

**Kent State University Request for Proposals no. 2039 (Training and Compliance Platform)**  
**Vendor Questions and University Answers**

**Vendor 1 of 2**

- 1) What are the primary goals Kent State is trying to achieve with this initiative (e.g., compliance, student engagement, retention, culture change, risk mitigation, etc.)?

Our baseline goals are certainly compliance and risk mitigation. A stretch goal would include culture change.

- 2) Approximately how many required trainings do you anticipate for students versus faculty/staff, and about how many total users would need access within each audience group?

All employees (including student employees) of the university are required to take a state-mandated fraud training. In total, that is about 8,450 people total.

All faculty and staff (~3,400 people) would require access. The only training required for staff and faculty is the state-mandated fraud training.

On the student side, we provide all incoming students prevention education on sexual violence. We are also considering using this platform down the road for hazing prevention to align with Collin's law in Ohio.

- 3) Are you primarily seeking pre-built compliance training content, custom-developed content, or a combination of both?

We would create and upload most of the custom developed content. We do require a system that allows us to upload our own content. And the pre-built compliance sessions need to be based on federal law and, if possible, state law.

- 4) Which training topics are the highest priority for the initial rollout?

On the faculty and staff side, Title IX training, sexual harassment training, and the state-mandated fraud training would be our two top priorities. Other courses that we would want to offer fairly quickly are an anti-hazing, overview of the ADA, bullying, workplace violence, workplace ethics.

For students, sexual and relationship violence prevention, bystander action, hazing prevention (that aligns with Collin's law requirements). Beyond those, may look at alcohol and drug awareness/prevention training. We also have our GA/TA's who complete FERPA and Title IX training. Some student employees (at the health center/ CPM students) and students in certain course (speech therapy) complete HIPAA.

- 5) Are there existing institutional policies, procedures, or materials that should be incorporated into the training content?

In addition to the state mandated fraud training, we do have some KSU-created sessions that we would want in the catalog. The sessions we have focus on FERPA, Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, Emergency Preparedness, and HIPAA.

**Kent State University Request for Proposals no. 2039 (Training and Compliance Platform)**  
**Vendor Questions and University Answers**

Depending on what the topic is, there may be additional institutional policies, procedures, or materials that could supplement the vendor-created content.

- 6) To what extent do you anticipate needing differentiated training content or learning paths by audience, campus, department, or role?

The differentiation would be mainly students vs faculty/staff. There are occasions when smaller groups and teams need to be identified and assigned a course. For example,

- GA/TA's who complete FERPA and Title IX training.
- Some student employees and students in certain courses complete HIPAA
- Incoming students receive prevention education on sexual violence

- 7) Is there an incumbent vendor or existing solution currently being used?

There is. We are still in contract with another vendor and will be through the end of the calendar year.

- 8) Has Kent State already conducted demonstrations or evaluations of any potential replacement solutions?

Not yet. That phase comes after proposals are received and reviewed.

- 9) Is Kent State seeking:
- a fully hosted LMS/platform,
  - training content only,
  - or the flexibility for both delivery models?

We require a hosted LMS platform that allows for the upload, storage, and access of data (accounts, non/completion records, etc). The platform must allow us to upload course content and it would be beneficial for the platform to have a content library of its own.

- 10) What is the desired implementation and launch timeline?

The platform should be launched on January 1, 2027.

- 11) Are there any specific challenges, frustrations, or gaps with the current process or solution that you are hoping to improve?

There are some quirks in our current system when it comes to administration. Some of the processes to set up courses are not intuitive, and reporting could be more robust. A clearer understanding of how initial category structures and system configurations align with the data provided by the University would be beneficial. Additionally, the ability to export Training and Compliance Platform data via API for integration with other institutional reporting data would help support broader reporting and analytics needs.

From the student perspective, it is difficult to pull older data. Once the semester is over, we struggle to run reports of who completed. So being able to run reports based on any date range would be great.

**Kent State University Request for Proposals no. 2039 (Training and Compliance Platform)**  
**Vendor Questions and University Answers**

- 12) From Kent State's perspective, what characteristics or capabilities would differentiate a strong vendor partner in this process?

In addition to having a platform that fits the needs of the university, strong communication and customer service support would differentiate a vendor.

**Vendor 2 of 2**

- 1) If we extend our offer to the IUC-PG group, does this extend to both pricing and terms and conditions? Or will our company have the ability to customize pricing for IUC-PG members on an individual basis?

Extending your contract to the IUC-PG provides an opportunity for other member schools to adopt your contract in lieu of bidding the same service on their own. However, you would customize your contract terms, conditions and pricing with each individual school.

- 2) Faculty and staff training examples includes fraud awareness and prevention. Does this refer to specific state of Ohio required training? Or something different? Can you provide some sample course training titles that would fit into this category?

It does refer to the state-mandated fraud training, specifically. A course that focuses on ethics in a workplace would also potentially fit into this category.

- 3) The EIT form will not allow me to preview the list of questions without answering each question. Can your team please provide a list of questions in the EIT survey so we can best determine who should answer all questions?

You can see the list of questions if you go to the page listed below which is the first page of the survey [https://kent.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8jgrI9pDOKHGQaa](https://kent.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8jgrI9pDOKHGQaa)

- 4) What are the strengths of your current vendor/platform?

Customer service and communication, content quality

- 5) What are the weaknesses of your current vendor/platform?

The process for course set up and administration is not always intuitive.

- 6) The RFP references Executive Order 2019-12D and indicates that services may not be performed outside the United States. In a multi-tenant SaaS environment, where:
- all customer data is stored and maintained within the United States,
  - cloud infrastructure and platform operations are centrally managed, and
  - limited offshore personnel may support platform operations under strict security and
  - access controls, without being specifically assigned to the University's account, and
  - where the Vendor remains fully responsible for all services delivered under the contract,

can the University confirm that this delivery model is acceptable?

**Kent State University Request for Proposals no. 2039 (Training and Compliance Platform)**  
**Vendor Questions and University Answers**

As long as the company is based/headquartered in the United States, this is acceptable.

- 7) The proposed solution is typically provided as an annual subscription service, invoiced and payable at the beginning of each contract year. Can the University confirm whether this pricing and payment structure is acceptable?

Consideration will be given for all proposed pricing and subscription structures.

- 8) In addition, in the event of termination for convenience, does the University intend for prepaid subscription fees to be treated as non-refundable, except in cases of termination for cause?

This will be considered a point of negotiation through the University's Office of General Counsel at the contracting phase should your company be selected.

- 9) Does the University anticipate incorporating the Vendor's standard terms of use or SaaS agreement into any final contract, particularly with respect to platform access, licensing, service delivery, and related commercial terms?

The vendor's standard terms will be reviewed by the University's Office of General Counsel and negotiation may be required for those terms to be compliant with University policy and State of Ohio law, then incorporated into a University contract.

- 10) The proposed solution is typically provided under a non-exclusive, non-transferable license for internal institutional use. Can the University confirm whether this licensing model is acceptable?

Consideration will be given for all proposed license structures.

- 11) Does the University intend to store or process protected health information (PHI) or other regulated sensitive data within the platform? If so, can the University provide additional details regarding scope and compliance expectations (e.g., HIPAA, FERPA alignment)?

We do not plan on storing protected health information on this platform.

- 12) The RFP includes requirements related to PCI-DSS compliance in the event that the proposed solution involves processing payment card transactions. Can the University confirm whether PCI-DSS requirements would apply only if the Vendor's solution directly processes, transmits, or stores payment card data?

Correct, PCI-DSS only applies to systems involved in processing payment card transactions. There would not be a need for payment processing in this platform so PCI-DSS would not be applicable.

- 13) If the proposed solution does not involve payment processing or access to cardholder data, can the University confirm that PCI-related requirements would not be applicable?

See #12 above

- 14) Does the University anticipate including commercially standard limitations on liability and indemnification in the final agreement? Specifically, would the University consider: a reasonable cap on liability based on a multiple of fees paid (e.g., preceding 12 months), and

**Kent State University Request for Proposals no. 2039 (Training and Compliance Platform)**  
**Vendor Questions and University Answers**

standard exclusions (e.g., intellectual property infringement, fraud, gross negligence, or willful misconduct)?

Such terms will be reviewed by the University's Office of General Counsel and negotiation may be required for those terms to be compliant with University policy and State of Ohio law, then incorporated into a University contract.

- 15) The RFP requests vendors to provide service level agreements (SLAs) and support models. Can the University confirm whether there are any minimum uptime or performance requirements vendors are expected to meet, or should vendors propose their standard SLA terms for evaluation?

Standard SLA terms may be submitted. Any deviation from this will be considered negotiable.

- 16) The RFP includes audit provisions related to Vendor performance and compliance. Can the University clarify whether audit access would be limited to:
- books and records directly related to the final agreement, and
  - documentation reasonably necessary to validate compliance,

rather than broad access to systems or unrelated data?

Consideration will be given by the University's offices of General Counsel and Internal Audit as appropriate.

- 17) The RFP requires accessibility compliance and requests a VPAT. Can the University confirm: the required level of WCAG compliance (e.g., WCAG 2.1 AA), and whether a current VPAT is sufficient for evaluation, or if additional testing or certification is required?

The requirement is WCAG 2.1, Level AA and must be in place by April 26, 2027, at the latest. Whether or not the VPAT alone is sufficient really depends on the type and scope of the product, but a VPAT is our standard starting point for accessibility reviews of technology products.

- 18) The RFP requests that vendors describe how institutional data will be returned upon termination. Are there specific requirements regarding data format, delivery method, or retention timelines that vendors are expected to meet?

The University does not currently have specific requirements regarding data format, delivery method, or retention timelines for returned institutional data. Vendors are encouraged to describe their standard offboarding and data return process, including available export formats, delivery methods, retention timelines, and any additional costs associated with these services.

- 19) Additionally, can the University clarify whether transition-related obligations would require the Vendor to provide technical assistance to, or disclose proprietary or confidential information (including platform architecture, source code, or security controls) to the University or any third parties beyond what is reasonably necessary to support data transfer and contractual compliance?

The University's expectation is limited to reasonable transition support necessary to facilitate the secure return, extraction, and migration of institutional data in a usable format upon contract termination or expiration. The University is not requesting disclosure of proprietary source code,

**Kent State University Request for Proposals no. 2039 (Training and Compliance Platform)**  
**Vendor Questions and University Answers**

trade secrets, confidential platform architecture, or detailed security controls except as reasonably necessary to support agreed-upon transition services and contractual obligations.

- 20) The RFP requires integration with Banner and API capabilities. Can the University provide additional detail on:
- expected integration scope with Banner,
  - whether middleware is in use, and
  - preferred data exchange methods (API, batch, etc.)?

The University anticipates integration with Banner primarily for user and organizational data management, including user provisioning, affiliation and department data, authentication support, training assignment, and reporting. We do use middleware. Our middleware is custom, using HTTP REST. Our platform is Microsoft Azure with a Microsoft API Gateway and Entra ID. We prefer API, using our custom middleware or Ellucian Ethos. Batch is available for vendors that do not support APIs or when real-time support is not necessary

- 21) The RFP requires both vendor-provided content and the ability to upload institutional content. What proportion of training is expected to be vendor-provided versus institution-developed content?

We have some institution-developed content (5 courses) and state-developed content (1 course). The majority would be vendor-provided.

- 22) Are there specific content areas that must be vendor-provided?

On the faculty and staff side, Title IX training/sexual violence prevention training and anti-hazing (Collin's law). It would be nice to have content on the American with Disabilities Act, bullying, workplace violence, workplace ethics.

For students, sexual and relationship violence prevention, bystander action, hazing prevention (that aligns with Collin's law requirements). Beyond those, may look at alcohol and drug awareness/prevention training.

We also have our GA/TA's who complete FERPA and Title IX training. Some student employees (at the health center/ CPM students) and students in certain course (speech therapy) complete HIPAA.

*(End of list.)*