

**University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
RFB – AA09-RH-3209  
Campus Judicial and Student Disciplinary  
Case Management System**

**Addendum # 1 – Dated 2/26/09**

Below is a listing of vendor questions that were submitted prior to the deadline on  
RFB # AA09-RH-3209 – Campus Judicial and Student Disciplinary Case Management System

**Due to the nature of these questions the bid opening date will remain as: Thursday, March 5, 2009.**

**Question # 1: What is the current software system used for housing occupancy management?**

**Answer # 1: Our housing module is an in-house developed application in PeopleSoft.**

**Question # 2: What is the number of hearing officer-type users (those who assign alleged violations and then find student not / responsible)?**

**Answer # 2: The following staff titles have the ability and may hear cases and find student responsible or not responsible – Dean of Students staff (4 staff); Area Directors (4 staff); Residence Directors (26 staff); Assistant Residence Directors (34 staff). Each cluster determines if and how many cases are divided among the senior staff in the cluster.**

**The following student staff titles are responsible to process the paperwork for judicial cases including in some cases assigning alleged violations – Judicial Assistants (0 to 1 per cluster), Cluster Office Managers (1 per cluster) and DOS student staff. Again, each cluster can be unique in how they assign and manage judicial tasks.**

**Question # 3: What does judicial conference users mean? Is it likely that this term is akin to HEARING OFFICER, a term we use?**

**Answer # 3: There is not any reference in the bid to judicial conference users. In section 2.3 F1 Judicial Conference Administrators are defined as Residence Directors (RD), Assistant Residence Directors (ARD), Area Directors (AD) and Dean of Students staff (DOS). This term is akin to a Hearing Officer.**

**Question # 4:** Tell me more about BASICS software (Section 2.2 H. 4). In order for use to build a custom interface, we need to know the type, structure, and technology undergirding this.

**Answer # 4:** The interface with Basics is not a software interface. We are requesting an automated referral. We hope to be able to set up a real time or batch process to notify Basics staff via email or work flow when a student is referred to the program.

**Question # 5:** Are Area Directors and Residence Directors responsible to adjudicate all cases that occurred within their respective residential areas / clusters / buildings? Or are these users responsible to adjudicate cases of their students, regardless of which residential area the potential violation may have occurred?

**Answer # 5:** Residence Directors and Assistant Residence Directors are responsible to adjudicate level one cases within their cluster (1-3 residence halls). Area Directors adjudicate level one, two and three cases that occur in their residential area (8 – 12 residence halls). The Dean of Students Office adjudicates all level cases outside of residence halls and level three cases for residence halls.

On occasion, other Residence Directors and Assistant Residence Directors assist other clusters with their case load.

**Question # 6: Bid Question D1:**

- **D1:** The System must provide flexible and detailed security to include durable password protection, and multiple levels of administrator-defined security access (i.e., entry only, read only, general user, assistant to general user, administrator / super user, by stage, by level, by violation, by sanction).

What is meant by security access by violation or by sanction – does this mean security access needs to be set-up by any violation or sanction within the system regardless of the incident level? OR, does it mean security access is set up by violations or sanctions within a specific incident level? OR, does it mean something different?

**Answer # 6:** In our current system when we set up violations and sanctions we have the ability to affiliate an incident level or levels to each violation. We give access based on levels so the user will only be able to see/use the violations and sanctions related to their approved incident level.

**Question # 7:** Are certain user's security access to sanctions / violations always tied to a specific incident level (Level 1, 2, or 3)? OR, do all users have access to difference violations / sanctions within any of the three (3) difference incident levels?

**Answer # 7:** Currently users are tied to one or more levels. A user could have access to one, some or all levels.

**Question # 8: Is incident status tied to workflow stages? OR, is the same user able to complete multiple incident statuses within the same workflow stage?**

**Answer # 8: Yes, incident status is tied to a workflow. Yes, the same user can complete multiple incident statuses within the workflow.**

**Question # 9: Bid question E2 and F9:**

- **E2: Incidents shall have an automatically generated, serialized incident number which becomes the “case number”. The case number should start with an identifier such as year.**
- **F9: The System shall be able to accept incident reports completed on the web, but not automatically generate a case.**

**Please explain how / when an incident report becomes a case. How do you differentiate between incident reports and cases? Are cases and incident reports separate forms? Do you track and run reports on incident reports or just cases?**

**Answer # 9: In our current business, we have a witness statement form for reporting an incident or incidents which starts the judicial process. However, not all witness statements actually warrant an actual judicial case. In the new system we want to accept incident reports or witness statements electronically. We want the opportunity for someone to review the incident report/witness statement to determine whether or not a case is warranted and at that point an incident/case number will be assigned.**

**We would want to track and run reports on both incident reports and judicial cases.**

**Question # 10: Bid question F21:**

- **F21: The System shall have a separate contact management module or contact management functionality as part of the delivered solution.**

**What is required in a separate contact management module?**

**Answer # 10: We want to be able to track various communications and contacts related to an individual and/or case. Examples include – record the date, time and content of email communications, phone conversations, documents received/sent and meeting notes.**

**Question # 11: Bid questions H3, I3, and I4:**

- **H3: The System shall be able to export relevant housing restriction and removal data for import into our administrative student data source.**
- **I3: The System shall be capable of producing a list of records to be purged or archived based on data rules.**

- **I4: The System shall be able to expunge or purge records meeting defined criteria as well as archive or copy to an archive / history version of database.**

**Can you please provide further clarification or an example of what is required by each question?**

**Answer # 11:**

**H3: The University requires the ability to develop a data extract that can run automatically on a schedule to produce a flat data file for import into our Housing Management module. The data extract will select individuals with active housing removal or specific housing restriction sanctions. In our current system we track full housing removals and Campus, Area, Cluster, Hall restrictions.**

**I3: The University would like to set up a rule set for records to be purged – such as any case that is more than 7 years old where the case is complete and there are no outstanding sanctions. Once the output is reviewed and possibly edited, then the system would archive and then purge based on the edited data.**

**I4: We want to be able to set up a rule to identify records to be archived and then have them moved to a separate version of the database should we decide not to purge data.**