**SOUTHWEST TENNESSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) 26-0001**

ON-DEMAND LEARNING CONTENT

PRE-PROPOSAL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

FINAL QUESTIONS DEADLINE: 10/16/2025

**Proposers Invited (at Proposer’s Request)**:

1. **Trainery HCM One** – **Terrica Nelson**, Operations & Platform Manager, [terrica@trainery.one](mailto:terrica@trainery.one) 800-397-5215 ext. 1134
2. **OpenSesame** – **Tyler Elliott**, Senior Customer Success Manager [tyler.elliott@opensesame.com](mailto:tyler.elliott@opensesame.com) 503-673-6982

&

**LaRonda Mays-Soles**, Customer Success Manager, [Laronda.mayssoles@opensesame.com](mailto:Laronda.mayssoles@opensesame.com) 971-253-7360

1. **Cegos** – **George Dickinson**, International Learning Consultant, [george@cegos.us](mailto:george@cegos.us),

**Cody Rowland** - [Cody@cegos.us](mailto:Cody@cegos.us) & **Courtney Mainwaring** courtney@cegos.us

**Important RFP Notes:**

* Proposal Form and Delivery instructions are provided in RFP Section 3.1.
  + Proposers may submit either electronically or hard copy.
  + Electronic submission of Proposals *and* Client References will be accepted via email to: [purchasing@southwest.tn.edu](mailto:purchasing@southwest.tn.edu)
  + Client Refences sent electronically must be received directly from the Client providing the reference.
* Dates and times are found in RFP Section 2, Schedule of Events. Proposals must be received no later than 2:00 pm CT on November 4, 2025. Late Proposals cannot be accepted and shall be rejected as non-responsive.
* Attention is called to the checklist in Attachment 6.15 (i.e., Proposer Checklist for Prevention of Common Mistakes that lead to Proposal Rejection). The checklist is not meant to be an all-inclusive list of requirements, but rather, a listing of the most frequently overlooked items resulting in rejection. All mandatory requirements are firm. Proposers that fail to provide or satisfy all mandatory requirements, *in the format specified in the RFP*, will be cause for Proposal rejection.

**RFP Corrections:**

Section B.12 – This Section references Attachment 6.7 in error. The correct Attachment that should be referenced is Attachment 6.8.

**Proposer Questions:**

Question #1: Can you clarify whether the College prefers full-catalog access pricing (unlimited titles) or a curated selection across specific domains such as compliance, professional development, and leadership?

Response: Per the RFP, the College is seeking a broad, regularly updated, catalog across topics to ensure managers can assign just-in-time learning aligned to employee’s performance goals and the College’s leadership programs.

Question #2: Should proposals include pricing for both individual seat licenses and site-wide access options?

Response: Proposers are to include its pricing proposal in accordance with Attachment 6.6.

Question #3: Does the College wish to include Spanish-language or bilingual courses as part of the proposed catalog?

Response: Per Section C.2.5, language packs for course curation should include both English and Spanish, but Spanish-language or bilingual courses are not required.

Question #4: Should usage and completion data be managed entirely through Bridge’s reporting, or should vendors provide supplemental analytics dashboards or CSV exports?

Response: The College expects that Bridge’s, or the current LMS platform, built-in reporting will manage the core usage and completion data for all training, whether delivered in person, via internally built courses, or via integrated external content. That ensures consistent operational visibility across the College’s full learning ecosystem.

However, for business planning and strategic decision making, the Proposer should also deliver user-level dashboards or data exports (e.g. CSV, API) that allows the College to map analytics back to known users, not just anonymized or random user IDs. Ideally, these dashboards should support filtering and segmentation by user attributes (e.g. department, role, location) so the College can identify specific individuals or cohorts needing support or intervention.

Question #5: How frequently does the College expect new or updated content to be added to the licensed library during the contract term (e.g., quarterly refresh, annual update)?

Response: Proposer’s Response must include its frequency for new and updated content as well as the ability for the College to request new content.

Question #6: Is the College open to multi-year pricing (one-year base with four optional renewals) reflecting cost efficiency over time?

Response: Through this RFP process, the College is seeking one (1) resulting contract for eLearning catalog/content. The term of the resulting contract shall be for a period of (1) year with the option to renew four additional one-year terms, for a total contract term of five (5) years. Attachment 6.6 requires 5-year costs from the Proposer.

Question #7: Does the College anticipate awarding to one vendor exclusively, or may it purchase content from multiple vendors to supplement existing libraries?

Response: See Response to Question 6 above.

Question #8: Thank you for considering Pluralsight for this RFP.   Our company is focused on tech skills training, inclusive of a suite of learning for leadership, and project management.   Our company is not a replacement for workplace harassment compliance training for example, nor do we provide training on laboratory safety.  There are other examples, and we will not be pursuing the RFP if those are critical.  If coverage of all of the topics listed is a requirement, our company would probably not be a great fit.

If the College’s objective is to train its technical IT staff on the systems and stacks used (app development, IT ops, Cloud, AI, big data, security etc.), or to use Pluralsight to drive outcomes for students and faculty in CS/IT/business courses, our company is an amazing fit.  Please indicate if the College is looking for a tech skills learning platform.

Response: The College is soliciting proposals from qualified vendors for web-based, on-demand eLearning content (catalog/courses) that integrates with our current learning management system (LMS). The awarded solution must deliver fully developed, online content that enhances employee skills and compliance, support hybrid learning models, and provides scalable, accessible learning for diverse roles and departments within the College. Based on what is being asked, it does not appear that the vendor’s solution would be what the College is seeking in this RFP process.

Question #9: The College is requesting vendors to provide on-demand eLearning content on a number of broad topics. Our company offers on-demand eLearning content but doesn't cover everything the College has requested; however, it does cover the below topics:

2. Leadership & Management  
New supervisor skills, coaching, feedback, performance management  
Goal-setting, decision-making, delegation, change management  
Inclusive leadership, psychological safety, stakeholder engagement, meeting facilitation  
  
4. Digital & Technology Skills  
AI productivity  
  
5. Project, Process & Strategy  
Project management, Agile/Scrum  
Strategic planning, KPIs/OKRs,  
  
6. Communication & Writing  
Presentation skills, storytelling with data, professional communication etiquette  
  
7. People & Culture  
Diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB)  
Cultural competence, respectful workplace, civility, conflict resolution, negotiation, ethics  
  
8. Workplace Skills & Well-Being  
Time and priority management, productivity, resilience, stress and burnout prevention  
Remote/hybrid work effectiveness

With this in mind, my question is, in your professional opinion, would only having content on the above be sufficient enough for us to engage entering a proposal for this RFP?

Response: The College is seeking, at a minimum, courses and on-demand details as outlined in Attachment 6.7, as well as the ability for both the Successful Proposer and the College to add courses. If the Proposer does not feel its solution offers these categories, providing a Proposal would not be warranted.

Question #10: Who are the key stakeholders and decision-makers involved? Who will be attending the demonstration? What is their role in relation to learning and development?

Response: A group of campus evaluators that are applicable to this procurement have been selected and will serve as evaluators for the presentations of Proposers that are deemed finalists.

Question #11: How many vendors are participating? Who are the competitors?

Response: The RFP process, including the vendors that were invited to attend, is confidential until the RFP process is complete.

Question #12: OpenSesame’s pricing is volume based and not determined by tiers as outlined in the COST PROPOSAL & SCORING GUIDE (Attachment 6.6). To provide the most accurate pricing, we would need to base our proposal on set user numbers (i.e. 500, 750, 1,000). Please confirm the specific user counts for which you would like us to provide pricing.

Response: SWTCC will need proposers to complete Attachment 6.6 as specified. The resulting contract from this procurement will be marketable by the Successful Proposer to all other institutions, identified in Attachment 6.9, if the Proposer elects to offer this RFP to others in their election on Attachment 6.3. These institutions vary greatly in size. Based upon the tiers in the RFP, OpenSesame would provide a price for 500 in the 1-500 range, a price for 750 in the 2nd tier, etc. Flexibility in offering tiers will be key to additional business with additional institutions.

Question #13: The RFP document notes: “the College needs a broader catalog to support the mandatory campus-wide professional development and academic needs.” Can you please provide more information about the specific content needs and any current gaps?

Response: The College currently provides a comprehensive range of professional development and compliance training through its existing learning management system and content providers. However, the College could benefit by expand its catalog to include higher education–specific content and web accessibility training, which have been identified as current gaps.

Specifically, the College would like to enhance its offerings in the following areas:

* Higher Education–Specific Topics: Courses that address teaching and learning in higher education, student engagement, academic advising, FERPA, inclusive pedagogy, and other topics relevant to faculty and staff in academic environments.
* Web Accessibility Training: Content designed for both end users and course developers, supporting faculty and staff who create or publish digital content. These courses should help ensure compliance with accessibility standards and promote the creation of inclusive, accessible materials.

While the College develops much of its own internal training, it seeks external content that complements these efforts, offers scalability across departments, and supports professional development, compliance, and continuous learning for all employees.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Question #14: Please confirm the number of Client References you require? From this line we understand the requirement to be three: *Provide customer references for similar projects, with an emphasis on higher education entities, representing* ***three of the larger accounts serviced by the Proposer.***

Response: Yes, a minimum of 3 references are required.

Question #15: If the References Questionnaire is being submitted via email by the Client Reference, is a signature on the document still required? Or, is the attachment sent directly by the Client sufficient?

Response: Per the RFP instructions, a signature is required.

Question #16: Your Pricing Template captures pricing for e-learning catalog access. Would you like pricing to be included for additional products available outside of the catalog subscription? For example, SWTCC has access to our course authoring tool, Simon, included currently at a promotional rate. Would you like us to include pricing for Simon assuming the continuation of access to this tool?

Response: Refer to the instructions in Section C.4. related to Additional Products and Services offerings submissions.

Question #17: Please confirm that we do not need to submit a paper copy nor a copy via flash drive, and that an electronic copy of our submission emailed to [purchasing@southwest.tn.edu](mailto:purchasing@southwest.tn.edu) will suffice for both the Technical Proposal, the Cost Proposal (3.1.4.1), and any other documents required for our submission.

Response: Proposers are to follow the instructions in Section 3 of the RFP related to submission. As stated in the pre-proposal conference, Proposers may submit hard copy or electronic proposals.

Question #18: If submitting electronically, should the Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal be included as separate email submissions, or so long as they are separate attachments will that suffice?

Response: A single email is preferred with 2 folders attached – one for technical proposal items and one for cost proposal items.

Question #19: If a tracking number is required for our submission, please confirm what tracking number we should use (3.1.4.7).

Response: When mailing items by common carrier (i.e. UPS, Fedex, DHL, etc.), the individual will receive a tracking number for what is requested to be mailed.

Question #20: This question is regarding the delivery of content.  Would you accept content that was not delivered by API? Our content portal allows you to login and download SCORM SCO files to upload to your LMS, but there is not a connection to access the content directly.

Response: The College requires that all on-demand learning content integrate seamlessly with its existing Learning Management System (Bridge LMS) or any successor LMS during the contract term. Content delivery through a live API or comparable direct integration method is preferred to ensure automated synchronization of course completions, enrollments, and updates.

Solutions that rely solely on manual downloads or static SCORM uploads may not meet the College’s operational needs for real-time reporting, version control, and learner tracking. Proposers unable to provide an integrated solution should clearly describe how they will ensure ongoing synchronization, automated updates, and reporting consistency within the LMS.