may consider, those may be listed in section two (2). If optional services or budget allows, KCTCS may consider during negotiations or at some point during the life of the resulting contract.

41) Section 4, Scope: Is the scope limited to KCTCS Online courses, or does it also include proctored exams in individual colleges' online courses and scheduling for exams delivered in the 16 college testing centers?
    a. The 100–225 course estimate in Section 4 applies to KCTCS Online. However, the solution must support all 16 KCTCS colleges sharing the system's Blackboard instance and must support college-level settings and use in courses offered by individual colleges. Faculty teaching face-to-face courses at any of the 16 colleges may opt to utilize proctoring for a course assessment, which could be administered at (but is not limited to) their local campus testing center, a physical classroom or any other student selected locale.

42) Section 4, Scope: Has KCTCS established a budget or target annual cost for this solution?
    a. This information is not available at this time. KCTCS encourages Offerors to provide the best solution at the most affordable price in proposals.

43) Section 4.E and Section 15.C: The RFP asks that the solution support current versions of the Blackboard mobile app (iOS and Android) and requests a matrix that includes the mobile app. May we have clarification as to the degree of exam integrity expected on mobile devices, including phones and tablets? There are industry-wide known issues with allowing students to engage with proctored exams on their mobile device, including severe performance lag, unstable video streams, battery and storage drain, broken verification processes, and system instability. Does mobile app support mean students taking proctored exams on mobile devices, or using the app for tasks such as scheduling, reminders, and launching? Will solutions that do not support full proctoring on mobile devices still be considered responsive?
    a. KCTCS does not require full proctoring to operate within the Blackboard mobile app. At a minimum, students must be able to use the supported Blackboard mobile app for functions such as accessing scheduling or receiving reminders for, or launching a proctored assessment. Offerors should identify in the Section 15.C compatibility matrix the proctoring modes and integrity controls supported on phones and tablets and those requiring a computer. Solutions that do not provide full proctoring on mobile devices will still be considered responsive, provided the proposal clearly identifies the mobile functionality available and how students using mobile devices are accommodated.

44) Section 49, Insurance: Please confirm that certificates of insurance are required upon award, prior to commencement of work, and not with the proposal. How should we provide “Evidence of Errors and Omissions insurance of at least $1 million in liability limit provided by a carrier acceptable to KCTCS.” Also, will KCTCS accept Commercial General Liability limits of $1,000,000 per occurrence and $2,000,000 aggregate combined with a $5,000,000 umbrella policy, for $6,000,000 total, in place of the $10,000,000 requirement? We carry $5,000,000 in Cyber Liability coverage, which includes Errors and Omissions and exceeds the RFP's $3,000,000 cyber requirement. Because the primary risk of an online proctoring service relates to data and technology rather than bodily injury or property damage, we believe this coverage best protects KCTCS. With that in mind, will KCTCS accept our $6,000,000 combined General Liability and umbrella limit in place of the $10,000,000 requirement?
    a. KCTCS confirms that COIs are required from only the successful awarded Offeror prior to commencement of work. For an acceptable carrier, KCTCS broker and policies do not use anyone less than an AM Best Rating of A-7. The amounts listed in this question for general liability are acceptable for this solicitation. KCTCS will check the specifics on the successful Offeror’s COI prior to contracting.

45) Section 45.02, Source Code Escrow: Please confirm that the source code escrow requirement does not apply to a cloud-hosted subscription service where no software is installed on KCTCS systems or developed specifically for KCTCS.
    a. KCTCS confirms this is correct. The source code escrow requirement would not apply in this instance.

46) Sections 39 and 48, Copyright and Intellectual Property: Please confirm that KCTCS ownership applies to work product created specifically for KCTCS under the contract, and not to the offeror's pre-existing platform, software, or its updates.
    a. KCTCS confirms this is correct.

47) Attachment A, Data Sharing Agreement: The sample agreement references employee information. Will the final Data Sharing Agreement be adapted to address student data collected in a proctoring context?
    Yes. Per Section four (4), Attachment A is a sample Data Sharing Agreement. The final Data Sharing Agreement will be tailored as appropriate to the data and services involved in the resulting contract.

48) Section 15, Proposal Instructions: Section 15 prohibits embedded links and requires all documentation to be included in full within the page count. May offerors list reference URLs as plain text (for example, staff LinkedIn profiles or our Trust Center)? May security documentation such as the SOC 2 Type II report be provided upon request rather than included in the proposal?
    a. SOC 2 Type II reporting included with the proposal is preferred. If providing the full report upfront is not possible due to confidentiality or audit timing, an official attestation letter detailing the vendor's current security framework, the coverage period of their last audit, and the target completion date for their next review will suffice prior to final contract execution.

49) Section 26, Method of Award: Does KCTCS anticipate a single award or multiple awards for this solution?
    a. KCTCS anticipates a single award for this solicitation.

50) Section 4.E – Browser-based delivery: Section 4.E requires a solution that is entirely browser based, while Section 15.C asks offerors to describe secure browser and enterprise deployment options. Will a solution that is browser-based by default, with an optional lockdown browser that KCTCS can enable for higher-stakes exams, be considered compliant?
    a. Yes. A solution that is browser-based by default and provides an optional secure or lockdown browser or application for higher-security assessments may be considered compliant, provided the proposal fully describes each delivery method, required permissions or installation, device compatibility, and deployment approach for managed KCTCS devices and Chromebooks as required by Section 15.C.

51) Section 4.E – Browser support: Is Safari support required for all proctoring modes, or is it acceptable for higher-security modes to require Chrome, Edge or Firefox, or a secure browser?
    a. Section 4.E requires support for the current version and one previous version of Firefox, Chrome, Safari, and Edge. KCTCS recognizes that individual proctoring modes may have differing browser requirements. Offerors should clearly identify in the Section 15.C compatibility matrix any proctoring mode that does not support Safari and identify the supported alternatives.

52) Section 4.E – iPad and Blackboard mobile app: For exams taken on iPad or through the Blackboard mobile app, is full device lockdown required, or is AI-monitored proctoring without device lockdown acceptable for lower-stakes exams? Is proctoring required inside the Blackboard mobile app itself, or is launching the exam from the app into a supported browser acceptable?
    a. Proctoring is not required to operate entirely within the Blackboard mobile app. Launching an assessment from the Blackboard mobile app into a supported browser or secure environment is acceptable. Offerors should clearly describe the level of device control available on iPad/iOS and identify the exam and proctoring modes for which that level of control is appropriate.

53) Section 15.C – Gradebook: Should integrity flags be written to the Blackboard gradebook, or is it acceptable for faculty to review flags and evidence in the proctoring dashboard reached from within the Blackboard course?
    a. Offerors should describe how integrity flags are returned or reported in connection with Blackboard, including how flagged, voided, or retaken sessions are handled. Faculty must also be able to review applicable flags and supporting evidence through the proctoring solution. Integrity flags are advisory, and KCTCS faculty retain responsibility for academic-integrity determinations.

54) Section 4.F – Third-party exams: Approximately what share of proctored exams are delivered through third-party publisher platforms (for example Pearson, Cengage or McGraw-Hill) rather than through Blackboard tests?
    a. KCTCS does not have reliable reportable analytics available on the percentages of proctored assessments delivered through third-party publisher platforms. Instructors determine whether assessments are delivered through Blackboard or publisher platforms, and KCTCS does not centrally track proctored assessments delivered within publisher systems. The proposed solution must support access to examinations outside the LMS through appropriate linked or integrated third-party providers as described in the RFP.

55) Cost Worksheet: The Cost Worksheet provides for a fixed annual cost. To help offerors size this accurately, can KCTCS share the estimated number of proctored exam sessions per year, or the average number of students per proctored course?
    a. Based on the additional information provided in this addendum, KCTCS updated the Cost Financial Worksheet which allows Offerors to provide annual fixed pricing which is deemed as a common pricing model for higher education and K-12. Please see **REVISED** worksheet for new pricing structure.

56) Historical volumes: How many proctored exam sessions has KCTCS delivered in each of the last two academic years? If available, please share the breakdown by semester (fall, spring and summer) and the peak number of sessions in a single day or week during mid-term and finals periods.
    a. KCTCS is providing available data for calendar year 2025: approximately 46,300 proctored sessions in Spring, 18,500 in Summer, and 53,100 in Fall, totaling approximately 118,000 sessions. KCTCS does not have reliable information available in the current record regarding peak sessions per day or week. Data for an additional academic year is not presently available for purposes of this addendum.

57) Proctoring types: Which types of proctoring is KCTCS looking for (for example, lockdown browser only, AI-automated proctoring, recorded proctoring with human review, or live proctoring)? Please indicate the expected percentage of sessions for each type, and the current split under KCTCS's existing arrangement, if available.
    a. All options will be considered. Non-live options are usually the most cost-effective, and cost will be a primary consideration. No reliable estimations can be provided as it varies by college, and no consecutive years replicate.

58) Section 45.05 – Offshoring: We understand the requirement that KCTCS Data must not leave the United States, and all KCTCS Data would be hosted and stored within the United States. As a global provider, Offeror's deployment, customer success and technical support teams assist with the overall service. These teams do not download or store KCTCS Data on their end, but do have controlled access to the platform in order to support KCTCS. Does KCTCS expect these teams to be based within the United States? We ask because a US-only staffing requirement would significantly increase the cost of the service.
    a. Non -U.S. customer success and technical support personnel are permitted to provide remote technical assistance and troubleshooting, subject to KCTCS written approval on an as-needed basis.

59) Section 45.02 – Source Code Escrow: Offeror is a software-as-a-service (SaaS) platform provider, and source code escrow is not a provision we undertake under any of our customer contracts. Would the absence of a source code escrow arrangement be considered a disqualifying exception for a SaaS offering?
    a. The absence of a source code escrow arrangement will **not** be considered a disqualifying exception for a cloud-hosted SaaS offering.

60) Section 39 – Copyright Ownership and Work Made for Hire: Solution offering is a SaaS platform provided under licence. No part of the offering is a work made for hire, and there would be no transfer of intellectual property between KCTCS and Offeror under the resulting agreement. Would this be considered a disqualifying exception?
    a. No. The circumstances described would not, by themselves, constitute a disqualifying exception.

61) Section 48 – Intellectual Property: Similarly, no intellectual property is developed for or transferred to KCTCS under this contract. Everything offered is provided under licence, and the intellectual property remains owned by Offeror. Can KCTCS confirm that Section 48 would not apply to a licensed SaaS offering of this kind, or that this would not be considered a disqualifying exception?
    a. This would not be a disqualifying exception.

62) Sections 31 and 32 – Standards: Sections 31 and 32 reference ISO/IEC 27001:2013 and SSAE 16. Will KCTCS accept current equivalents, specifically ISO/IEC 27001:2022 certification and a SOC 2 Type II report?
    a. Yes.

63) Attachment A – Data Sharing Agreement: The sample Data Sharing Agreement lists employee data elements. Can KCTCS confirm the student data elements expected to be shared for proctoring purposes?
    a. The Data Sharing Agreement is an example only. KCTCS will review required information for this particular resulting contract during the negotiation process with the successful offeror.

64) Section 15.H – Travel rates and page count: Section 15.H refers to an attachment containing KCTCS travel rates, which does not appear to be included in the RFP package. Can KCTCS provide this attachment? In addition, do required exhibits such as device compatibility matrices and sample reports count toward the 75-page maximum, or may they be included as appendices?
    a. This solicitation will not require travel from the successful Offeror. Mention of travel rates or attachments is hereby stricken from this RFP.

Bidders must acknowledge receipt of this and any addenda either with solicitation or by separate letter or email prior to award of contract. If by separate letter, the following information should be placed in the lower left-hand corner of the envelope:

RFP No.: RFP-0342
Title: Online Proctoring Solution

Name of Firm: _____

Signature: _____