



RFP #951080 Academic Operations & Curriculum Management System Q&A

- 1. The Vendor Pilot Environment (page 10 of the RFP) mentions a fully configured environment for evaluation prior to selection. Is this expected to be provided before the demos, or later in the evaluation process?**

Later, in the evaluation process.

- 2. To support configuration of the sample environment, what data and documentation does MSU anticipate providing to respondents, and in what form? For example: student roster data, curriculum and program structure, graduation requirement rules, clinical site and capacity inventory, role and permission definitions? When can we expect this data to be available?**

The goal is to have the vendor fill in example data that will allow MSU to verify each use case within the product. MSU can provide the campus names, total students, but the vendor should be building this example data around the use case requirements. Questions beyond that, each vendor should communicate to request specific information needed to accomplish building a working test site. It is anticipated that specifics would be provided after demo phase in the evaluation process.

- 3. How does MSU plan to evaluate the sample environment, including which stakeholder groups will participate?**

MSU plans to evaluate the sample environment through a selected evaluation committee representing key stakeholder groups across Academic Affairs. Participants may include faculty, staff, and leadership from relevant units to ensure appropriate representation of the functional areas and use cases outlined in the RFP.

- 4. On page 4, in section K under the "Reservations" header, MSU reserves the right to "award multiple, optional-use contracts, or award by type of service or good". Does MSU anticipate a single award for this solicitation, or multiple awards across functional areas?**

We anticipate a single award for this solicitation, but reserve the right for a multiple award.

- 5. Could MSU please clarify how Section 11(k) on page 4 applies, and specifically whether they'll accept vendor proposals by functional area? For example, could a vendor submit a response focused only on the advising and student requirements?**

Proposals addressing a subset of functional areas, such as advising and student requirements, may be evaluated for their viability, alignment with MSU's needs, and ability to support the broader solution.

- 6. UC15-G5 and UC15-C12 - same question for both: Can you clarify whether you want the approval workflow for the tags themselves, or for what they map to?**

Procurement-FORM04v01 | Release date: 09/29/25 | This document is uncontrolled when printed or saved.



The approval workflow should apply to the tags and mappings assigned to curriculum content. Faculty or curriculum administrators should be able to review, edit, and approve suggested tags or mappings to the applicable taxonomies. The underlying curriculum content does not require approval through this workflow. The system should maintain version history of changes to approved tags and mappings

- 7. UC19-G3: Can you clarify what is meant by 'source-linked'? Would the source be in Elentra (example - showing the links to tags?) or would sources be external (example - content generated from 'approved source materials' that are only available outside of Elentra?)**

"Source-linked" refers to the ability to maintain traceability to the originating or authoritative source. This may include information housed within the proposed solution or external systems, such as JIT, through links, references, tags, integrations, or similar functionality. The intent is to preserve a clear connection to the source without requiring content to be duplicated within the proposed solution. CHM is interested in understanding how the proposed solution supports these relationships, including links, tags, references, integrations, or other methods of maintaining source traceability.

- 8. Scope of Work, p.8 — Can MSU confirm the specific SIS platform in use?**

MSU uses Oracle PeopleSoft Campus Solutions for our Student Information System.

- 9. Section 14, p.5 — The RFP does not describe a process for identifying or marking confidential or proprietary information (e.g., trade secrets, pricing methodology) that a Respondent wishes to exempt from disclosure under Michigan's FOIA. Can MSU confirm whether such a process exists, and if so, how Respondents should designate exempt material in their proposal?"**

MSU must disclose information subject to FOIA within its possession unless a valid, statutory exemption applies. A bid proposal, itself, is not exempt from disclosure and must be disclosed pursuant to FOIA.

- 10. Would CHM consider extending the proposal submission deadline by two weeks and the deadline for submitting clarification questions by one week? The additional time would allow vendors to thoroughly test the provided use cases and develop informed clarification questions based on that testing.**

An proposal extension was announced on August 20.

- 11. Please identify the Student Information System (SIS) currently in use at CHM.**

Oracle PeopleSoft Campus Solutions

- 12. Are there any current or planned initiatives to replace, consolidate, or materially change the institutional systems supporting the medical program, including the SIS, JustInTime Medicine (JIT), Desire2Learn (D2L)?**

The SIS will remain MSU's institutional source of truth and is not within the scope of this initiative for replacement. JustInTime Medicine (JIT) will remain in use, although its role and functionality may



adapt based on the capabilities of the selected solution. FAME and New Innovations are systems MSU intends to replace through this initiative. D2L is currently in use; however, MSU is open to evaluating opportunities to modify, integrate, consolidate, or replace functionality where appropriate based on the capabilities of the proposed solution and institutional needs. CHM has a custom page within Campus Solutions where some modifications may be theoretically possible if needed to support business processes and integrations into downstream systems.

- 13. Regarding the requirement that the SIS remain the authoritative system of record, please clarify which specific data elements or categories of information this requirement applies to. For data that originates within the proposed solution, would synchronizing the relevant data back to the SIS satisfy this requirement?**

The SIS must remain the system of record for official student and academic information, including enrollment, student name(s), expected graduation, final grades, and transcript-related data. Where data needs to be returned to the SIS, CHM currently anticipates reviewed and approved bulk loads rather than full synchronization or integration.

- 14. Regarding the SIS import requirement, please clarify whether the intended workflow is for schedule data to originate in the SIS and then be delivered to end users through the proposed solution.**

The SIS will be the system of record. The schedule does not have to originate in the SIS, but there must be a method of confirming enrollment from the SIS. If the schedule is not enrolled in the SIS, it must be clear to the student that their schedule is not official and they are not enrolled.

- 15. Please provide the anticipated implementation start date and target go-live date for the selected solution, including when the system is expected to be available to end users/learners.**

Implementation would begin as soon as feasible following completion of the evaluation and vendor selection process, with a preferred full implementation before the incoming class next fall.

- 16. Please clarify the expected functionality associated with “timing rules” and “schedule validation,” including any specific rules, workflows, or examples that the proposed solution is expected to support. Regarding schedule validation, we need to have a means of schedule confirmation between the SIS and the external system. This can look like a checkbox that shows the student they are enrolled once an integration runs to confirm their enrollment from the SIS. Additional enrollment context (section information, SIS course-specific information, etc.) sent over to attach to the user schedule via the integration can also be helpful context to confirm proper enrollment.**

- 17. The requirement states that elective requests must be connected to specialty interest or career advising information where appropriate. Please clarify how CHM envisions this connection functioning, including the types of specialty or career advising information that should be associated with elective requests and made available to learners.**

CHM envisions elective requests being connected to relevant career advising information, including specialty interests, career goals, advisor recommendations, and prior advising discussions where



appropriate. This connection should allow learners and advisors to use career planning information when selecting electives and support alignment between elective choices and a learner's intended specialty or career pathway. Vendors should describe how their solution supports this workflow.

18. Identify the current authoritative source/system of record for VSLO data.

VSLO data comes from AAMC Student Records System (SRS). SRS is loaded with student data from AMCAS at the time of matriculation and is updated throughout medical school based on SIS data.

19. Please clarify what is included within the scope of "curriculum content" that the proposed solution is expected to ingest. For example, does this include lecture materials, assignments, worksheets, online textbooks/resources, or other content types?[FE1.1][FE1.2]

CHM considers curriculum content broadly to include lecture materials, assignments, worksheets, online resources, modules, videos, and other instructional materials. Content may remain in existing systems such as JIT (Just in Time Medicine), with the proposed solution supporting curriculum mapping and, where feasible, connections and/or integrations between systems.

20. Please identify the system or systems currently used by CHM for exam and assessment delivery.

CHM currently uses a combination of systems and methods for exam and assessment delivery, including NBME, D2L, Top Hat, LearningSpace, and paper-based assessments. Specific systems and delivery methods vary depending on the course and assessment type.

21. The Mandatory Vendor Pilot Environment described in the RFP appears to require substantially more than access to a demonstration or sandbox environment, including CHM-specific configuration of campuses, roles and academic phases; role-based permissions; scheduling and workflow configuration; data import/export capabilities; reporting dashboards; documentation; guided test scenarios; and hands-on stakeholder evaluation for a minimum of two months. Would MSU permit respondents to propose a paid pilot engagement for this Mandatory Minimum Requirement, including a defined scope of configuration, training, support, and evaluation activities?

No. MSU will not permit respondents to propose a paid pilot engagement for the Mandatory Vendor Pilot Environment requirement. The Pilot Environment is designed as a standardized evaluation phase within the competitive RFP process to allow the evaluation committee to assess hands-on functionality, workflow capabilities, and stakeholder experience. All costs associated with configuring, supporting, and demonstrating the environment during this evaluation phase must be borne by the respondent.

22. Please clarify when the Mandatory Vendor Pilot Environment must be made available. Is MSU expecting every respondent to configure and provide the required environment as part of its initial proposal submission, or will respondents that otherwise satisfy the Mandatory Minimum Requirements and advance through an initial qualification/evaluation stage be invited to establish the required two-month pilot environment prior to final vendor selection?

Procurement-FORM04v01 | Release date: 09/29/25 | This document is uncontrolled when printed or saved.



Vendors that advance to the final stages of the evaluation process would be invited to establish the pilot environment as part of MSU's final evaluation and consideration prior to an agreement.

- 23. For the required Vendor Pilot Environment, will MSU provide participating vendors with representative CHM configuration information and/or sample data, including campus structure, academic phases, roles, scheduling scenarios, reporting requirements, and test scenarios, or should respondents independently configure the environment based solely on the information contained in the RFP?**

Vendors that advance to the final stages of the evaluation process would be invited to establish the pilot environment as part of MSU's final evaluation and consideration prior to an agreement. MSU will provide representative configuration information and sample data needed to support the pilot environment at that stage.

- 24. Where a requirement is identified as Roadmap Functionality or Custom Functionality in the Use Case Analysis, will MSU consider functionality that has a committed delivery date prior to CHM production go-live, provided the respondent clearly identifies the delivery timeline, implementation assumptions, and any limitations applicable during the pilot evaluation period?**

MSU will consider proposed Roadmap or Custom Functionality as part of the evaluation process. Respondents should clearly identify anticipated delivery timelines, implementation assumptions, and any limitations, including those applicable during the pilot evaluation period.

- 25. Does CHM have a target implementation and production go-live date, academic term, or phased deployment schedule for the selected solution? If a phased implementation is anticipated, does CHM have preferred priority areas or use cases for the initial phase?**

The RFP is structured by CHM's priority areas and use cases, which should assist in informing implementation planning and sequencing. Timing and any phased deployment will be determined following the evaluation and vendor selection process.

- 26. While the current Scope of Work and Appendix A identify the College of Human Medicine as the initial population, the Pricing section references multiple colleges, programs, and program lengths. Is the current procurement intended solely for CHM, with potential future expansion?**

Yes. The scope of work, requirements, and resulting contract from this RFP are intended solely for the College of Human Medicine (CHM). Any future adoption or expansion by other MSU colleges would be evaluated independently under a separate procurement.