ADDENDUM NO. 2
TO
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL RFP 03 – 2010/11 WEB CONSULTING SERVICES

The following are the questions we received for the referenced RFP based on the specifications before the mandatory pre-proposal that was held on September 28, 2010. The answers are listed in bold.

1. Do you currently have a CMS, and if so which one?
   No, website is currently maintained by college staff.

2. In this assessment, are you looking to have the vendor evaluate the current site for SEO?
   Yes

3. Has Pensacola State College conducted any market research in the past three years, including perception and image research, and/or research on the brand platform and messaging? If yes, will the chosen vendor have access to the data, analysis and recommendations?
   Not any formal study. We anticipate that the proposals will include this information.

4. What is the long range goal for this assessment? Is a redesign the next step?
   We are looking for a strategy plan with recommendations for future considerations.

5. Does this assessment include a review of the architecture, and does the College want the project to include a new architecture and navigational maps?
   Yes. There should be some site-mapping.

6. Is there a budget range for this project?
   No. There are resources set aside but we are waiting to see what the proposals list.

The following questions and statements are from the pre-proposal meeting and written questions submitted:

7. Who is your audience?
   Students, faculty, staff, and community patrons. We service Escambia and Santa Rosa Counties in Florida. We want to expand our service area to get our message to prospective students from South Alabama to the Mississippi Panhandle with both on site and distance learning courses.

8. Is there any new branding going on?
   Pensacola State College changed its name from Pensacola Junior College on July 1, 2010. We are currently working on a new logo that won’t be available until after the Spring 2011. We will also begin offering our two new Baccalaureate degrees in January 2011. The logo currently being used is temporary and can be found on our website.

9. Are we going to be reviewing user paths and conducting usability testing?
   Yes.

10. Section 4.1 states we need at least three public sector references and preferably higher education within the last three years. We have three similar references but they are not public sector or higher education. Is this desired or required to respond to the RFP and will any points be deducted if we cannot meet this criteria?
    Since this is a preferred, the committee will not be deducting points. Obviously if there is detailed experience the scores will reflect that.
The second question came up on the conference call and it would be to our advantage to state with some detail what each vendor will need to price and estimate by deliverable so we receive what we want to get from the vendor responses. This will allow us to identify a deliverable that will be useful and each vendor can be evaluated on their approach, hours and pricing.

The following are additional key components you will need to address along with the bulleted list in Section 4.0 of the RFP:

A. Provide Search Engine Optimization analysis
B. Provide Architecture and navigational maps
C. Review user paths and conduct usability testing (See Question 9)

Per 5th bullet in Section 4.0, what are the marketing priorities?

Recruit, retain, and graduate students

The following are items that Addendum 1 did not address in the specifications:

Page 1 Section 1.0: Change Original and five (5) copies to Original and six (6) copies; and

Page 2 Section 1.4: Change my email to acjones@pensacolastate.edu.

Page 2 Section 1.6: Change Tab #8 to Tab #7.

Page 8 Section 3.1: Change 9 months to 6 months.

Page 8 Section 4.0 6th Bullet: Add “at a minimum we would like a cursory review of the websites of Virginia College, University of West Florida and Troy University. This is only a minimum so other reviews will be welcomed.

Page 10 Section 5.13 Third Sentence: Delete “in Florida in a multi-campus environment”. We prefer experience in Higher Ed regardless of location.

Page 10 Section 5.2: Move 5.22 to Section 5.1 and make 5.15

Page 10 Section 5.2: Change 5.23 to 5.22

Page 10 Section 5.3: Change Attachment F to Attachment E.

The college would like a price for each of the components that we have asked the proposer to submit. If something cannot be priced independently, because it requires some other task associated with it, then the proposer needs to state that and price the components that have to be done together in order for the project to make sense or move to the logical next step.

All other requirements remain the same.

Angie C. Jones
Director of Purchasing and Auxiliary Services

Please acknowledge and return this addendum with your proposal. If you have already submitted a proposal, please return this addendum, with signed acknowledgment, by the proposal opening deadline, October 20, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. CST. Addendum cannot be faxed or emailed.

ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGED BY:  

FIRM/ENTITY

SIGNATURE OF REPRESENTATIVE: