



## Department of Procurement Services

---

160 South Hollywood Street · Room 126 · Memphis, TN 38112 · (901) 416-5376

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

#### **RFP 032426SB Learning Management System**

1. With respect to the Professional Learning Capabilities services listed section 5 (page 16) in the RFP (and copied below), is MSCS looking for training on how to use the proposed software platform, or would you like the vendor to provide in-person training on educational professional development topics?

**Answer: The District is seeking a vendor that can support both. The expectation is that the vendor will provide functional and development-level training on the effective use and administration of the proposed platform, as well as professional learning that supports end-user implementation strategies and instructional best practices. These services should be available in both in-person and virtual formats.**

2. Should Appendix I (Compensation/Pricing Schedule) be submitted in Tab G (Pricing Schedule/Compensation Schedule), Tab F (Forms), or both?

**Answer: You may submit Appendix I in either or both locations.**

3. Please confirm the requested delivery address is 160 South Hollywood Street, Room 126, Memphis, TN 38112 (and not 160 Glenn Rogers Sr. St., Memphis, TN 38112).

**Answer: While 160 Glenn Rogers Sr. St. is printed on the street sign; we are finding delivery services are not recognizing the Glenn Rogers Sr. St. address. Please use 160 South Hollywood Street, Room 126 as the delivery address.**

4. Regarding the requirement that reads, "Provide a consultant with education/teaching experience dedicated to the needs of our large district and the expertise to support multiple district departments in-person and/or virtually." Is SCBE requiring a full-time, dedicated consultant for this engagement?

**Answer: Yes**

5. Regarding the requirement that reads, "Provide a dedicated, full-time Implementation and Adoption Consultant for two (2) years who has the proximity to be physically present in the District." Is this in addition to the dedicated consultant in 1.0.2?

**Answer: No. The dedicated, full-time Implementation and Adoption Consultant referenced in this requirement is the same individual described in Section 1.0.2. This role is expected to serve as the primary point of contact for implementation and adoption support and must have the proximity necessary to be physically present in the District as needed.**

6. Regarding the requirement that reads, "Providing a minimum of eighty (80) hours of in-person training for groups of up to 150 participants." Is this the expectation for incumbent solutions as well as newly proposed solutions?

**Answer: Yes**

7. What learning management system is currently used by Memphis-Shelby County Schools Virtual Schools?

**Answer: Memphis-Shelby County Schools currently uses Canvas by Instructure.**

8. Approximately how many active users (students, instructors, and administrators) currently use the existing LMS environment?

**Answer: The District is seeking a curriculum solution that will support not only its virtual schools but also serve as a curriculum supplement for all district schools.**

**The anticipated virtual school enrollment is approximately 700 students, district-wide usage totals approximately 108,000 students, in addition to any required user licenses for teachers and school-level administrators, if applicable.**

9. Is the District seeking to replace the current LMS platform or expand an existing LMS environment to support virtual school programs?

**Answer: Because the current multi-year contract for the District's Learning Management System is concluding, the District is conducting a Request for Proposals (RFP) in accordance with procurement requirements. The intent is to secure a continued LMS solution through a competitive procurement process.**

10. What primary challenges or limitations with the current system prompted the District to issue this RFP?

**Answer: Because the current multi-year contract for the District's Learning Management System is concluding, the District is conducting a Request for Proposals (RFP) in accordance with procurement requirements. The intent is to secure a continued LMS solution through a competitive procurement process.**

11. Will course content from the existing LMS need to be migrated to the new system?

**Answer: Yes**

12. If migration is required, approximately how many courses must be migrated?

**Answer: The district estimates that there are less than 100 courses needing to be migrated.**

13. In what format are existing courses available (for example SCORM, Common Cartridge, or proprietary LMS formats)?

**Answer: Courses can be downloaded as common cartridge.**

14. Will historical learner data, completion records, or transcripts also require migration?

**Answer: No. Historical learner data, completion records, and transcripts will not require migration. The District will archive this information and retain it on internal data storage systems for recordkeeping purposes.**

15. The RFP references studio-quality training video production. Could the District clarify:
- the approximate number of videos expected - **There is no predetermined number of videos expected. The District's expectation is that the vendor include tutorial videos as one of the available training modalities. The quantity of videos should be appropriate to the scope and relevance of the training content provided.**
  - the typical length of each video - **The length of videos should be appropriate to the scope and relevance of the training content provided.**
  - the expected production timeline - **The District expects that these videos are already developed and available as part of the vendor's existing training resources and delivery modalities. Therefore, no separate production timeline is anticipated.**

16. Does the District currently use a lecture capture or video platform such as Panopto, Kaltura, or another media management system?

**Answer: No**

17. Will the LMS vendor be responsible for hosting video content, or will video assets be hosted within existing District infrastructure?

**Answer: The LMS vendor will be responsible for hosting video content when such videos are incorporated into courses created within the LMS platform.**

18. The RFP references a full-time Implementation and Adoption Consultant for a two-year period. Could the District clarify the primary responsibilities expected for this role?

**Answer: The Implementation and Adoption Consultant will serve as the District's primary partner for successful implementation, adoption, and ongoing optimization of the LMS. Key responsibilities will include supporting the District's implementation planning and system configuration, guiding onboarding and rollout strategies, and ensuring alignment with the District's instructional and operational goals. The consultant will also support the development of training and adoption strategies, provide guidance on best practices for LMS use, and collaborate with District leadership to monitor usage, identify opportunities for improvement, and address challenges as they arise. In addition, the consultant will coordinate with the vendor's technical teams as needed and serve as a consistent point of contact to help ensure the District maximizes the value and effectiveness of the platform throughout the contract term.**

19. Is daily onsite presence required for the full duration of the two-year period, or would a hybrid approach combining onsite engagement and remote support be acceptable?

**Answer: Onsite presence is required for the full duration of the RFP contract term.**

20. The RFP specifies a minimum of 80 hours of in-person training. Could the District clarify:
- the anticipated number of training sessions

- the typical audience size
- the intended audiences (teachers, administrators, IT staff, etc.)

**Answer: The number of training sessions, audience size, and intended participants will be determined based on the District's needs throughout the implementation and adoption process. Training may be requested for a variety of audiences, including teachers, administrators, instructional support staff, and IT personnel. Specific scheduling and session structure will be coordinated with the vendor to ensure the allotted training hours are used in a manner that best supports District implementation and ongoing usage.**

21. Will training sessions be delivered centrally or across multiple school locations?

**Answer: The District prefers a blended training approach. District personnel are in place to facilitate a train-the-trainer model, which will be appropriate for the majority of training needs. However, when the vendor is asked to provide in-person training it will usually be in one location.**

22. Does the District require the LMS platform to be hosted on District infrastructure, or is cloud-hosted deployment acceptable?

**Answer: We prefer for the LMS platform to be cloud-based.**

23. If cloud hosting is permitted, are there preferred cloud environments or compliance requirements?

**Answer: The District's security requirements will be defined through the security questionnaire that will be provided by the District's IT department to all RFP respondents. Vendor responses to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate existing security controls and determine whether the vendor meets the District's security standards or what measures may be required to align with those expectations.**

24. Are there specific security standards or certifications required for the LMS platform?

**Answer: The District's security requirements will be defined through the security questionnaire that will be provided by the District's IT department to all RFP respondents. Vendor responses to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate existing security controls and determine whether the vendor meets the District's security standards or what measures may be required to align with those expectations.**

25. What Student Information System (SIS) is currently used by the District?

**Answer: Memphis-Shelby County Schools currently uses PowerSchool as its SIS.**

26. What authentication method does the District currently use (for example Active Directory, SAML, or other SSO technologies)?

**Answer: The District primarily utilizes Clever for Single Sign-On (SSO) and, in many cases, rostering for third-party curriculum tools and LMS access. In addition, the District uses Microsoft Azure (now Entra ID) for certain systems, with integrations typically configured through SAML-based authentication, though Entra supports multiple authentication protocols.**

27. Are there additional systems that the LMS must integrate with (for example conferencing tools, assessment platforms, or analytics systems)?

**Answer: Yes. The LMS should be capable of integrating with additional systems as needed. Potential integrations may include platforms such as Microsoft Teams, as well as established connections with tools like Performance Matters and i-Ready. The District also requires the ability to export data from the LMS to support analytics through its internal systems and other potential data platforms.**

28. The RFP includes multiple service components including LMS platform delivery, onsite implementation and adoption consulting, and instructional media/video production. Could the District confirm whether respondents may propose a partnership model in which specialized services—such as onsite consulting or media production—are delivered by qualified subcontractors under the direction of the prime contractor?

**Answer: Yes. However, vendors should disclose the use of subcontractors and provide relevant qualifications within their proposal.**

29. If subcontracting is permitted, are there specific requirements regarding local partner participation or disclosure of subcontractor qualifications within the proposal?

**Answer: Subcontracting is permitted; however, any third-party contractors must be located within the continental United States. Vendors should disclose the use of subcontractors and provide relevant qualifications within their proposal.**

30. If the District currently collaborates with local organizations or service providers that support instructional technology implementation, faculty training, or educational media production, would the District be willing to identify such organizations so respondents may consider potential partnership opportunities where appropriate?

**Answer: No. The District is not identifying external organizations or service providers for partnership as part of this RFP process. Vendors should submit proposals based on their own capabilities and partnerships.**

31. Could the District provide an estimated budget range or historical annual expenditure associated with the current LMS environment to assist vendors in preparing appropriate pricing structures?

**Answer: No. Please provide your best pricing solution.**

32. Does the District have a preferred implementation timeline or target go-live date for the new LMS platform?

**Answer: The target date for go live would be by August 1, in time for the beginning of the 2026-27 school year.**

33. Will the District require phased deployment or district-wide implementation at launch?  
**Answer: District-wide implementation at launch is preferred.**
34. Given that proposal submission requires physical delivery, will the District accept electronic courtesy copies via email or secure file transfer?  
**Answer: MSCS requires all vendors to submit hard copy submissions (original and 3 copies) as well as provide their proposals on a USB.**
35. If additional clarifications or addenda are issued during the Q&A process, would the District consider extending the proposal submission deadline?  
**Answer: No, MSCS will not extend the deadline. All proposals are due March 24, 2026 at/or before 2 p.m**
36. Could the agency delineate the exact number of strictly *active* users (students, faculty, administrators) versus the number of *inactive/historical* user records that must be maintained within the system for compliance and auditing purposes?  
**Answer: The estimated peak concurrent user load is 200,000 users, which includes students, teachers, and central office staff across 3 instances.**
37. What is the anticipated peak concurrent user load (e.g., during standardized testing windows, initial enrollment days, or morning log-ins), and are there specific latency or performance Service Level Agreements (SLAs) required during these peaks?  
**Answer: The estimated peak concurrent user load is 200,000 users, which includes students, teachers, and central office staff across 3 instances.**
38. Can the agency provide an estimate of the total existing database size (in Terabytes), including the division between structured relational data (grades, demographics) and unstructured data (multimedia, SCORM packages, uploaded assignments)?  
**Answer: The District does not currently have an exact measure of the LMS database size or a breakdown of structured and unstructured data. At present, usage is relatively light for a district of our size, as many instructional resources are managed outside the LMS, though storage needs may evolve over the course of the contract depending on adopted curriculum and content**
39. Which Identity Provider (IdP) is currently utilized for Single Sign-On (e.g., Microsoft Azure AD, Okta, Google Workspace), and does the agency require automated user provisioning via SCIM 2.0?  
**Answer: The District utilizes Microsoft Azure (now Entra ID) as the standard identity provider for devices and administrative resources. The LMS should also support Single Sign-On through Clever to allow seamless access for students, teachers, and administrators. Vendors should indicate their capability to support these authentication methods.**
40. What are the specific versions of the incumbent SIS/ERP systems, and do they support modern bi-directional API endpoints (e.g., Ellucian Ethos) or will integration require direct SQL views and batch flat-file transfers?

**Answer: The District maintains PowerSchool on a current version and updates to the latest release following each end-of-year rollover. PowerSchool supports modern API connectivity and vendors are expected to have an established PowerSchool API integration already in place. The District's ERP system does not support bi-directional API endpoints. Any required data from the ERP system would need to be provided through scheduled exports delivered via SFTP.**

41. Does the agency mandate adherence to 1EdTech (formerly IMS Global) standards, specifically OneRoster 1.1/1.2 for rostering and Learning Tools Interoperability (LTI) 1.3 Advantage for seamless third-party content integration?

**Answer: The District does not currently mandate adherence to specific 1EdTech standards such as OneRoster 1.1/1.2 or LTI 1.3. However, solutions that support these widely used interoperability standards are strongly preferred. In particular, the District expects the LMS to provide robust support for LTI integrations, while still allowing flexibility to use alternative integration methods if needed.**

42. Which specific third-party curriculum publishers or content aggregators (e.g., Savvas, Edmentum, OpenSesame) will require direct integration into the new platform upon Go-Live?

**Answer: The primary integration required at Go-Live will be with PowerSchool. Vendors should also identify any additional existing integration partnerships or agreements they maintain with third-party curriculum publishers or content providers, as this information will assist the District in evaluating the overall capabilities and flexibility of the platform.**

43. Will the agency's current vendor provide full backend database exports, or will the migration require MGRM to perform "Forensic White Glove" data extraction via available APIs and custom scripting?

**Answer: The District anticipates minimal need for extensive data extraction. A full forensic-level data extraction is not expected to be necessary.**

44. Is the agency expecting the vendor to perform extensive data sanitization (e.g., resolving duplicate profiles, normalizing mismatched IDs) during the ETL (Extract, Transform, Load) phase, or will clean data be provided?

**Answer: The level of data sanitization required will depend largely on the vendor's data integration approach. If the vendor is able to request and ingest only the specific data elements needed—such as current students, relevant contact information, current enrollments, and data limited to applicable district schools—minimal data cleanup should be necessary. However, if the vendor's process involves bulk extraction of SIS data that includes inactive students, historical course records, or data from schools not served by the platform, additional data sanitization may be required. Therefore, the District expects vendors to structure their data requests to retrieve only the relevant and necessary data elements for implementation.**

45. How many academic years of historical data must be migrated, and does the agency require this legacy data to be natively queryable in the new platform's reporting engine or simply archived in a read-only format?

**Answer: The District does not currently anticipate a need to migrate historical legacy data and would likely prefer that such data be archived rather than migrated into the new system. However, for school usage, it may be appropriate to migrate historical data covering the maximum period during which currently enrolled students may have participated. The final determination regarding the appropriate timeframe for MVS data migration will be confirmed by the relevant program leadership.**

46. Does the agency prefer a fully managed, multi-tenant SaaS environment, or is there a requirement for "Sovereign Hosting" (e.g., dedicated AWS GovCloud instances or deployment within the agency's own on-premise data center)?

**Answer: The District prefers a single-tenant hosting environment. However, vendors are encouraged to also provide pricing for on-premise hosting options, if available, to allow the District to evaluate which solution best aligns with its operational and security needs.**

47. Is the agency targeting a "Big Bang" simultaneous cutover for all users, or a phased rollout strategy (e.g., deploying to administrative staff first, followed by pilot schools, and then district/agency-wide)?

**Answer: The District's preference is for a solution that can be implemented and available to all users simultaneously. However, the District is open to a phased rollout approach if a structured implementation plan can be developed that effectively meets the District's operational needs.**

48. What are the rigid target dates for User Acceptance Testing (UAT), the final system cutover, and the official Go-Live, and are these dates tied to specific legislative or funding deadlines?

**Answer: The target date for go live would be by August 1, in time for the beginning of the 2026-27 school year.**

49. Does the agency require a persistent, parallel staging/sandbox environment for ongoing training and pre-release testing of new system updates?

**Answer: Yes. The District prefers that the vendor provide a persistent staging or sandbox environment to support ongoing training and pre-release testing of system updates prior to deployment in the production environment.**

50. What internal IT and administrative resources will the agency dedicate to this project, and will there be an Executive Steering Committee available for a joint "War Room" to resolve real-time data mapping conflicts?

**Answer: The District will designate a primary project lead who will serve as the contract owner and central point of coordination for the implementation. This individual will have the authority to convene the appropriate internal IT and administrative personnel as needed to collaborate with the vendor in addressing real-time issues, including data mapping or other implementation-related matters.**

51. What is the expected division of labor for Helpdesk support? Specifically, will the agency manage Tier-1 (end-user/student) support internally, relying on MGRM strictly for Tier-2 and Tier-3 engineering escalations?

**Answer: The vendor's help desk should be available to provide Tier 1 support for end users, as well as support for escalated Tier 2 and Tier 3 issues as needed. This ensures comprehensive technical assistance and timely resolution of both basic and complex support requests.**

52. Does the agency prefer a "Train-the-Trainer" model where MGRM instructs key district personnel who then disseminate the training, or does the agency expect direct vendor-led professional development for all end-users?

**Answer: The District supports a blended approach. District personnel are in place to facilitate a train-the-trainer model, which will be appropriate for the majority of training needs. However, the vendor should also be capable of providing direct professional development to end users when requested, in accordance with the training hours outlined in the contract.**

53. Does the agency prefer pricing structured as a flat enterprise capitation rate, a tiered per-active-user/per-year model, or a modular pricing structure based on specific functionalities utilized?

**Answer: The District requests that vendors provide pricing for both enterprise-level licensing and modular pricing structures based on specific functionalities. Providing both options will allow the District to evaluate the most cost-effective and operationally appropriate approach.**

54. How should the pricing proposal address mid-contract user scalability? Should vendors present a locked block of users with an established per-user overage rate?

**Answer: Yes. Vendors should propose pricing that includes a defined block of users with an established per-user rate for any additional users added during the contract term. This approach will allow the District to scale usage as needed while maintaining predictable pricing.**

55. Are there specific funding sources (e.g., Title I, ESSER, WIOA) driving this procurement that require specific itemized billing codes or outcome-based reporting to ensure the agency's funding compliance?

**Answer: No**

56. Beyond standard FERPA and COPPA compliance, are there specific state-level data privacy agreements (e.g., NY Ed Law § 2-d, California SOPIPA, or TX-RAMP) that the vendor must execute?

**Answer: The required data privacy agreements and other security requirements will be defined through the security questionnaire that will be provided by the District's IT department to all RFP respondents. Vendor responses to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate existing security controls and determine whether the vendor meets the District's security standards or what measures may be required to align with those expectations.**

57. What level of web accessibility compliance is mandated (e.g., WCAG 2.1 Level AA), and does the agency require the submission of a current Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT)?

**Answer: The level of web accessibility compliance and other security requirements will be defined through the security questionnaire that will be provided by the District's IT department to all RFP respondents. Vendor responses to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate existing security controls and determine whether the vendor meets the District's security standards or what measures may be required to align with those expectations.**

58. Does the agency require the vendor to hold specific third-party security certifications (e.g., ISO/IEC 27001:2022, SOC 2 Type II, or FedRAMP/StateRAMP equivalency)?

**Answer: The District's security requirements will be defined through the security questionnaire that will be provided by the District's IT department to all RFP respondents. Vendor responses to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate existing security controls and determine whether the vendor meets the District's security standards or what measures may be required to align with those expectations.**

59. For virtual or blended learning programs, does the state/agency require the platform to capture, aggregate, and report precise active "time-on-task" or instructional minutes to satisfy Average Daily Attendance (ADA) funding formulas?

**Answer: While this is not a state requirement for virtual attendance, it is an expectation that the vendor selected by the district will have the capabilities to capture and report users' precise active "time on task" or instructional minutes.**

60. To address digital equity and connectivity gaps, is there a requirement for a mobile application with "Offline-First" capabilities that allows users to download content, work offline, and sync progress once connectivity is restored?

**Answer: At a minimum, the selected vendor should provide the capability for users to download content for access when connectivity is limited. Additionally, solutions that support offline work with the ability to synchronize progress once connectivity is restored would be considered a beneficial feature.**

61. Is the responding vendor (MGRM) expected to provide a comprehensive, out-of-the-box curriculum (e.g., K-12 core subjects, CTE, credit recovery, or professional development), or will the agency utilize a "Bring Your Own Curriculum" (BYOC) model where MGRM strictly provides the LMS governance and delivery infrastructure?

**Answer: The District is not seeking curriculum from the LMS vendor. The LMS should serve as a centralized platform to host and manage existing curriculum resources, integrate multiple instructional providers, automate student enrollment and course access processes, and provide customizable reports and dashboards that align courses and curriculum across multiple programs and platforms.**

62. If the vendor is required to provide the curriculum, does the agency have preferred or pre-adopted publishers (e.g., Edmentum, Savvas, SchoolsPLP) that MGRM should partner with to ensure alignment with specific state adoptions?

**Answer: Please refer to the answer to question #61.**

63. For any required third-party curriculum or content aggregators (e.g., OpenSesame), will the agency procure those licenses directly under separate contracts, or should MGRM include those licensing fees as pass-through costs within our total proposed capitation rate?

**Answer: The District will procure any required third-party curriculum or content aggregator licenses through separate contracts. Therefore, vendors should not include licensing fees for third-party curriculum or content providers in their proposed capitation rate.**

64. Does the agency possess a repository of proprietary, teacher-created content (e.g., SCORM 1.2/2004 packages, Thin Common Cartridge files, standard multimedia files) that MGRM is required to bulk-ingest and normalize prior to Go-Live?

**Answer: The District's Digital Citizenship curriculum is the primary content that would need to be ingested and remain editable for ongoing updates. The District does not have a complete inventory of locally developed or teacher-created content currently hosted within the MVS instance. However, any courses developed and maintained by the district's professional development team would likely need to be migrated as part of the transition.**

65. Are there specific state, national, or industry competency standards (e.g., Common Core, TEKS, NGSS, professional CEUs) that the platform's curriculum mapping engine must natively support to track learner mastery?

**Answer: Yes**

66. Is the vendor expected to supply pre-built formative, summative, and diagnostic assessment item banks alongside the curriculum, or will the platform strictly serve as the delivery engine for the agency's existing testing materials?

**Answer: The District is not seeking curriculum from the LMS vendor. The LMS should serve as a centralized platform to host and manage existing curriculum resources, integrate multiple instructional providers, automate student enrollment and course access processes, and provide customizable reports and dashboards that align courses and curriculum across multiple programs and platforms.**

67. For any requested curriculum, does the agency require a solution equipped with an AI-driven or diagnostic-prescriptive engine that automatically assigns remedial modules based on pre-test data, or is a standard linear learning progression sufficient?

**Answer: The District is not seeking curriculum from the LMS vendor. The LMS should serve as a centralized platform to host and manage existing curriculum resources, integrate multiple instructional providers, automate student enrollment and course access processes, and provide customizable reports and dashboards that align courses and curriculum across multiple programs and platforms.**

68. What are the specific systemic requirements regarding curriculum accessibility for Special Education (SPED) and English Language Learners (ELL) (e.g., native text-to-speech, real-time linguistic translation, Lexile level adjustments)?

**Answer: The District does not have specific mandated requirements for accessibility features at this time. However, the District strongly prefers solutions that include a broad range of built-in accommodations and intervention supports for diverse learners, including students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Vendors should describe the accessibility tools and supports available within their platform (e.g., text-to-speech, translation, reading level adjustments, and other assistive features) that promote equitable access to curriculum and instruction.**

69. If comprehensive curriculum provision is in scope, does this mandate extend to the logistical distribution of physical learning materials, manipulatives, or science lab kits, or is the scope strictly confined to digital asset delivery?

**Answer: The District is not seeking curriculum from the LMS vendor. The LMS should serve as a centralized platform to host and manage existing curriculum resources, integrate multiple instructional providers, automate student enrollment and course access processes, and provide customizable reports and dashboards that align courses and curriculum across multiple programs and platforms.**

70. Should the successful completion of the curriculum trigger the automated issuance of verifiable digital credentials (e.g., Open Badges v3.0 or blockchain-based certificates), and is the vendor expected to design the associated competency taxonomy?

**Answer: At present, the District does not implement micro-credentialing at the district level. However, the District would prefer a solution that has the capability—either currently available or available through future development—to support automated issuance of verifiable digital credentials. This functionality is not a current requirement, but the District would value an LMS platform that preserves the option to implement such features in the future.**

Thank you,

Procurement Services