Procurement and Contracting Services

Request for Proposals for User Testing Services

ADDENDUM #1

Please mark all proposal submission Envelopes with the following information

Sealed RFP # L182104

Due on March 4, 2021 no later than 2:00 PM, MST
The following questions have been received by the technical question due date of February 22, 2021 by 12:00 PM, MST.

1. How many people will be using this platform to create studies?
   a. As few as three (3), but as many as make sense based on price structure (ideally, we can scale as needed).

2. Do we plan to utilize our own terms for a contract?
   a. We (The University of Arizona) will prefer to utilize our own set of terms as listed in the RFP document, however if we were to utilize the awarded vendors terms, we will need the ability to negotiate and work through those terms as needed.

3. How many total monthly pageviews does your site receive and are you looking to track for user testing purposes?
   a. No more than 5M monthly page views across all arizona.edu sites. We aren’t necessarily looking to track pageviews for user testing purposes. This methodology doesn’t fit our current understood need as represented within the RFP (we are not evaluating candidates based on this factor), but we are interested in learning about options.

4. How many user/admin seats would you be looking to have in your account?
   a. As few as three (3), but as many as make sense based on price structure (ideally, we can scale as needed).

5. How many participants are you looking to source on a monthly/yearly basis from our panel?
   a. Between 30-150 per month, although usage may vary depending on pricing structure, ease of onboarding, and scalability.

6. How many participants are you looking to source yourself or through a 3rd party on a monthly/yearly basis?
   a. We don’t know how frequently we would use this option. We may not use it every month, but we estimate no more than 50 participants in a given month.

7. How many Moderated Studies are you looking to run monthly, and with how many users per study?
   a. Depending on cost and ease of use, we could perform as few as one Moderated Study per month and as many as six per month.

8. How many Unmoderated Studies are you looking to run monthly, and with how many users per study?
   a. We anticipate an average of 12 unmoderated studies per month, however that may change based on price structure and ease of use.

9. Are there any other studies besides Moderated or Unmoderated that you would be looking to run (ex: surveys, diary studies, etc.)? If so, how many users a month would you need there?
a. We tend to use other services for alternate usability studies. But if the product incorporates additional tools, we’d be open to using them. Estimate: 10-50 users per month.

10. Would you need to run concurring studies?
   a. Yes.

11. Would you need any assistance with building the test, setting up the screener questions, analyzing results, or creating reports based on the study results?
   a. Depends on ease of use, documentation, onboarding, and scalability of product. Depending on price and costs, we could see a benefit to get maximum value from the investment.

12. Are you primarily looking to run tests with our own panel of testers or your own testers as well?
   a. The primary interest is in an existing pool of testers provided by the vendor, but there is clear desire to use our own panels as well.

13. Do you have a sense of the volume of testing you are looking for or would an unlimited testing proposal be what you are looking for?
   a. Between 30-200 participants per month, although usage may vary depending on pricing structure, ease of onboarding, and scalability. We would not rule out an unlimited testing scenario.

14. When is the University hoping to have something in place?
   a. Our goal is Mid-April 2021.

15. What does the procurement process entail and how long might it take?
   a. The procurement process involves the terms of the RFP and timeline stated. Proposals will be reviewed and scored, which may involve further clarification which ultimately will be followed by an award and contract. The process timeline is to be determined as not all steps in the process are defined by a date.

16. Is the budget already determined and allocated for this or is the case still being made? If it can be shared, what is the budget that you’re working with to properly make a recommendation?
   a. No budget will be disclosed for this project.

17. Is the fact that not all of our methodologies are WCAG compliant today a deal-breaker?
   a. WCAG compliance itself is not a deal breaker. Please make sure to include as many details as possible around your efforts to work towards accessibility and compliance for our review.

18. Which three departments and their respective users are part of this RFP as mentioned in 5.1?
   a. Although not finalized, the departments’ focus are primarily marketing and IT services.

19. What are the names and functions of the departments?
   a. For the purposes of this RFP, assume Marketing & Brand Management and University Information Technology Services. Relevant shared functions include building a unified
experience across multiple digital touchpoints with an end goal of increased student enrollment and retention.

20. How do their needs differ from one another in terms of audiences they'd like us to recruit and types of usability research they would like to perform?
   a. Audiences range from knowing little about the university to being a current student or even alum. As a result, a key distinction might be anonymous vs. authenticated users.

21. What does sufficient speed of test results from our pool mean exactly? (Referencing mention in 5.2)
   a. Current expectation is results from 10 or more users within 12 hours to 3 days.

22. How often does the University plan on leveraging the vendor’s panel/pool to source/recruit your target audiences? (How many per week, month, quarter, year estimates are fine)
   a. Between 30-150 participants per month, although usage may vary depending on pricing structure, ease of onboarding, and scalability.

23. What are the desired sample sizes by methodology (surveys vs think-aloud, vs click-tests, vs card-sorts, qual vs quant, etc.)?
   a. This really depends. Historically we've had 10-30 users per week that primarily perform tests that are 80% think-aloud/qualitative and 20% input specific quantitative questions. But we’ve also performed some tests (20%) that utilize card sorting, and other tools that don’t necessarily ask the user to visit one of our websites or designs. All of this is subject to change as we potentially bring more departments into the tool — dependent on cost structure and ease of onboarding.

24. Based on desired sample size and frequency of research, how many studies and completes (completed user tests or surveys) do you anticipate running with the vendor panel?
   a. Between 30-200 participants per month, although usage may vary depending on pricing structure, ease of onboarding, and scalability.

25. Are the University and its 3 users interested in having an unlimited recruitment model based on incidence rate(s) of the audience(s) that you hire the vendor to find for you, or is it preferred to have a credit-based model where users/licensees can pull from a bucket of credits when sourcing studies through the vendor?
   a. We would not rule out a credit-based or unlimited testing model.

26. When the University is running studies across the 3 respective departments/users, how many studies are anticipated to be running/collecting data at the same time? Of those, how many would you anticipate being run with your own audience’s vs the vendor panel/pool?
   a. We anticipate 6 to 9 concurrent tests, although that could increase based on price structure, ease of use, and ease of onboarding. Of those tests, there may be a mix of vendor provided panelists and our own audience. We predict 0-5 tests using our own panelists in a given month.
27. Section 5.3.7 asks about software integrations. What types of integrations are of interest to the University? What is/are the use case(s)?

a. We are interested in learning about how capabilities can be extended by a range of integrations. To date, we've run tests using card sorting, heat mapping, and prototyping tools — among others. We'd like to see any opportunities to learn more about our audiences’ experience or optimize the efficiency of our testing process.

End of addendum, all else remains the same.