

BID/ RFP ADDENDUM
DATE: 7/1/2026
BID/RFP No: 2026-04
BID/ RFP TITLE: **Ag Technology and Food Systems Pathway Curriculum Development and Learning Experience Production**

MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Jane Pilkington, Dir. Purchasing and Risk Management
3600 M Street, Merced, California 95348-2898
Email: purchasingbids@mccd.edu

ADDENDUM 1

This addendum contains clarification and additional information, which modifies the conditions of the above referenced BID/RFQ as follows:

1. Can you share the authorized funding amount for this project? Thank you.

Answer: The authorized funding amount and project budget will not be released during the bidding phase, estimated \$1.4M award. Bidders are instructed to submit pricing that accounts for the complete scope of work outlined in the RFP

2. Do they have on-site video production facilities that we could leverage, or do they want us to go out and record the content in addition to producing it? (We can also work with faculty to self-record video that we edit, is that an option they'd like to explore as an alternative?)

Answer: We do not have on-site video production facilities. The expectation is the Contractor will work with our staff in filming the videos at our industry partner locations or on campus.

3. Would we also be asked to film the Central Valley agricultural and food producing context? Or would we be provided with stock footage or footage from a Merced-owned production team to edit?

Answer: We have some stock footage that could be used but may need to develop more stock footage. Majority of the footage will need to be produced.

4. Roughly how many minutes of video per module are you expecting?

Answer: 30 seconds to 3 minutes

5. What type of production quality is expected for the video?

Answer: B-roll, voiceover, and individual interviews will be most common. The videos will be incorporated into our LMS modules (Canvas).

6. For course and curriculum development, are we working with their SMEs or do we need to provide SMEs?

Answer: Will be working with Merced College SMEs.

7. Can you provide more information about the accessibility standards for your District? Do you build to a certain level (i.e. WCAG 2.2 AA) or is there a checklist we could consult to understand requirements?

Answer: Will be provided by ITS

8. Do captioning requirements apply to both English and Spanish content?

Answer: Yes, both English and Spanish.

9. What level of quality is expected for the Spanish content? Is a straight translation enough, or should we price working with a subject matter expert who speaks Spanish to ensure we are utilizing appropriate terminology?

Answer: Straight translation is enough.

10. How many courses does Merced anticipate will be in this pathway and how many distinct stackable credentials will exist between the certificate and the AS? Even a rough range will help us bid accurately.

Answer: 15 BS level courses and 3 AS level courses

11. How much of the materials from the completed certificate will we repurpose into the AS degree? Can we see any sample certificate materials?

Answer: No materials from certificate to AS degree will be repurposed. We can obtain b-roll recording though that may be useful.

12. Is there an expected number of AI-assisted simulations to create? Does the District already have a tool or do you want for the firm to suggest one?

Answer: The District has not established a fixed number of AI-assisted simulations and does not currently require the use of a specific simulation platform. Proposers should recommend an appropriate approach, platform, and anticipated number of simulations or scenario-based activities based on the proposed course structure, competencies, instructional value, accessibility, licensing requirements, data privacy, long-term maintainability, and available budget.

The proposal should identify which competencies are best supported through simulations or scenario-based learning and provide enough detail for the District to evaluate the proposed volume, complexity, and instructional value.

13. Are we expected to integrate any competency-tracking tools into Canvas, or are we leveraging the features natively available in Canvas?

Answer: Leveraging features available in Canvas

14. Is there any flexibility in the posted timeline? We are particularly concerned that state approvals for curriculum may cause us to go past the listed timeline.

Answer: All deliverables must be completed no later than February 15th, 2027.

15. How many program-specific courses does the AgTEC team anticipate in the Associate of Science pathway?

Answer: For proposal-development purposes, firms should anticipate approximately 10 to 13 program-specific courses, representing approximately 30 to 39 semester units of technical and program-specific coursework. General education coursework is not included in the development scope.

The final number of courses and units will be confirmed through the discovery, competency crosswalk, curriculum review, and pathway-mapping process. Proposers should clearly identify the course and unit assumptions used in their cost proposal and provide a method for adjusting scope if the final approved crosswalk differs materially from those assumptions.

16. Is each course targeted at roughly 80 hours of student seat time, or does the target vary by course?

Answer: The instructional time and student learning hours are expected to vary by course based on unit value, modality, laboratory requirements, competency requirements, and applicable California Community College standards.

Proposers should not assume that every course will require exactly 80 hours of student seat time. Course design should reflect the appropriate combination of lecture, laboratory, applied learning, independent work, assessment, and competency demonstration. The selected firm will work with District faculty and curriculum representatives to determine the appropriate hours and unit structure for each course.

17. How much of the existing Applied Agriculture Systems Certificate — competency frameworks, assessments, course materials — will be available for review and potential reuse?

Answer: The selected firm will be provided access to available Applied Agriculture Systems Certificate materials relevant to this project, including competency frameworks, existing course documentation, assessments, instructional materials, employer-validation information, and related pathway-development materials.

The extent to which existing materials may be reused, adapted, or incorporated will be determined during the discovery and crosswalk phase. Proposers should assume that the existing certificate will provide an important foundation, but that substantial new development will still be required for the Associate of Science pathway.

Use of existing materials will remain subject to District approval, accessibility requirements, quality review, intellectual-property rights, and alignment with the new pathway.

18. Should the pathway be built as a unit/credit-based competency model mapped to Carnegie-hour equivalencies, or as a direct-assessment CBE model?

Answer: The pathway should be developed primarily as a unit- and credit-based competency education model that can move through the standard California Community College curriculum and approval processes. Courses should include clearly defined competencies, mastery-based assessments, appropriate instructional-hour and unit calculations, and flexible delivery structures where permitted.

The District is also interested in design features that support future consideration of direct assessment, credit for prior learning, open-entry/open-exit delivery, and other flexible CBE approaches. However, proposers should not assume that the initial pathway will be approved or implemented solely as a direct-assessment program.

19. For prior learning and on-the-job experience, does MCCD have an existing prior-learning-assessment (PLA) policy and instruments the curriculum should align to, or is development of the competency-credit instruments part of this scope?

Answer: The selected firm will be expected to align its work with applicable District policies, California Community College requirements, and local procedures governing credit for prior learning and competency assessment. Relevant District policies and procedures will be made available to the selected firm.

Development of program-specific competency assessments, rubrics, evidence standards, and recommendations for evaluating prior learning or on-the-job experience is included in the scope. The selected firm will not be expected to independently establish or replace District policy.

Final decisions regarding the awarding of credit will remain with the District and its authorized faculty and academic processes.

20. For the English/Spanish quality-equivalence requirement, will MCCD provide bilingual faculty or staff to validate Spanish-language materials, or is end-to-end Spanish development and validation expected from the vendor?

Answer: Proposers should assume that end-to-end Spanish-language development, review, and quality validation are the responsibility of the selected firm. The vendor should include qualified bilingual curriculum specialists, translators, reviewers, or subject-matter experts capable of ensuring that Spanish-language materials are instructionally equivalent, technically accurate, culturally appropriate, and not merely machine-translated.

The District may provide faculty or staff feedback when available, but proposers should not base their staffing or cost assumptions on the District providing comprehensive bilingual review or validation.

21. Will MCCD or AgTEC help broker access to Central Valley employer sites for filming (locations, scheduling, releases), or should the vendor assume studio- and stock-supplemented production? Is there an expected volume of filmed content per course beyond “per module”?

Answer: MCCD and AgTEC will make reasonable efforts to facilitate introductions to participating employers, District facilities, the College farm, instructional facilities, and other regional sites where appropriate. However, access, scheduling, permissions, releases, safety requirements, and site availability cannot be guaranteed.

Proposers should develop a production plan that can be completed through a combination of District-supported site access, vendor-arranged locations, studio production, demonstrations, animation, graphics, and appropriately licensed supplemental media.

The District has not established a required number of filmed minutes per course or module. Proposers should recommend an appropriate volume of produced content based on the competencies, learner needs, instructional value, accessibility requirements, and budget. Proposals should describe anticipated video volume, typical segment length, production method, and assumptions used in pricing.

22. For the “scenario-based learning or AI-assisted simulations” requirement — do scenario-based activities satisfy the requirement, or does MCCD specifically expect built AI-driven simulations? Is there an expected number or fidelity per course, or is this at vendor discretion within budget?

Answer: Well-designed scenario-based learning activities may satisfy the requirement where they appropriately support the identified competency. The District does not require every course or competency to include a fully AI-driven simulation.

The proposed solution may include a combination of branching scenarios, case studies, interactive decision-making exercises, role-based activities, H5P or comparable interactives, AI-supported simulations, virtual equipment activities, or other appropriate learning experiences.

The number and level of fidelity are at the proposer’s discretion within the proposed budget, provided the approach is educationally sound and clearly described. Proposers should identify the proposed number, type, purpose, complexity, platform, licensing needs, and maintenance requirements of the activities included in their proposal.

23. Are there existing Canvas standards or shell templates Wisewire should align to? An existing template would reduce development time.

Answer: The selected firm will be provided with available District Canvas standards, accessibility expectations, branding guidance, naming conventions, course-navigation expectations, and shell templates after contract award.

Proposers should assume that course shells must follow a consistent, accessible, intuitive, and transferable structure suitable for use in Canvas. Course shells must be exportable in a District-approved format and designed so they can be adopted or adapted by AgTEC consortium colleges.

Proposers may describe their preferred Canvas design framework and should identify any assumptions regarding templates, integrations, plug-ins, or external tools.

24. Does MCCCD have district data-privacy or security restrictions on third-party AI tools that would limit which simulation platforms the vendor may use?

Answer: Any third-party AI, simulation, media, assessment, or instructional technology proposed for this project will be subject to District review and approval for data privacy, information security, accessibility, licensing, interoperability, intellectual-property rights, and long-term sustainability.

Proposers should identify all proposed third-party platforms and disclose:

- Data collected from students, faculty, or the District;
- How data are stored, processed, retained, and deleted;
- Whether data are used to train external AI models;
- Accessibility conformance;
- Licensing and recurring costs;
- Account or authentication requirements;
- Ownership of content and generated materials;
- Exportability and continuity if the District discontinues the platform.

Proposers should not assume that a specific third-party platform will be approved until it has completed the District's review process. Solutions that minimize unnecessary collection of personally identifiable information and recurring licensing obligations are preferred.

25. What does the curriculum committee / COCI review schedule look like — what real review windows can Wisewire plan against within the six-month timeline?

Answer: The six-month period of performance applies primarily to vendor-controlled deliverables, including discovery, crosswalk development, curriculum drafting, Course Outlines of Record, assessments, LMS course shells, learning materials, revision support, and preparation of complete curriculum-submission packages.

Local curriculum committee, faculty senate, governing board, Chancellor's Office COCI, accreditation, and other external review timelines are not fully controlled by the selected firm or the District project team and cannot be guaranteed within the six-month contract period.

Following award, the District will provide available curriculum calendars, submission deadlines, meeting dates, and internal review expectations. The selected firm will be expected to sequence its work to meet the earliest practical review windows and respond promptly to requested revisions. Proposers should distinguish completion of submission-ready materials from final approval by external bodies.

26. Is the optional upper-division/baccalaureate scope intended to be priced as a post-award contract option, or pursued as a separate future procurement?

Answer: Proposers should provide optional pricing for the upper-division/baccalaureate scope as a separately identified contract option. The District may consider exercising the option after award only if sufficient funding is available, the work is authorized, the scope remains consistent with the original solicitation, and use of the option complies with applicable federal, state, grant, and District procurement requirements.

The District reserves the right not to exercise the option and may pursue a separate future procurement if required by funding availability, scope changes, procurement requirements, or other circumstances.

27. How many total courses and/or credits of development does Merced College intend to include in this Associates Degree? The RFP indicates this does not include general education development, which appears to be ~21 credits worth, so if we are to assume this is a 60 credit degree, then we would be expected to build 39 credits (or, about 13 courses). Is that a reasonable assumption of development volume to base our bid on?

Answer: Yes. For purposes of developing a responsive and comparable proposal, firms may assume approximately 30 to 39 semester units of program-specific coursework, or approximately 10 to 13 courses, exclusive of general education.

The District anticipates that the final award will be structured as a degree of at least 60 semester units, consistent with applicable requirements. The precise number, unit value, and configuration of technical courses will be finalized during the discovery, crosswalk, faculty-review, and curriculum-development process.

Proposers must identify the course and unit assumptions used in their pricing and should provide a transparent unit-price, course-price, or change-management methodology if the final approved course count differs materially from the proposal assumption.

28. Is Merced College supplying faculty subject matter experts to work in partnership with our instructional designers?

Answer: Yes. Merced College and AgTEC will identify faculty, project staff, and other representatives to provide institutional context, review materials, participate in key decision points, and validate pathway alignment.

The District may also facilitate input from industry representatives and consortium partners. However, the selected firm should provide sufficient subject-matter expertise, instructional-design capacity, curriculum-development expertise, and project management to complete the required deliverables.

Proposers should not assume that District faculty will serve as the primary authors or production staff for the curriculum. The proposal should clearly define the expected roles, time commitments, review responsibilities, and decision points for District faculty and staff.

29. The RFP makes reference to AI developed simulations; is Merced College likewise comfortable with AI-developed (and human expert reviewed) content within the courses?

Answer: The District will consider responsible use of AI-assisted content-development tools when all resulting content is reviewed, edited, validated, and approved by qualified human subject-matter experts and instructional-design professionals.

AI-generated or AI-assisted materials must be accurate, accessible, unbiased, appropriately sourced, free of unauthorized copyrighted content, aligned with course competencies, and suitable

for college-level instruction. The selected firm remains fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, quality, accessibility, and legal use of all deliverables, regardless of whether AI tools were used.

The proposal must disclose how AI will be used, which tools are anticipated, the human-review process, data-privacy considerations, and how intellectual-property and source-verification risks will be managed.

30. What are Merced College's expectations for the types of interactives in this program? E.g., H5P, AI video scenarios, etc.

Answer: The District is open to a variety of interactive learning formats, including but not limited to:

- Branching scenarios;
- H5P or comparable accessible interactive activities;
- Equipment-identification and troubleshooting exercises;
- Safety and compliance decision-making scenarios;
- Interactive process maps;
- Case studies;
- Knowledge checks and formative assessments;
- Virtual demonstrations;
- AI-supported conversational or decision simulations;
- Video-based scenarios;
- Quality-control and production-management exercises.

The appropriate type of interactive should be determined by the competency and instructional objective rather than by a requirement to use a specific technology. Proposed interactives should be accessible, Canvas-compatible, exportable or maintainable by the District, reasonably sustainable, and free from unnecessary recurring costs.

Proposers should describe the anticipated mix and volume of interactives, authoring tools, accessibility approach, licensing requirements, source-file delivery, and maintenance expectations.

31. The RFP asks us to provide information on the dollar value of previous client contracts. As a private firm, it is not our practice to release contract amounts from prior clients in a publicly viewable document to protect the privacy of our prior clients. Is it acceptable to Merced College for us to withhold listing contract dollar amounts in the prior-client section?

Answer: The District will accept an approximate contract-value range in place of an exact dollar amount when a proposer is contractually prohibited from disclosing the exact value or has a legitimate client-confidentiality concern.

The proposer should provide sufficient information for the District to determine whether the prior engagement was comparable in scale and complexity. Acceptable responses may include ranges such as:

- Less than \$100,000;
- \$100,000 to \$249,999;
- \$250,000 to \$499,999;
- \$500,000 to \$999,999;
- \$1 million or more.

A proposer withholding an exact amount should briefly explain the confidentiality restriction. Proposers should be aware that proposal materials may be subject to applicable public-records

requirements, and the District cannot guarantee confidentiality merely because information is labeled confidential.

32. Can Merced College provide additional clarity as to what external approval timelines are being referenced in the following question from the RFP from Section D, Project Timeline: • Distinguish vendor-controlled deliverables from external approval timelines.

Answer: “External approval timelines” refers to reviews, decisions, meetings, and processing periods that are not solely controlled by the selected vendor. These may include:

- District faculty and subject-matter-expert review;
- Departmental review;
- Local curriculum committee review;
- Academic senate review;
- Governing board approval where applicable;
- California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office COCI review;
- Regional or labor-market review where applicable;
- Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges review or substantive-change processes where applicable;
- Department of Education or other approval processes associated with competency-based or direct-assessment delivery, if pursued;
- Consortium-college adoption and local approval timelines.

The selected firm is responsible for completing all vendor-controlled materials within the contract schedule, preparing submission-ready documentation, meeting agreed District review deadlines, and responding promptly to feedback. The firm is not expected to guarantee the timing or outcome of decisions made by independent approval bodies.

The proposal timeline should clearly identify which milestones are within the vendor’s control and which depend on District or external review and approval.

33. Does the District prefer that instructional videos feature MCCD/AgTEC faculty as on-camera presenters, or is the selected firm expected to recommend the most appropriate video format (e.g., faculty-led, professional narrator, animated/motion graphics, screen-capture demonstration) based on the instructional content and competency being addressed?

Answer:

The District does not require that all instructional videos feature MCCD or AgTEC faculty as on-camera presenters. The selected firm should recommend the most appropriate production format for each course, module, and competency based on instructional value, technical accuracy, learner engagement, accessibility, production efficiency, and long-term usability.

Acceptable formats may include faculty-led instruction, professional narration, subject-matter-expert demonstrations, animated or motion-graphics content, screen-capture demonstrations, facility or equipment demonstrations, scenario-based video, or a blended approach.

MCCD and AgTEC faculty may participate as presenters, reviewers, or subject-matter experts when appropriate and available, but offerors should not assume that District faculty will be available to serve as the primary on-camera talent for all content. Proposals should describe the recommended production model, the anticipated role of District faculty and staff, and any associated scheduling, release, or production assumptions.

34. Will offerors have access to existing Applied Agriculture Systems Certificate materials and competency frameworks before proposal submission, or only after award during Phase One discovery

Answer:

Detailed Applied Agriculture Systems Certificate materials, competency frameworks, assessments, course content, and related internal documents will generally be made available to the selected firm after award during Phase One discovery.

Offerors should base their proposals on the information contained in the RFP and any materials formally released through the PlanetBids addendum process. The District may provide limited supplemental information before the proposal deadline if it determines that doing so would support fair and comparable proposals and if the information can be made available equally to all prospective offerors.

For proposal-development purposes, firms should assume that the existing certificate materials will provide a meaningful foundation for the pathway, but that substantial new curriculum, assessment, learning experience, and course-shell development will be required.

35. For each course in the AS pathway, does the District have expectations or existing standards for course structure — such as number of modules per course, credit hours, and expected weekly student time commitment (contact hours plus outside coursework)

Answer:

The District has not established a fixed number of modules for every course. Course structure should be driven by the approved competencies, course objectives, unit value, instructional modality, laboratory or applied-learning requirements, assessment needs, and applicable California Community College curriculum standards.

For proposal-development purposes, offerors should assume that courses may vary in unit value and instructional design. The final number of modules, contact hours, outside student work, laboratory hours, and expected weekly time commitment will be established during the discovery, crosswalk, curriculum-development, and faculty-review process.

The selected firm will be expected to:

- Recommend an appropriate module structure for each course;
- Align course hours and units with applicable California Community College requirements;
- Clearly distinguish lecture, laboratory, applied learning, independent work, and competency assessment;
- Design the workload so it is appropriate for the course unit value and delivery modality;
- Document the assumptions used in the proposed course architecture.

Offerors should clearly state the course-structure and workload assumptions used in their technical and cost proposals. The District does not require a uniform module count or identical student-time expectation across all courses.

36. Is there an established budget range or a not-to-exceed contract value for this solicitation?

Answer: Already answered previously

37. How many total courses are anticipated in the required Associate of Science pathway crosswalk?

Answer: Already answered previously

38. The solicitation is silent on specific insurance coverage types and limits. Please clarify the coverages with limits required to be maintained by the bidders for this RFP

Answer:

Bidders are required to procure and maintain, for the duration of the contract, insurance coverage against claims for bodily injury, death, and property damage arising out of or related to the performance of the contract by the provider, its agents, representatives, or employees. At a minimum, the following insurance coverages and limits are required:

- **Commercial General Liability: \$1,000,000 per occurrence**
- **Automobile Liability: \$1,000,000 per occurrence**
- **Workers' Compensation/Employers' Liability: \$1,000,000 per occurrence (or as otherwise required by applicable state law for Workers' Compensation, with Employers' Liability limits of \$1,000,000)**

These insurance requirements apply throughout the term of the contract. Bidders should be prepared to provide certificates of insurance upon request or prior to contract execution.

SPECIAL NOTE:

It is the responsibility of each Bidder to acknowledge all addenda by *signing below* and submitting a copy of each addendum with their respective bid.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND THESE MODIFICATIONS ABOVE BID:

(Sign and Date)