



The Power  
of International  
Education

Solicitation Amendment / Modification

1.	Solicitation No.	062425/AK
2.	Solicitation Name	RFQ for Plagiarism Detection Software
3.	Issue Date	June 24, 2025
4.	Closing Date	July 18, 2025
5.	Solicitation Amendment No.	1
6.	Solicitation Amendment Date	July 9, 2025

7. The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 9 below.

8. The hour and dates specified for receipt of proposals/quotations: ☒ is not extended; ☐ is extended as described in Item 9 below.

9. Description of Amendment/Modification:

The purpose of this solicitation amendment is to inform prospective offerors/bidders that the above numbered solicitation is hereby amended to provide responses to questions as follows.

Q: An approximate number of documents to be checked annually

A: We would scan around 4,000 PDF documents each year.

Q: The estimated number of participants per year

A: The number of users in the system each year would be around 5 to 10.

Q: The average length of the documents (in pages)

A: Most documents scanned would be 6 to 10 pages in length. Statistically, the average number of words is 2,011 and the median number of words is 1,840.

Q: Whether all documents require AI-based analysis, or only a portion. If only some, please estimate the percentage or number of documents that would need AI verification.

A: All documents would be scanned for both AI-generated content and “old-fashioned” (non-AI-generated content) plagiarism.

Q: Is IIE open to a custom-built solution tailored to the stated requirements, or is the preference for an existing, off-the-shelf software product?

A: IIE would prefer an off-the-shelf product with little to no customizations.

Q: Can you confirm the expected number of total users and admins for initial deployment? Will there be any anticipated scaling needs?

A: The number of users in the system each year would be around 5 to 10. Of those, 2 to 3 would be admins. We currently do not foresee needing to increase user count in the near future; however, if we secure additional programs that wish to scan for plagiarism/AI-generated content, this could grow.



The Power  
of International  
Education

•Q: Will each user require access to a unique folder structure, or will shared folder access suffice for most users?

A: Personal folders won't really be needed by each user, but it would be ideal if folders could be shared/not shared with specific users, to manage access.

Q: Are user authentication or Single Sign-On (SSO) integrations preferred or required?

A: We would prefer configuration for SSO, and IIE currently uses Okta for our SSO.

Q: Is there a preferred maximum file size or document batch size for uploads?

A: File size of individual documents should be under 16 MB and frequently much smaller. The Zip file containing the files in a batch would, of course, be larger. We frequently scan 200 – 300 documents in a day during our busy season, so batch sizes of 100 or more would be ideal.

Q: Will documents be uploaded only through the self-service portal, or are API-based uploads or integrations also needed?

A: We would only upload through the self-service portal.

Q: Are there specific naming conventions or metadata requirements associated with uploaded documents?

A: We would want to upload any valid (Windows-based) filename. Usually, our filename format would be like "Jones, Frank (123467890).pdf". We would also want to export the exact filename in reports.

Q: Could you clarify the level of customization needed for threshold and sensitivity settings (e.g., per document, per folder, per user)?

A: The thresholds and sensitivity settings, in practice, would be set by the system admins and apply to all documents scanned within our instance of the platform. User-specific settings would not be needed. We would like to be able to exclude very small matches (in terms of word count and in terms of overall percentage of the document). We also would like to exclude certain phrases (like essay prompt questions).

Q: Are there particular use cases where paraphrased content detection is more critical than exact match detection?

A: Generally, we would want to be aware of both paraphrased content and exact matches. Review of the essays and matches would allow us to exclude matches where we feel citation was sufficient. All documents scanned are application essays to scholarship programs and should all have the same approach applied to reviewing them for plagiarism/AI-generated content.

Q: Are there specific sources, databases, or repositories that are mandatory for comparison (e.g., PubMed, JSTOR)?

A: We would expect that all commonly used databases would be included in the search for matches. Anywhere a student might have found content should be included in the search.

Q: Can users create global exclusion rules (e.g., prompts, citations) or must they be set per scan?

A: We actually prefer the global setting of these.



The Power  
of International  
Education

Q: How important is the manual review capability for excluding or approving flagged matches?

A: This is very important for the “old-fashioned” plagiarism scan (not the AI-generated content scan), as we arrive at a final score of the document after having removed matches where we deemed the citation was sufficient. We also frequently find that the content is matching to the author’s own work on the web, so those would also be excluded from the overall score. Arriving at this final score is the goal of this whole review.

Q: How frequently is the similarity score or AI-content score expected to update (e.g., real-time, scheduled)?

A: We would expect the scan to take place once when the document is uploaded. Then the score would recalculate upon dismissing any matches when manually reviewing. We would not need to rescan the document after the initial scan. However, for reporting, the final score (reflecting any dismissed matches) would need to be exportable.

Q: What accuracy or confidence thresholds are expected for AI-content detection?

A: While this is a developing field, we recognize that there is no clear-cut way of detecting AI-generated content. We would like to see the result where the confidence level of the system is high, meaning that there is a very good chance that AI-generated content is present. We do not require that the flagging of such content be 100% confident.

Q: Will IIE provide access to previously scanned documents for private repository setup, or must vendors create a storage solution for future documents only?

A: We can provide the documents to add to the repository (securely housed on the platform) at implementation (approx. 20k documents). Thereafter, new documents would automatically be added to the repository when they are scanned.

Q: Is there a requirement to compare documents across multiple internal programs or folders within the same instance?

A: We would want to have a single repository against which all documents scanned would be compared. This would not need to be separate by program or folder.

Q: Should reporting functionality be limited to administrative users, or should all users be able to run exportable reports?

A: All users can run reports.

Q: Are there any additional report filters or parameters you anticipate needing beyond date, time, similarity score, and AI-content score?

A: No.

Q: Are there specific data handling or retention policies ITR should comply with (e.g., GDPR, FERPA)?

A: IIE is subject to a wide variety of data handling and processing laws and regulations. As such, we would not be able to answer this question succinctly.

Q: Should all scanned content be stored within U.S.-based data centers?

A: This is not required.



The Power  
of International  
Education

Q: What is the anticipated implementation timeline following award?

A: IIE would like to have a solution in place by the end of September 2025.

Q: Will IIE require onboarding or training services as part of the implementation?

A: Yes, for the admin users, who could then become trainers for the regular users.

Q: Could you provide insight into how proposals will be scored (e.g., pricing, features, ease of use, scalability)?

A: Please refer to the evaluation criteria in the RFQ.

Q: Will vendors be asked to demonstrate the solution in a live environment or provide a sandbox environment for evaluation?

A: A demonstration in either a sandbox or live environment would be acceptable, but we definitely would like a demonstration.

END OF AMENDMENT