

HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS BRANCH

September 17, 2026

ADDENDUM A

TO

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

RFP D27-031

PROVIDE A ROBUST LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
FOR THE HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PART I: The following change(s) are hereby made:

- Replace RFP Section 3.1.3, Professional Support Services and Training with the following:

3.1.3 PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES AND TRAINING

3.1.3.1 Dedicated Client Liaison

CONTRACTOR shall provide a dedicated Client Liaison that provides the following:

- 3.1.3.1.1 Response to phone calls within twenty-four (24) hours. This level of response shall be kept up twenty-four (24) hours per day, three hundred sixty-five (365) days per year.
- 3.1.3.1.2 Participate in regular online meetings with designated STATE personnel as needed.
- 3.1.3.1.3 Focuses on the status of all STATE LMS needs and issues pertaining to the STATE, and participate in planning and assessment with STATE designees.

3.1.3.2 Professional Development Services

- 3.1.3.2.1 CONTRACTOR shall provide professional development services in the use, administration, implementation, organization, features, and tools of the LMS.

3.1.3.3 System Administration Support

The CONTRACTOR shall provide a dedicated remote LMS system administrator and help desk service that provides the following. The system administrator must be located within the United States.

- 3.1.3.3.1 This system administrator will maintain the LMS, troubleshoot and resolve technical issues, and manage LTI integrations, application plug-ins, core platform upgrades, and extensions.
- 3.1.3.3.2 This system administrator will work with the various registration systems to ensure efficient and effective flow of data.

- 3.1.3.3.3 The CONTRACTOR's help desk and technical support shall:
- A. Provide direct Tier 1 end-user technical support for approximately 250 teachers/instructors across active implementation sites;
 - B. Provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 technical support for designated STATE and District System Administrators to resolve core platform issues, LTI tool configurations, API/SFTP integration sync errors, user permissions, and complex system troubleshooting; and
 - C. Direct help desk support for teachers and technical escalation support for system administrators must be accessible via phone, web portal, and email during Hawaii Standard Time (HST) business hours.
- 3.1.3.3.4 This system administrator will work with the STATE administrators to configure the system to meet the goals and needs of the STATE programs.

3.1.3.4 Migration of Existing Courses into the LMS (as needed)

CONTRACTOR shall facilitate and migrate all courses and content from the current LMS, Canvas.

Within one (1) month from contract execution, CONTRACTOR shall submit a course migration plan to STATE personnel that describes the process of how courses will be migrated which includes, but is not limited to:

- A. Integration of conversion functionalities to convert all applicable content to web and mobile compatible formats and enable content to be reused as many times and in as many ways without losing features and/or meaning;
 - B. Ability to migrate existing courses from the current LMS into the new LMS;
 - C. High quality technical support for the migration; and
 - D. Migration of all of the existing STATE courses.
- Replace RFP Section 3.1.4.2.2.4, Data Breach, with the following to correct the number formatting:

3.1.4.2.2.4 Data Breach

3.1.4.2.2.4.1 CONTRACTOR shall comply with all applicable laws that require the notification of individuals in the event of unauthorized release of personally identifiable information or other event requiring notification.

3.1.4.2.2.4.2 In the event of a breach of any of CONTRACTOR's security obligations or other event requiring notification under applicable law, CONTRACTOR shall notify the designated STATE personnel immediately and assume responsibility for informing all such individuals in accordance with applicable law and to indemnify, hold harmless and defend the STATE and its trustees, officers, and employees from and against any claims, damages, or other harm related to such Notification Event, unless released in writing by a Hawaii State Department of Education officer with designated data, security, or signature authority.

3.1.4.2.2.4.3 In the event of an unauthorized release or acquisition of STATE data, the CONTRACTOR shall notify the STATE immediately, but no longer than seventy-two (72) hours after confirmation of the incident, via email to eab@k12.hi.us.

3.1.4.2.2.4.4 CONTRACTOR shall provide a copy forensic report describing the data breach, including an account of the data that may have been compromised, and a description of the corrective actions that will be undertaken.

- Replace RFP Section 3.1.4.2.2.5, Disaster Recovery, with the following to correct the number formatting:

3.1.4.2.2.5 Disaster Recovery: CONTRACTOR shall provide the following recovery services including, but not limited to:

3.1.4.2.2.5.1 Nightly full database backups of all STATE LMS instances shall be completed using a hot backup solution. Nightly backups shall be stored off-site and kept for a minimum of seven (7) calendar days.

3.1.4.2.2.5.2 Weekly full database backups of the STATE LMS instances shall be completed using a hot backup solution. Weekly backups shall be stored off-site and kept for a minimum of one (1) month.

3.1.4.2.2.5.3 CONTRACTOR shall have a disaster recovery plan, to include, but is not limited to, contingencies and recovery protocols relating to loss of data or data center due to power or connectivity outage, natural disaster, terrorist threat or attack, act of God, war, criminal enterprise, or any state of war that may exist, and other exigent situations.

- Replace RFP Section 3.1.4.2.2.6, End of Contract Data Handling, with the following to correct the number formatting:

3.1.4.2.2.6 End of Contract Data Handling: Upon termination of this Contract, CONTRACTOR shall return all data to the STATE in a useable electronic form, and erase, destroy, and render unreadable all STATE data in their entirety in a manner that prevents their physical reconstruction through the use of commonly available file restoration utilities, and certify in writing that these actions have been completed within thirty (30) days of the termination of this Contract or within seven (7) days of a Hawaii State Department of Education administrator's request, whichever shall come first.

PART II: This addendum is hereby issued to respond to the following questions:

Q1: Could you confirm whether a Canadian prime contractor may submit and whether relevant qualifications may include experience of named key personnel or disclosed technical delivery partners?

A1: Yes, Offerors in Canada may submit a proposal, however, Offeror must be able to meet all requirements, which includes, but is not limited to, being registered to do business in Hawaii, and being able to furnish proof of compliance (e.g. Hawaii Compliance Express) and certificate(s) of insurance. Refer to RFP Section 1.21, Responsibility of Offerors; Hawaii Compliance Express, and RFP Appendix C, Section 7, Liability Insurance. Additionally, all application hosting, databases, backups, and network paths must reside strictly within the United States or Hawaii and the System Administrator must be located within the United States. Refer to RFP Sections 3.1.1.5, Hosting; 3.1.3.2.2, System Administration Support, and 3.1.4.2.2.2, Data Storage and Backup.

Offerors may include the experience and resumes of named key personnel and disclosed technical delivery partners or subcontractors to demonstrate qualifications for their assigned technical and/or professional service roles.

Q2: Budget / funding envelope. The RFP does not state a budget, NTE, or estimated contract value. Will the STATE publish a funding range or maximum available for the base term through June 30, 2030 (and for each optional extension), or should offerors propose pricing without a published ceiling?

A2: The STATE will not publish a budget ceiling or estimated funding range for this solicitation. Offerors shall submit competitive pricing based on the scope. Refer to RFP Section 4.12, Price Proposal.

- Q3: Active-user definition and baseline. Section 3.1.1.5.3 requires capacity from 5,000 to 150,000 active users. How does the STATE define an "active user" for pricing and capacity (e.g., unique logins in a 30-day period, licensed seats, enrolled students)? What is the STATE's current Canvas active-user count and expected Year-1 go-live count?**
- A3: For licensing and capacity planning purposes, the STATE defines an 'active user' as an individual student, instructor, or administrator account who logs into the LMS during a contract year (parent/observer accounts are explicitly excluded per RFP Section 3.1.2.7.1). The initial active user baseline is established at 5,000 active users for Year 1. During peak times throughout the school year, the system must support an estimated average concurrent load of 5,000 simultaneous active user sessions.
- Q4: "Equivalent size client" (section 3.2.1). Offerors must have provided similar services to an equivalent-size client for at least three years. What metrics define "equivalent size" (students, teachers, active users, schools, concurrent courses)? Will a K through 12 district or state department of education of substantially similar active-user scale satisfy this, or is a full-state department of education required?**
- A4: The STATE is looking for equivalent K-12 districts of either full-state size or similar implementation for large district, multi-school implementation of 5,000+ users.
- Q5: Ownership and control of SaaS (section 3.2.1). Please confirm whether "ownership and control of the SaaS products and services" requires the offeror to be the product owner / publisher of the LMS (not a reseller or implementation-only partner of a third-party LMS such as Canvas, Blackboard, or Moodle.com hosting).**
- A5: An Offeror who is an authorized reseller, OEM, licensee, or white-label provider may satisfy the requirement in Section 3.2.1 and Section 4.9.1, provided that the Offeror possesses all requisite legal rights and authorizations from the software publisher to license, host, maintain, and support the SaaS platform, and assumes 100% contractual, technical, and legal liability for the performance of the contract.
- Q6: Canvas migration scope and formats. Section 3.1.3 requires migration of courses and content from Canvas. What export formats and volumes will the STATE provide (Common Cartridge, QTI, SCORM, LTI links, files, gradebook history)? Approximate number of courses, content items, and historical years to migrate?**
- A6: The STATE can provide course exports in standard IMS Common Cartridge and SCORM package formats. For planning purposes, the estimated migration volume consists of approximately 2,400 total courses (approximately 200 master course shells/templates and two (2) years of historical course data, which has approximately 2,200 active and archived courses). The STATE strongly prefers an automated, direct system-to-system migration methodology, rather than manual bulk file extraction and file-passing.
- Q7: SIS / SSO integrations at award. The RFP lists Infinite Campus, Microsoft Azure AD, Google / Clever SSO, and other interfaces. Which integrations are mandatory at Notice to Proceed vs. phased after go-live? Are existing Canvas LTI / API credentials and Clever district configuration available to the awardee?**
- A7: All core identity, SIS, and registration integrations required for full production go-live on July 1, 2027 will be configured, integrated, and validated during the implementation phase following the Notice to Proceed.

Regarding specific systems:

- Student Information System (Infinite Campus): The STATE currently utilizes automated nightly file exchange (SFTP/batch files) for rostering rather than a direct connection. Offerors must support automated ingestion of nightly roster and enrollment files from Infinite Campus.
- Single Sign-On (SSO): Primary SSO at go-live will be provided via Microsoft Azure Active Directory (Entra ID) for staff. Clever SSO is not currently configured or implemented, but Offerors should describe their capabilities and requirements to support Clever as an optional or future student SSO pathway.
- Other Core Systems: Learnsoft (PD) and Genius (HOC SIS) will be integrated for automated enrollment and credit synchronization. Refer to RFP Section 3.1.2.1.6.

- Credentials: Following the Notice to Proceed, the STATE will provision new SFTP drop locations, API integration endpoints, and enterprise application registrations for the CONTRACTOR.

Q8: Pricing basis for the Price Proposal (section 4.12). Should licensing be proposed on a per-active-user, per-FTE, per-school, or flat enterprise basis? May Offerors include volume tiers tied to the 5,000–150,000 scale?

A8: Offerors may propose licensing under their standard pricing structure (e.g., flat enterprise fee, per-active-user, per-FTE, or volume tiers scaling across the 5,000 to 150,000 active user range) and must provide a comprehensive cost breakdown by year covering initial setup/implementation, licensing, migration, ongoing maintenance, and professional support. Refer to RFP Section 4.12, Price Proposal.

For evaluation and scoring purposes under RFP Section 5.2, Evaluation Criteria, Offerors must provide a single proposed price for the entire contract term (five (5) years). The price proposal shall include a breakdown of all costs by year, including the optional extension periods. Refer to RFP Section 4.12, Price Proposal. If an Offeror's proposed pricing is based on per-active-user or volume-tiered rates, the Offeror must explicitly state the baseline active user count assumed for each year to calculate their firm total price.

Q9: Contract year vs. school year. Full performance begins July 1, 2027, with contract end June 30, 2030, plus two optional 12-month extensions. Should Year-1 pricing assume a full school-year of production use starting July 2027, and how should dual-running with Canvas (if any overlap) be priced if required?

A9: Full performance of services commences on July 1, 2027, and runs through June 30, 2030 (plus two optional 12-month extensions). Refer to RFP Section 1.18.1, Contract Term. Offerors shall base their Year-1 production licensing pricing on a full 12-month school year of operational deployment starting July 1, 2027.

Migration, system setup, staging, testing, and integration activities will take place between Contract Execution (estimated February 2027) and June 30, 2027. Any CONTRACTOR costs associated with initial setup and implementation costs, data migration, testing instances, and/or transition support during this pre-launch window must be included in the breakdown of costs required by RFP Section 4.12, Price Proposal.

Q10: Hosting location. Section 3.1.1.5.1 requires hosting within the United States. Is FedRAMP, State ETS cloud tenancy, or a specific compliance framework required beyond the RFP's security section, or is commercial US-region SaaS hosting acceptable if all stated security controls are met?

A10: Commercial US-region Software as a Service (SaaS) hosting is acceptable, provided that all hosting, data storage, backups, and network paths reside strictly within the continental United States or Hawaii per RFP Section 3.1.1.5.1 and RFP Section 3.1.4.2.2.2, and that the solution fully complies with all security, privacy, encryption, and operational standards detailed in RFP Section 3.1.4, Security and Data Management.

Q11: Page / file limits. Please confirm any page limit for the technical proposal and whether price may be a separate searchable PDF under HlePRO's 100 MB per-file rule.

A11: There is no page limit for the technical proposal. Offerors may attach their pricing under a separate attachment on the HlePRO.

Q12: RFP Reference 3.2.1 / 4.9.1 - The RFP requires the Offeror to have "ownership and control of the SaaS products and services." Please clarify what the STATE considers sufficient to satisfy this requirement. Specifically, may a prime Offeror satisfy this requirement through an authorized OEM, reseller, licensing, white-label, or similar contractual arrangement where the Offeror assumes full contractual responsibility for the proposed SaaS solution and associated services?

A12: See response to Question 5.

Q13: RFP Reference 4.10 - Section 4.10 states that subcontractors must comply with the Offeror qualification requirements identified in Section 4.9. Please confirm whether a subcontractor providing only implementation, systems integration, migration, training, help desk, managed services, or other professional services must independently satisfy the LMS-specific requirements in Section 4.9.1, including the five-year LMS industry experience, three-year comparable K-12 experience, and ownership/control of the SaaS product.

If not, please confirm that a qualified LMS SaaS provider may serve as prime contractor and subcontract these professional services to a firm that does not independently own or control the LMS SaaS product.

A13: RFP Section 4.10 requires subcontractors to comply with applicable qualification standards under RFP Section 4.9 relevant to their assigned scope of work. Subcontractors providing specialized professional or technical support services such as implementation, systems integration, data migration, training, help desk, or managed services are not required to independently satisfy the LMS SaaS product ownership, five-year LMS industry experience, or three-year comparable K-12 client requirements set forth in RFP Section 4.9.1.

A qualified LMS SaaS provider meeting the requirements of Section 4.9.1 may serve as the CONTRACTOR and subcontract specialized professional services (including, but not limited to, implementation, integration, migration, training, help desk, or managed services) to a third-party services firm that does not independently own or control an LMS SaaS product.

However, the CONTRACTOR retains sole and full responsibility and legal liability for the completion of all tasks, quality of work product, cybersecurity compliance, and performance of all subcontractors under the Contract. Refer to RFP Section 4.10, Subcontractors.

Q14: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 / 4.12 - Please provide the approximate number of active and historical Canvas courses/course shells, total enrollments, approximate content/data volume, and major content types expected to be migrated. If available, please provide the approximate distribution among K-12 classroom instruction, Hawaii Online Courses/HVLN, and professional development.

A14: See response to Question 6 for estimated course volume figures and package export formats. The STATE will not be migrating historical student enrollment records, student submission data, or past gradebook logs from Canvas. All active student, teacher, and administrator user accounts and current-term course enrollments for the July 1, 2027 production launch will be provisioned fresh via automated integration with the STATE's systems.

Q15: RFP Reference 3.1.2 / 3.1.3.3 - Please identify the current integrations, LTI tools, APIs, plug-ins, custom interfaces, and third-party applications associated with the existing Canvas environment that the STATE expects the Contractor to migrate, replace, reconfigure, or otherwise support. Please identify any material custom-developed integrations.

A15: The STATE's existing Canvas environment utilizes the following LTI tools, API integrations, and custom front-end scripts that the CONTRACTOR will be expected to support, reconfigure, and/or replicate equivalent functionality for in the new LMS environment:

1. The current active LTI tool registry includes, but is not limited to:
 - Content and Publisher Tools: AWS GetIT, Access Pearson, CodeHS, CourseKata, Discovery Education, EBSCO, FluencyLink, HKPropel, Pivot Interactives
 - Interactive Learning Tools: Canva, Lucid, Padlet, Quizziz, Screencastify
 - Virtual Classroom: Cisco Webex, Google Meet
 - Educational AI Tools: Khanmigo, SchoolAI

CONTRACTOR is expected to support LTI 1.3 / LTI Advantage standards to enable re-configuration and single sign-on linking for these tools.

2. API Integrations and Middleware:
 - Edlink (integration middleware)

- Genius SIS (Hawaii Online Courses registration/SIS sync)
 - Learnsoft (Professional Development credit/enrollment sync)
 - Infinite Campus (Automated nightly flat-file batch ingestion for core K-12 SIS rostering; see response to Question 7)
3. Custom Front-End User Interface (UI) Enhancements (JavaScript and CSS):
The existing environment includes custom JS/CSS scripts to enhance the native user experience. Offerors should provide capability (via custom themes, UI hooks, CSS/JS overrides, or native platform functionality) to support similar visual/functional features, including:
- Displaying semester grading on the course grades page
 - Displaying section rosters for a single class
 - Displaying ungraded assignments on the course home page
 - Displaying cross-course student grades on the main course home page

Offerors shall include all technical, implementation, and support costs associated with supporting these integrations and UI capabilities within their Price Proposal (Refer to RFP Section 4.12).

Q16: RFP Reference 2.1 - Please describe the primary functional, technical, operational, or contractual gaps in the current LMS that are driving the replacement procurement, to the extent the STATE can provide that information.

A16: The STATE is conducting this procurement due to the upcoming expiration of the current LMS contract. This solicitation allows the STATE to conduct due diligence across the market and evaluate modern enterprise K-12 LMS solutions against the STATE's updated technical, security, and pedagogical requirements detailed in RFP Section 2.1, Purpose and Introduction, and RFP Section 2.2, Business Goals and Objectives.

Key drivers and enhanced functional/technical requirements under this solicitation include:

- Data Security and Student Privacy Governance: Strict compliance with State and Federal student data privacy standards (including FERPA), mandatory US-only data hosting, storage, and backups, and alignment with NIST / ISO 27001 cybersecurity frameworks (RFP Section 3.1.4, Security and Data Management).
- WCAG Accessibility Compliance: Full adherence to Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.1 and 2.2, Level AA) standards (RFP Section 2.1, Purpose and Introduction).
- Generative AI Governance: Built-in K-12 data privacy guardrails, 'Human-in-the-Loop' teacher approval workflows, and role-based administrative toggles (RFP Section 3.1.2.3.10 through 3.1.2.3.14).

Q17: Regarding System Load and Active Users: Section 3.1.1.5.3 mentions scaling from 5,000 to 150,000 active users. Can the STATE provide average and peak concurrent user counts (i.e., users logged in and actively taking assessments at the exact same minute) during peak school hours?

A17: See response to Question 3.

Q18: For the prior contract with Instructure, Inc., how many users were on that contract performance?

A18: Under the current contract, the contracted user performance levels were 10,000 users per year for Contract Years 1 through 4, and 5,000 users for Contract Year 5.

Q19: Regarding Help Desk Support Tiers: Section 3.1.3.2.2 states that the Contractor's system administrator will function as the STATE help desk for participants and teachers. Does the STATE require Tier 1 support (direct end-user support for all students and teachers), or is the STATE open to a Tier 2/3 model where the Contractor supports designated STATE/District administrators who manage internal Tier 1 requests?

A19: The STATE requires the CONTRACTOR to provide direct Tier 1 end-user technical support for all teachers enrolled in or teaching courses within the LMS. Tier 1 end-user support is not required for students. However, the CONTRACTOR must provide Tier 2/3 technical escalation

support for designated STATE and LMS administrators to resolve system-level outages, LTI tool configurations, data integration errors, and complex platform troubleshooting. Refer to changes made in PART I herein.

Q20: Regarding Offshore Personnel: Section 3.1.3.2.2 specifies that the system administrator must be located in the United States, and Section 3.1.4.2.2.2 requires all data to reside in the US. Are technical team members or software developers located outside the US permitted to work on system maintenance or development, provided they do not store or access protected student data outside the US?

A20: General core product software development and maintenance conducted on global vendor codebases (where no STATE data, staging instances, or STATE network paths are accessed or involved) is permitted. Any direct access, administration, troubleshooting, or maintenance performed on or within the STATE's hosted LMS production or staging environment must be conducted strictly by US-based personnel.

Q21: Could you please provide the expected number of active users/licenses at launch and at peak usage?

A21: See response to Question 3.

Q22: How many courses and how many years of historical data are expected to be migrated from the current Canvas LMS?

A22: See response to Question 6.

Q23: Who will be the State's primary business owner and system owner for the LMS?

A23: The Office of Curriculum and Instructional Design (OCID) serves as the primary Business Owner and System Owner responsible for overall LMS administration, instructional policy, courseware standards, and program management.

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as a key technical consulting body providing oversight for cybersecurity compliance, technology standards, and coordination for enterprise IT integrations, which includes, but is not limited to, SIS, SSO, and state network security.

Q24: What are the main challenges or limitations with the current Canvas LMS that the State is seeking to address through this new solution?

A24: See response to Question 16.

Q25: Could you please clarify the State's target go-live date and overall rollout approach for the new LMS?

A25: Full production performance under the Contract commences on July 1, 2027, for the start of the 2027–2028 school year. Refer to RFP Section 1.18.1, Contract Term.

Following Contract Execution (estimated February 2027), the CONTRACTOR will immediately commence implementation activities, including system configuration, SIS/SSO integrations, course content/media migration, staging/testing, and administrator/teacher training. All master course shells, integrated LTI tools, and automated enrollment synchronization interfaces must be fully tested, validated, and operational prior to July 1, 2027, to ensure a seamless transition for the 2027–2028 academic year.

Q26: Who will be the designated State project manager and primary implementation lead for this project?

A26: Overall contract administration and administrative oversight will be managed by the Contract Administrator, or their successor. Refer to RFP Appendix C, Section 1, Contract Administrator.

Q27: How many State team members are expected to be involved in the implementation and ongoing administration of the LMS?

A27: The STATE core LMS implementation team will consist of approximately 4 to 5 team members responsible for project management, functional configuration, course content migration review, staging, testing, and training coordination.

Additionally, State IT staff will be consulted and engaged as needed to facilitate Single Sign-On (SSO) configuration via Microsoft Azure AD and data integration setups with Department enterprise systems (including Infinite Campus roster data file exchanges, Learnsoft, and Genius SIS).

Q28: How many team members will be involved in creating and managing course content?

A28: At the administrative level, approximately 8 to 10 core staff members manage master course shells, course templates, and statewide digital curriculum from the system backend. Additionally, all instructors enrolled in the platform have course-level content creation, modification, and management capabilities within their individual assigned courses.

Q29: Are there any external authoring tools currently being used that the new LMS should support or integrate with?

A29: The STATE does not use a specific proprietary external authoring suite. However, the LMS must natively support the ingestion, execution, tracking, and grade-passback of content created in external authoring software that exports to standard IMS Common Cartridge and SCORM package formats without requiring third-party player wrappers. Refer to RFP Section 3.1.2.2.3 and Section 3.1.2.2.4.

Additionally, the LMS must support LTI 1.3 Advantage standards to maintain seamless integration with content creation and collaboration platforms currently in use. See response to Question 15.

Q30: Are there specific language requirements beyond the translation and text-to-speech capabilities outlined in the RFP?

A30: There are no specific additional language requirements beyond the capabilities outlined in RFP Section 3.1.2.2.8 (translation support for English Language Learners and English Speakers of Other Languages) and RFP Section 3.1.2.2.9 (text-to-speech language capabilities), as well as WCAG 2.1 and 2.2, Level AA accessibility standards (RFP Section 2.1).

Offerors shall describe their system's native multi-language translation capabilities, interface localization options, and integrated text-to-speech features designed to support English Language Learners (ELL) and diverse student populations.

Q31: Is the State expecting the selected vendor to provide any pre-built content or content libraries? If yes, could you please specify the preferred topics or subject areas?

A31: No. The STATE does not expect or require the CONTRACTOR to supply pre-built courseware, digital curriculum, or proprietary content libraries as part of the LMS platform licensing or implementation. However, the LMS must support standard LTI 1.3 / LTI Advantage protocols to seamlessly integrate with the Department's existing content providers. See response to Question 15.

Q32: Are there any additional integrations, communication tools, or document management systems that the LMS will need to integrate with beyond those identified in the RFP?

A32: The Department utilizes existing enterprise collaboration, communication, and document management platforms that interoperate with the LMS via standard LTI 1.3 / LTI Advantage protocols. See response to Questions 15, 16, and 29.

Q33: Could you please provide the anticipated budget or budget range for this LMS project, if available?

A33: See response to Question 2.

Q34: For Sections 3.2.1 and 4.9.1, how will the STATE determine whether a K-12 client is "equivalent" or "similar in size"—total enrollment, active LMS users, concurrent users, number of schools, course volume, or another measure—and must one client independently satisfy the entire three-year requirement?

A34: See response to Question 4.

Experience serving large K-12 school districts or state educational entities meeting the 5,000+ active user threshold for at least three (3) years satisfies the Offeror's experience requirement. Offeror must have provided similar services for K-12 educational institution(s) for at least three (3) years. Refer to RFP Section 3.2.1 and RFP Section 4.9.1.

Q35: Please confirm whether every requirement in Section 3.1, including each System Feature Requirement, is a mandatory pass/fail condition or whether the STATE will award proportional points based on degree of compliance; how will capabilities scheduled for delivery before production go-live be evaluated?

A35: See response to Questions 9, 25, and 55.
The Evaluation Committee will score technical proposals objectively in accordance with the evaluation criteria and point allocations set forth in RFP Section 5.2, Evaluation Criteria. Points will be awarded proportionally based on the degree to which the proposed LMS solution satisfies the functional, technical, security, and administrative requirements specified in Section 3.1, Scope of Work.

Features scheduled for release during the pre-launch implementation window (February 2027 – June 30, 2027, per Question 9) will be evaluated based on the Offeror's documented product roadmap, release schedule, development track record, and implementation risk.

Q36: Please provide the expected number of active students, instructors, administrators, and courses for each contract year, the anticipated peak concurrent-user load, and whether the 150,000-active-user figure is the evaluated licensing quantity or only a scalability requirement.

A36: See response to Question 3. The 150,000-active-user figure is a scalability requirement.

Q37: Please provide the current Canvas migration inventory, including the number of active and archived courses, total storage, assessment-item volume, historical grade and activity data, multimedia content, custom integrations, and any content that may be excluded from migration, together with the STATE's migration acceptance criteria.

A37: See response to Questions 6 and 14.

Q38: Please clarify the expected operating hours, support channels, historical ticket volumes, severity definitions, and resolution SLAs for the dedicated administrator/help desk, and identify the required implementation, parallel-operation, and production-acceptance milestones between contract execution and full service commencement on July 1, 2027.

A38: See response to Questions 9, 19, 25, and 61.
Historical ticket volume data is not published. Incident severity definitions are standard as follows: Severity 1 Critical Outage, Severity 2 Major Impact, Severity 3 Minor Issue. Resolution SLAs are governed by the RFP specifications (e.g., one (1)-hour incident notification per RFP Section 3.1.1.5.8) and the Offeror's proposal.

The finalized baseline project schedule and milestone cutoffs will be collaboratively reviewed and approved by OCID and the CONTRACTOR following contract execution.

Q39: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 - As of a recent date, how many active Canvas courses currently exist across the STATE's instance, and how many additional archived/inactive courses (if any) are also expected to be migrated under "migration of all of the existing STATE courses"?

A39: See response to Question 6.

Q40: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 - What is the estimated total volume of course content to be migrated (e.g., total storage in GB/TB across all courses, including embedded files, images, and video), and is there a rough average course size the STATE can share?

A40: See response to Questions 6 and 14.

Q41: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 - Please describe the range of course complexity in the current environment — for example, the number of modules/content items in a typical course versus the largest or most content-heavy courses — so Offerors can size the migration effort accurately.

A41: See response to Question 6.

Course Complexity and File Size Metrics:

- Typical Course - Contains 4 to 6 modules with standard lesson pages, assignments, quizzes, and embedded content links.
- Content-Heavy / Large Course - Contains 15 or more modules with course file sizes averaging up to approximately 1 GB.

Q42: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 / 3.1.2.4.11 - Is any course media currently hosted in Canvas Studio or another third-party video/media platform integrated with Canvas? If so, is migrating those media assets (not just the course shell) within the scope of “migrate all courses and content”?

A42: Yes. Course video assets are currently hosted and managed using Canvas Studio, which is integrated into the existing Canvas LMS environment.

The migration of instructor-created course media assets, video lectures, and embedded instructional media hosted within Canvas Studio is within the scope of 'migrate all courses and content'. Refer to changes made to RFP Section 3.1.3.4 in PART I herein.

The CONTRACTOR is expected to support the extraction, transfer, and relinking of these instructional media assets (or provision an equivalent LTI-integrated media repository solution) so that embedded course video links function seamlessly within the new LMS environment. However, historical student-submitted video recordings or student assignment response media stored in Canvas Studio are excluded from migration. See response to Question 14.

Q43: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 - Does “migrate all of the existing STATE courses” include historical student enrollment, gradebook, and submission data, or is it limited to course structure and content (with current-term enrollments provisioned fresh in the new LMS)?

A43: See response to Question 14.

Q44: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 / 2.2 - Can the STATE confirm the number of Districts, Complex Areas, and school campuses in scope for this implementation, and indicate whether Canvas is currently in active use at all of them, or whether there are campuses/programs not currently on Canvas that would be onboarded as net-new (rather than migrated) once the new LMS is implemented?

A44: The STATE operates as a single unified State Educational Agency (SEA) / Local Educational Agency (LEA) consisting of 15 Complex Areas. Canvas is not currently utilized across all Complex Areas or schools statewide. In addition to the online programs, there are 14 active schools utilizing Canvas across varying levels of implementation (ranging from individual teacher adoption to broader school-wide use).

Schools and special programs may be onboarded to as new implementations at any time throughout the school year. Additionally, non-Canvas schools or new programs adopting the LMS may require course migration and onboarding support for the subsequent school year. Offerors should account for flexible onboarding workflows and ongoing course migration support within their implementation approach.

Q45: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 - How many distinct Canvas sub-accounts (or equivalent organizational divisions) exist in the current instance today - for example, one per District, one per Complex Area, or another structure - to help ensure the proposed LMS organizational hierarchy maps cleanly to the STATE's existing course organization?

A45: The STATE operates a single statewide LMS instance with a nested sub-account hierarchy structured as follows:

- Separate top-level sub-account are maintained for Master Courses, Migrated Courses and Professional Development.

- o Under Master Courses: statewide programs, including Hawaii Online Courses, State Distance Learning Program, and Hawaii Online Teaching
 - The sub-account for Hawaii Online Teaching serves as the primary organizational parent for school and complex area operations.
 - Child sub-accounts exist for each Complex Area.
 - Under each Complex Area, sub-sub-accounts are partitioned by educational level (Elementary and Secondary).
 - Individual schools under their respective Elementary or Secondary umbrella.

Q46: RFP Reference 3.1.2.1.6 / 3.1.2.2.10 - Beyond the integrations already named in the RFP — Infinite Campus, Learnsoft, HOC SIS (Genius), Microsoft Azure Active Directory/Entra ID, Clever, Google Workspace, and Cisco Webex/Google Meet - are there other third-party tools or LTI integrations currently connected to Canvas that the STATE expects the new LMS to preserve after migration?

A46: See response to Question 15 for a comprehensive inventory of all active LTI tools, API middleware, and custom user interface enhancements currently integrated with Canvas that the CONTRACTOR is expected to support, reconfigure, and/or replicate.

Q47: RFP Reference 3.1.3.3 / 1.18.1 - Does the STATE have a preferred migration/cutover approach in mind — for example, a single cutover, a phased rollout by District or Complex Area, or a parallel-run period — and is there a target completion date for full migration relative to the July 1, 2027 full-performance start date?

A47: See response to Question 25.

Q48: RFP Reference 3.1.1.5.3 - RFP Section 3.1.1.5.3 references the system scaling “from 5,000 active users to 150,000 active users.” Can the STATE confirm whether current active LMS usage is closer to the lower or upper end of that range, and whether 150,000 represents total potential enrollment or an active/concurrent usage projection?

A48: See response to Question 3.

Q49: RFP Reference 2.2.E / 3.1 - Can the STATE describe the number and structure of its Districts and Complex Areas, and indicate whether there's an architectural preference for how these should be organized within the LMS (e.g., a separate top-level environment per District versus a single unified environment with nested organizational structure), or is this open to Offeror recommendation?

A49: The STATE operates as a single unified SEA/LEA consisting of 15 Complex Areas. The STATE requires a single unified statewide LMS instance with a nested organizational sub-account hierarchy (rather than separate, isolated top-level environments).
See response to Question 45. This single-instance architecture maps cleanly to the Department's operational structure. A unified, single-instance architecture is required to ensure consistent statewide LTI tool configurations, centralized data governance, shared master course templates, and seamless student enrollments while maintaining role-based administrative permissions at the Complex Area and school levels.

Q50: RFP Reference 3.1.2.2.10 / 3.1.4.1.10 - Are the STATE's core identity and roster integrations - Infinite Campus, Azure Active Directory/Entra ID, and Google Workspace for Education (@k12.hi.us) - provisioned as a single statewide instance, or are there separate instances/configurations maintained per District?

A50: All core enterprise systems, including Infinite Campus SIS, Microsoft Azure Active Directory, and Google Workspace will be configured and managed at the single statewide root instance level.

Q51: RFP Reference 3.1.2.1.6 / 3.1.2.2.10 - For the required Learnsoft “simultaneous enroll/unenroll” synchronization, can the STATE confirm the specific data elements in scope - for example, course-completion status only, or also professional-development credit-hour values?

A51: Course completion and grade passback between the LMS and Learnsoft (the Department's Professional Development system of record) is managed via an automated nightly batch pipeline:

1. A scheduled job executes nightly to trigger the passback pipeline for active Learnsoft PD courses.
2. The pipeline utilizes REST and GraphQL APIs to query the LMS for published assignments, student roster data, submission completion states, and current/final course grades.
3. The system checks that a participant has submitted and completed all required assignments in the course shell.
4. For all completed enrollments, the pipeline generates a standardized CSV file (sis_course_id, sis_user_id, completed, current_score, final_score) and transmits it via secure SFTP to Learnsoft to update official employee PD credit hours.

The proposed LMS must support robust REST/GraphQL APIs or standard automated SFTP export capabilities allowing the Department to query assignment submission states, roster IDs, and final scores to maintain this automated completion passback workflow.

Q52: RFP Reference 3.1.2.1.6 - Is the intent for Learnsoft to remain the system of record for professional-development training and credit-hour data, with the new LMS interoperating via the required enroll/unenroll synchronization (Section 3.1.2.1.6)? If so, does the STATE anticipate any reporting or export capability from the LMS to support downstream use of that data?

A52: Yes. Learnsoft remains the official system of record for all Department professional development (PD) training records, employee transcripts, and official credit-hour tracking. The LMS functions as an online and blended instructional delivery environment for PD courses. In accordance with Section 3.1.2.1.6 and response to Question 51, the LMS interoperates with Learnsoft via automated enrollment synchronization (enrollment/unenrollment) and automated completion passback.

The STATE requires the LMS to provide built-in administrative reporting, dashboard analytics, and configurable data export capabilities (e.g., CSV/JSON exports or direct data access APIs) to support downstream reporting on participant progress, assignment completion rates, and course activity.

Q53: The RFP identifies Canvas as the Department's current LMS. Is the Department seeking to replace Canvas, or will proposals offering continuation of the existing Canvas environment also be considered?

A53: See response to Question 5.
Proposals offering the continuation of the existing Canvas LMS will be considered alongside proposals for alternative LMS platforms.

Q54: Canvas is a mature and widely adopted enterprise LMS. Considering the substantial migration, integration, retraining, and change-management effort associated with replacing the incumbent platform, could the Department identify the specific capabilities, service improvements, operational benefits, or financial advantages it seeks that are not adequately provided by its current Canvas environment? Which of these improvements would the Department consider sufficiently material to justify transitioning to a replacement LMS?

A54: See response to Question 16.

Q55: If the incumbent LMS is proposed, it may not require a comparable platform migration, rebuilding of integrations, retraining, or organizational transition. How does the Department intend to account for this material difference when evaluating incumbent and replacement solutions?

A55: All proposals will be evaluated fairly, objectively, and impartially in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section 5.2, Evaluation Criteria.

Offerors are required to submit a comprehensive Price Proposal covering all tasks described in the scope of work, which includes, but is not limited to, initial setup, implementation, data migration, licensing, maintenance, and support costs. Price Proposal scoring is calculated using the objective mathematical formula in RFP Section 5.2, Evaluation Criteria, based on the firm

total 5-year proposed price submitted by each Offeror. The price proposal is worth approximately 5.6% of the total evaluation points.

The Evaluation Committee will utilize the evaluation criteria in RFP Section 5.2 to score each proposal independently based on its demonstrated capabilities, quality, and feasibility. This includes General Requirements, System Features, Professional Support Services and Training, Security and Data Management, and Offeror Qualifications. Implementation timelines, risk management plans, migration strategies, and training methodologies will be evaluated based on the merit and completeness of the written proposal.

Q56: Section 3.1.1.5.3 requires the solution to expand from 5,000 to 150,000 active users. Could the Department define “active users” and provide the estimated number of registered or licensed users by user category for each contract year, together with the anticipated peak number of simultaneously connected users?

A56: See response to Question 3.

Q57: Section 3.1.3.3 requires migration of all existing STATE courses and content from Canvas. Could the STATE provide the number of courses to be migrated, categorized where possible by type and status; the approximate total volume of associated files and data; and clarify whether historical learner records must also be migrated and, if so, which categories and how many years?

A57: See response to Questions 6 and 14.

Q58: Must all required courses, content, files, and historical data be migrated, validated, and operational in the replacement LMS by July 1, 2027, or may the selected contractor propose a phased migration based on priority, usage, complexity, and actual migration volume?

A58: See response to Question 25.

Q59: May the designated U.S.-based system administrator perform routine administration, initial troubleshooting, coordination, and escalation while qualified technical personnel located outside the United States provide advanced support, integrations, upgrades, maintenance, and complex troubleshooting? If so, does Section 3.1.4.2.2.2 permit those personnel to access the U.S.-hosted environment remotely, provided that no STATE data is downloaded, stored, or transferred outside the United States and all required security controls are maintained?

A59: See response to Question 20.

Q60: Does “dedicated remote LMS system administrator” require a full-time individual assigned exclusively to the STATE, or may the Contractor designate a named U.S.-based administrator who remains accountable for the STATE’s environment while being supported by a broader technical team?

A60: The CONTRACTOR shall provide a dedicated U.S.-based system administrator who remains primarily accountable for the STATE’s environment. The system administrator may be supported by a broader technical support team. Refer to changes made in PART I herein.

Q61: Section 3.1.3.2.2.3 states that the system administrator will function as the STATE help desk for participants enrolled in and teaching courses. Could the STATE clarify the required support tiers, covered user populations, communication channels, and anticipated monthly support volume?

A61: The CONTRACTOR is not required to provide direct Tier 1 help desk support to students, parents, or course participants.

The CONTRACTOR Help Desk and Technical Support shall:

- Provides direct Tier 1 end-user technical support for approximately 250 teachers/instructors across active implementation sites.
- Provides Tier 2 and Tier 3 technical support for designated STATE and District System Administrators to resolve core platform issues, LTI tool configurations, API/SFTP integration sync errors, user permissions, and complex system troubleshooting.

- Direct help desk support for teachers and technical escalation support for system administrators must be accessible via phone, web portal, and email during Hawaii Standard Time (HST) business hours.

Refer to changes made in PART I herein.

Q62: For the required interfaces with Infinite Campus, Learnsoft, Genius, Microsoft Entra ID, Google Workspace, and Clever, will the STATE provide its existing system licenses, vendor-side API access, and connectors, or must the offeror include any additional third-party connector, API, transaction, and recurring integration fees in its proposed price?

A62: See response to Questions 7, 15, and 50.

The STATE provides and maintains all existing enterprise system licenses, vendor-side API access, SFTP drop locations, and SSO configurations for Infinite Campus SIS, Learnsoft, Genius SIS, Microsoft Azure Active Directory, Google Workspace, and Clever. Offerors do not need to include third-party software licensing, transaction, or recurring integration fees for these Department-owned enterprise systems in their proposed price.

Q63: Section 3.1.1.5.10 requires the Contractor to provide the latest backups and data necessary for the STATE to continue the service at a STATE site at any time and at no additional cost. Does this require a deployable copy of the LMS application and related software, or only the STATE's data and content in a documented, usable format? Could the STATE specify the required format and delivery method?

A63: The requirements under Section 3.1.1.5.10 depend on the specific operational context:

1. Disaster Recovery and Emergency Operational Continuity (System Outage):

If the primary hosted SaaS environment experiences a catastrophic outage or service disruption, the STATE requires disaster recovery protocols and a deployable/restorable copy of the LMS application environment and software configurations to ensure operational continuity in with Section 3.1.1.5.7.

2. Backup Retention, Transition and Contract Termination:

For ongoing data backup, archiving, or contract transition/termination (Section 3.1.4.2.2.6), the CONTRACTOR is not required to transfer proprietary application source code, but must provide all STATE data, user records, and instructional content in documented, usable electronic formats at no additional cost.

- Courseware and Instructional Content: Exported in standard 1EdTech IMS Common Cartridge and SCORM package formats (as detailed in response to Questions 6 and 29).
- Instructional Media Assets: Native video, audio, and document formats (e.g., MP4, MP3, PDF, JPEG, PNG) hosted within Canvas Studio or integrated repositories, including full file manifests and link-mapping tables (as detailed in response to Question 52).
- System Data and User Records: Standard structured database export formats (CSV or JSON) containing user account tables, course enrollment structures, assignment metadata, and administrative logs (excluding historical student submission files and past gradebooks per response to Question 14).
- Delivery Protocol: All backup and transition data must be transmitted via secure electronic means (encrypted SFTP or secure cloud storage buckets) within thirty (30) days of contract termination or within seven (7) calendar days of a Department administrator's request (RFP Section 3.1.4.2.2.6).

Q64: May all implementation, configuration, migration coordination, training, and support services be performed remotely, or should offerors include any onsite services or travel to Hawaii in their proposed price? If onsite services are anticipated, could the STATE specify their expected scope and duration?

A64: All professional services under the Contract are expected to be delivered 100% remotely. Onsite presence in Hawaii is not required.

Q65: The RFP specifies K–12 privacy guardrails and administrative controls for any AI toolset but does not define the functional AI capabilities the LMS must provide. Could the STATE identify the specific generative AI functions required at the commencement of full performance and the anticipated usage volumes upon which offerors should base their pricing?

A65: The STATE does not mandate a specific, pre-determined list of proprietary Generative AI functions. Rather, the STATE is interested in reviewing built-in, native AI technologies that may already be available as part of the Offeror's platform to enhance LMS usability and support teachers, students, and administrators.

All proposed or built-in AI functionality must adhere strictly to the governance, security, and privacy specifications set forth in Section 3.1.2.3.10 through Section 3.1.2.3.14.

Offerors shall clearly specify in both their Technical Proposal and Price Proposal whether any built-in AI features are included in the base SaaS platform licensing fee or if optional advanced AI modules carry additional tier-based costs.

Q66: The RFP specifies that the solution must support expansion from 5,000 to 150,000 active users. Can the STATE confirm the anticipated number of licensed users for the initial contract term, including students, instructors, and administrators? Additionally, should pricing be based on total registered users, active users, or another licensing metric?

A66: See response to Question 3.