QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. 2.2.1 And 2.2.5 – The requirements state *Professional content and no animation; and* (2.2.1) and *Use a variety of delivery elements to engage learners, providing a balance of written, audio and video content;…*(2.2.5) Those two requirements seem to be contradictory. It is understood that the content is meant to be viewed/consumed on devices ranging from desktop computers to smartphones. However, animation can be (and is) routinely created for use on all types of devices ranging from computers to smartphones. The requirement also states that audio and video is allowed, which is harder to effectively and reliably deliver to mobile devices due to locale/connectively issues. Thus, the question is, can other learning techniques/elements designed to engage the learner (including animation, whiteboarding, and others) be utilized, in addition to video, while ensuring that the course is reliably delivered on a range of devices from computers to mobile devices? Our goal is to secure a training product with a blend of learning elements and that any videos include images and narration for a professional audience (without graphic/vulgar depictions) and not of a 'cartoon' type product. It is highly desirable to have a product in a format accessible on a variety of media devices.

2. 2.2.4 – How much customization (percentage) is envisioned? Is the customization purely references, and/or inclusion of court documents? If inclusion of court documents is desired, will those documents be available in the course for download by individual learners, or will they be embedded as a read-only document(s)? Customization to reference court policies in the product and inclusion of court policies by either option noted above (including a link or embedded as read-only). If embedded, will need ability to update if policies are updated.

3. 2.2.9 – Is the desired Learning Management System (LMS) compatibility SCORM (what version?) or AICC? The court currently does not have an LMS, but desires a product that does not restrict the ability to access via an LMS should we acquire one during the term of the contract.

4. 2.2.9 – Has the court made a firm decision to host on a LMS run by the court or the State of California, or is the hosting of the course an option to be considered and priced in the response to the RFP? Absent an LMS, the current intent is to link this training program from the court's intranet site.

5. Does the court want a version for employee learners with either vision or hearing disabilities? Having a closed caption option is desirable.

6. Does the court want references to "…court procedures…" to be incorporated into the script and story line of the course? The court is looking for an immediate deliverable, so customized 'court' scripting is not expected.

7. Will the vendor's online training program be evaluated during the proposal evaluation period in September? Yes, the training will be evaluated.

8. Must the vendor currently have a sexual harassment online training in place? Yes, the training is anticipated to take place this calendar year.

9. How soon will the customized online training modules launch for the court employees? October/November.