

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
RFP#948460

Enterprise Solution for Curriculum, Catalog, and Syllabus

RFP Timeline	
Issue RFP	September 17, 2026
Deadline for Respondent Questions to MSU	October 5, 2026
RFP Response Due	October 28, 2026, 3:00 pm Eastern
Estimated Contract Award	December 15, 2026

RFP Contact	
Name:	Kathy Perron
Unit:	MSU Procurement
Email:	perronka@msu.edu
Phone:	517-884-6183

DESCRIPTION: Michigan State University (the “**University**” or “**MSU**”) is soliciting proposals through this Request for Proposal (“**RFP**”) for the purpose of seeking an enterprise solution for curriculum management, catalog management, and an integrated repository for syllabi. The requested services are more thoroughly described under the Scope of Work Section of this RFP. Firms intending to respond to this RFP are referred to herein as a “**Respondent**” or “**Supplier**.”

PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

- PROPOSAL PREPARATION.** The University recommends reading all RFP materials prior to preparing a proposal, particularly these Proposal Instructions. Respondents must follow these Proposal Instructions and provide a complete response to the items indicated in the table below. References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal. Include the Respondent's company name in the header of all documents submitted with your proposal.

Document	Description	Response Instructions
Cover Page	Provides RFP title and number, important dates, and contact information for MSU	Informational
Proposal Instructions	Provides RFP instructions to Respondents. A complete proposal includes answers to all the following elements below	Informational
Respondent Information Sheet	Company and Contact Information, and Experience	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Scope of Work	Describes the intended scope of work for the RFP	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Pricing	Pricing for goods and services sought by the University through this RFP	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Appendix 1	Complete your answers to these catalog details.	Informational
Appendix 2	Address VPAT information	Informational
Master Service Agreement	Provides legal terms for a contract awarded through this RFP	Deemed accepted by Respondent unless information required in Section 9, Master Service Agreement is submitted by proposal deadline

- EXPECTED RFP TIMELINE.**

Activity	Date
Issue RFP	September 17, 2026
Deadline for Respondent Questions to MSU	October 5, 2026
RFP Response Due	October 28, 2026, 3:00 pm Eastern
Estimated Contract Award	December 15, 2026

- CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE UNIVERSITY.** The sole point of contact for the University concerning this RFP is listed on the Cover Page. Contacting any other University personnel, agent, consultant, or

representative about this RFP may result in Respondent disqualification.

4. **QUESTIONS.** Respondent questions about this RFP must be submitted electronically by email to the contact listed on the cover page of this RFP. In the interest of transparency, only written questions are accepted. Answers to all questions will be sent to Respondents via email. Submit questions by referencing the following: (i) Question Number, (ii) Document Name, (iii) Page Number, and (iv) Respondent Question. Please refer to **Section 2** above for the deadline to submit questions.
5. **MODIFICATIONS.** The University may modify this RFP at any time. Modifications will be sent via email. This is the only method by which the RFP may be modified.
6. **DELIVERY OF PROPOSAL.** The Respondent must submit its proposal, all attachments, and any modifications or withdrawals electronically via email to the contact listed on the cover page of this RFP. **The price proposal should be saved separately from all other proposal documents and should be sent as a separate attachment from the other proposal documents.** The Respondent should submit all documents in a modifiable (native) format (examples include but are not limited to: Microsoft Word or Excel and Google Docs or Sheets). In addition to submitting documents in a modifiable format, the Respondent may also submit copies of documents in PDF. Respondents' failure to submit a proposal as required may result in disqualification. The proposal and attachments must be fully uploaded and submitted prior to the proposal deadline. **Do not wait until the last minute to submit a proposal.** The University **may not** allow a proposal to be submitted after the proposal deadline identified in the Cover Page, even if a portion of the proposal was already submitted.
7. **MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.** The RFP may contain minimum qualifications, which will be identified as "**Mandatory Minimum Requirements**" in the Scope of Work Section of this RFP. If the RFP does contain mandatory minimum requirements, any proposal not meeting these minimum requirements **will be deemed non-qualified and will not be considered.** All proposals meeting these mandatory minimum requirements will proceed for review and evaluation consistent with **Section 8, Evaluation Process.**
8. **Evaluation PROCESS.** The University will convene a team of individuals from various Departments within MSU to evaluate each proposal based on each Respondent's ability to provide the required services, taking into consideration the overall cost to the University. The University may require an oral presentation of the Respondent's proposal; conduct interviews, research, reference checks, and background checks; and request additional price concessions at any point during the evaluation process. The following criteria will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Criteria	Weight
Pricing Model	25%
Tools and Service Aligned to MSU's Needs	25%
Team's Evaluation of Solution	25%
References	5%
Quality & Effectiveness of Proposed Training and Documentation	5%
Vendor's Implementation Solution & Support	5%
Effectiveness of Demonstration	5%
Adherence to MSU Legal Terms	5%
	100%

9. **MASTER SERVICE AGREEMENT.** The University strongly encourages strict adherence to the terms and conditions set forth in the Master Service Agreement. The University reserves the right to deem a

proposal non-responsive for failure to accept the Master Service Agreement. Nevertheless, the Respondent may submit proposed changes to the Master Service Agreement in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the Respondent's need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the Respondent's need for the proposed change constitutes the Respondent's acceptance of the Master Service Agreement. General statements, such as "the Respondent reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions," may be considered non-responsive.

10. **CLARIFICATION REQUEST.** The University reserves the right to issue a Clarification Request to a Respondent to clarify its proposal if the University determines the proposal is not clear. Failure to respond to a Clarification Request timely may be cause for disqualification.
11. **RESERVATIONS.** The University reserves the right to:
 - a. Disqualify a Respondent for failure to follow these instructions.
 - b. Discontinue the RFP process at any time for any or no reason. The issuance of an RFP, your preparation and submission of a proposal, and the University's subsequent receipt and evaluation of your proposal does not commit the University to award a contract to you or anyone, even if all the requirements in the RFP are met.
 - c. Consider late proposals if: (i) no other proposals are received; (ii) no complete proposals are received; (iii) the University received complete proposals, but the proposals did not meet mandatory minimum requirements or technical criteria; or (iv) the award process fails to result in an award.
 - d. Consider an otherwise disqualified proposal, if no other proposals are received.
 - e. Disqualify a proposal based on: (i) information provided by the Respondent in response to this RFP; or (ii) if it is determined that a Respondent purposely or willfully submitted false or misleading information in response to the RFP.
 - f. Consider prior performance with the University in making its award decision.
 - g. Consider total-cost-of-ownership factors (e.g., transition and training costs) when evaluating proposal pricing and in the final award.
 - h. Refuse to award a contract to any Respondent that has outstanding debt with the University or has a legal dispute with the University.
 - i. Require all Respondents to participate in a Best and Final Offer round of the RFP.
 - j. Enter into negotiations with one or more Respondents on price, terms, technical requirements, or other deliverables.
 - k. Award multiple, optional-use contracts, or award by type of service or good.
 - l. Evaluate the proposal outside the scope identified in **Section 8, Evaluation Process**, if the University receives only one proposal.
 - m. Obtain and consider information from other sources concerning a Respondent, such as the Respondent's capability and performance under other contracts, the qualifications of any subcontractor identified in the Proposal, the Respondent's financial stability, past or pending litigation, and other publicly available information.
 - n. Utilize third parties to assist in the evaluation process, provided such parties are subject to confidentiality requirements.
12. **AWARD RECOMMENDATION.** The contract will be awarded to the responsive and responsible Respondent who offers the best value to the University, as determined by the University. Best value will be determined by the Respondent meeting any mandatory minimum requirements and offering the best combination of the factors in **Section 8, Evaluation Process**, and price, as demonstrated by the proposal. The University will email a **Notice of Award** to all Respondents. A Notice of Award does not constitute a contract, as the parties must reach final agreement on a signed contract before any services can be provided. The awarded Respondent is prohibited from partnering with losing bidders unless the RFP specifically allows for such arrangement, and any violation of this prohibition may result in disqualification.

of the awarded Respondent.

13. **GENERAL CONDITIONS.** The University will not be liable for any costs, expenses, or damages incurred by a Respondent participating in this solicitation. The Respondent agrees that its proposal will be considered an offer to do business with the University in accordance with its proposal, including the Master Service Agreement, and that its proposal will be irrevocable and binding for a period of 180 calendar days from date of submission. If a contract is awarded to the Respondent, the University may, at its option, incorporate any part of the Respondent's proposal into the contract. This RFP is not an offer to enter into a contract. This RFP may not provide a complete statement of the University's needs or contain all matters upon which agreement must be reached. Proposals submitted via email are the University's property.
14. **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.** Respondent acknowledges that any responses, materials, correspondence or documents provided to the University may be subject to the State of Michigan Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), Michigan Compiled Law 15.231 *et seq.*, and may be released to third parties in compliance with FOIA or any other law. Questions about the Respondent's own performance can be directed to the RFP Contact indicated on page 1 of this document. Questions about the overall evaluation and any other post-award inquiries must be submitted via a formal FOIA request to the [Michigan State University FOIA office](#).

RESPONDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Please complete the following Information Sheet in the space provided:

Information Sought	Response
Contact Information	
Respondent's sole contact person during the RFP process. Include name, title, address, email, and phone number.	
Person authorized to receive and sign a resulting contract. Include name, title, address, email, and phone number.	
Respondent Background Information	
Legal business name and address. Include business entity designation, e.g., sole proprietor, Inc., LLC, or LLP.	
What state was the company formed in?	
Main phone number	
Website address	
DUNS# AND/OR CCR# (if applicable):	
Number of years in business and number of employees	
Would this represent a material portion of your organization's annual revenue?	
Legal business name and address of parent company, if any	
Has your company (or any affiliates) been a party to litigation against Michigan State University? If the answer is yes, then state the date of initial filing, case name and court number, and jurisdiction.	
Experience Reference	
Describe relevant experiences from the last 5 years supporting your ability to successfully manage a contract with an organization similar to MSU in nature, size, and scope for the services described in this RFP.	
Reference 1	
Company name Contact name Contact role at time of project Contact phone Contact email	
1. Project name and description of the scope of the project 2. What role did your company play? 3. How is this project experience relevant to the subject of this RFP?	
Start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy)	
Status (completed, live, other – specify phase)	
Reference 2	
Company name	

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Contact name Contact role at time of project Contact phone Contact email	
1. Project name and description of the scope of the project 2. What role did your company play? 3. How is this project experience relevant to the subject of this RFP?	
Start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy)	
Status (completed, live, other – specify phase)	
Reference 3	
Company name Contact name Contact role at time of project Contact phone Contact email	
1. Project name and description of the scope of the project 2. What role did your company play? 3. How is this project experience relevant to the subject of this RFP?	
Start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy)	
Status (completed, live, other – specify phase)	

SCOPE OF PROPOSAL

Please address each of the sections below in a written response, which can be completed by copying and pasting pages 8-28 in a separate document with the same section headings and format.

Background.

Michigan State University is seeking proposals for a cloud-based software solution for creating, managing, updating, maintaining, and archiving the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, and for managing the course, program and curriculum management processes through an automated submission, review, approval, curation, and archive workflow process. In addition, we are seeking information about a syllabus repository that may integrate with our current tools. Proposals must detail Implementation schedule, staffing, and milestones.

Scope of Work.

Vendors will self-rate and explain the current state of their tool(s) using this scale.

5 = Out-of-the-Box (OOTB): Fully supported/demonstrated natively in the current production release. No configuration or coding required.

4 = Configuration Required: Supported via built-in admin settings, workflows, or standard toggles. No custom coding is needed.

3 = Third-Party Integration: Supported seamlessly but requires an active subscription or integration with a third-party partner tool.

2 = Custom Development: Requires bespoke coding, database modifications, or custom API builds at an extra cost to the buyer.

1 = Future Roadmap: Not currently available but committed to a future product roadmap release (specify estimated delivery date).

1. Functional Requirements: Curriculum Management

1.1 Form Management: The system **shall** provide a native, editable form-builder that allows administrative users to create and modify curriculum proposal forms without vendor intervention or additional fees.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

1.2 Data Pre-population: The solution **must** support the pre-population of curriculum forms with existing data from Oracle PeopleSoft Campus Solutions 9.2 to eliminate manual data entry.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

--	--	--	--	--	--

1.3 Dependency Visualization: The system **shall** automatically identify and visualize dependencies between courses and programs (e.g., impact on prerequisites, co-requisites, and degree maps) during the proposal process.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

1.4 Governance Support: The solution **must** support the automated creation of committee agendas by grouping related proposals based on workflow stage or date.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

1.5 Attribute Visibility: The system shall allow for the visibility and management of course attributes (e.g., Capstone, Honors, General Education, Transfer, Professional Licensure) throughout the curriculum lifecycle.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating	1	2	3	4	5

1.6. Audit Trails: The solution must maintain an in-line audit trail for every proposal, tracking all changes, time stamps, user comments, and decisions.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

1.7 Export Capabilities: The system **shall** provide exports in multiple file formats including CSV, Excel, JSON, and PDF.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

--	--	--	--	--	--

2. Functional Requirements: Catalog Management

2.1 Real-Time Synchronization: The system **shall** support real-time or scheduled synchronization between the curriculum management module and the public-facing catalog to ensure requirement accuracy.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

2.2 System-wide updates: changes to a course title or the number of credits on a specific course are applied to all instances globally.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

2.3 Multi-Catalog Support: changes to a course title or the number of credits on a specific course are applied to all instances globally.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

2.4 In-Description Editing: The system **shall** allow authorized users to perform in-line description editing directly within the catalog interface.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

2.5 Archiving and Versioning: The solution must provide a publicly accessible version history and automated archival process for previous catalog years.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

2.6 Export Capabilities: The system shall provide exports in multiple file formats including CSV, Excel, JSON, as well as "one-click" PDF generation for the full catalog or specific sections, formatted for print and accessibility compliance.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

2.7 Search Functionality: The catalog **must** include an intuitive, keyword-searchable interface allowing users to filter by program type, subject, learning objectives, and other custom attributes.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3. Reporting Requirements

General Reporting Infrastructure

3.1 Centralized Reporting Environment: The solution **shall** provide a comprehensive reporting environment (e.g., a Data Warehouse) that allows administrative users to create, edit, run, and filter reports on all system data.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.2 Ad-Hoc and Pre-Defined Reporting: The system **must** provide a library of pre-defined "canned" reports while also supporting a robust ad-hoc report builder with a drag-and-drop interface for custom queries.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.3 Multi-Format Export: The solution **must** support the export of report results into multiple industry-standard formats, including CSV, Excel (xlsx), PDF, and JSON.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.4 External Integration (BI Tools): The solution **should** support direct data exports or integration with institutional business intelligence tools, such as Tableau and Power BI, for advanced datavisualization.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.5 API Access: The system shall provide read-only REST APIs to allow for the programmatic retrieval of reporting data, including curriculum approval processes and catalog content.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

Curriculum Management Reporting

3.6 Workflow and Proposal Tracking: The system **must** provide real-time dashboards to track curriculum proposals by author, request status (e.g., approved, suspended), current workflow step, and "aging" (days in the current step).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

--	--	--	--	--	--

3.7 Governance Support (Agenda Creation): The solution **shall** allow users to compile lists of proposals at specific approval stages and automatically format them into meeting agenda templates for curriculum committees.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.8 Impact and Dependency Analysis: The system **shall** generate reports identifying the impact of proposed changes on co-requisite, pre-requisite, and degree relationships across the institution.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.9 Historical and Version Audits: The system **must** maintain a historical change report providing a timestamped change log of all proposal versions, including user comments, edits, and decisions over time.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.10 Accreditation and Alignment: The solution **should** provide reports that align curriculum data with institutional goals, state regulatory requirements, and accreditation standards (e.g., HLC, MSCHE).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

Catalog Management Reporting

3.11 Content Status Reporting: The system **must** generate reports on the status of all catalog sections, indicating if content is unchanged, working, approved, or final.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.12 Audit Trail for Public Content: The solution **shall** maintain in-line audit trails for all catalog description edits, tracking modification dates and identifying the authorized user responsible for the change.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.13 Usage Analytics: The catalog **should** integrate with third-party tools (e.g., Google Analytics) to provide reports on student navigation paths, most-visited pages, and common keyword search terms.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.14 Synchronization Reconciliation: The system **must** provide reconciliation reports or "sync tabs" that alert administrators to any data inconsistencies between the catalog, curriculum module, and the PeopleSoft SIS.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

3.15 Inclusive Language Reporting: The solution **should** provide tools to report on course titles and descriptions against a library of institutional inclusive language rules to ensure catalog compliance with diversity and equity standards.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

4. Technical & Integration Requirements

4.1 SIS Integration (Non-Negotiable): The solution **must** provide nightly integration with Oracle PeopleSoft Campus Solutions v. 9.2 using recommended methods such as Integration Broker (REST/HTTPS).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

4.2 Integration between curriculum management and catalog sections such that real-time updates are seamless and can happen as needed.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

4.3 SSO Integration: The system **must** support Single Sign-On (SSO) authentication through MSU's identity provider (e.g., Okta).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

4.4 API Access: The vendor **shall** provide a full library of REST APIs to support custom integrations and data exports to MSU's electronic Enterprise Data Warehouse.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

4.5 Hosting: The solution **must** be a cloud-based SaaS environment hosted in a secure, redundant facility (e.g., AWS) with documented 99.9% uptime.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

4.6 Environment Management: The vendor **shall** provide separate environments for Development (DEV), Testing/Quality Assurance (QA), and Production (PROD).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

5. Usability & Accessibility Requirements

5.1 ADA Compliance: The system and all public-facing catalog pages **must** comply with WCAG 2.1 Level AA standards at a minimum. WCAG 2.2 Level AA is desired.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

5.2 Responsive Design: The solution **must** deliver a responsive design that is fully functional and optimized for mobile devices, tablets, and desktops.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

5.3 Institutional Branding: The system **shall** allow for full customization of the catalog interface to match MSU's visual identity, including logos, headers, footers, and CSS.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

5.4 User Interface: The user interface **shall** be intuitive and include modern elements such as drag-and-drop workflow designers and visual dashboards.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

5.5 Browser Functionality: All functionality works in most modern browsers including Microsoft Edge, Apple Safari, and Google Chrome

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

6 Security & Data Management

6.1 Role-Based Access Control (RBAC): The system **must** support granular, field-level permissions based on user roles and institutional hierarchy (e.g., department, college, university).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

6.2 Data Security: The solution **must** adhere to the MSU Institutional Data Policy and ensure FERPA compliance for all student-related course data.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

6.3 Disaster Recovery: The vendor **shall** provide documented disaster recovery and business continuity plans, including data redundancy and a recovery time objective (RTO) for mission-critical operations.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

7. Implementation & Support

7.1 Implementation Strategy: The vendor **must** provide a dedicated implementation team (including a Project Manager and Integration Engineer) and a phased project plan with vendor-recommended client staffing models and clear milestones including estimated timelines, client approvals, and closure tasks.

Describe the implementation strategy, staffing, timeline and tasks:

7.2 Training: The vendor **shall** provide comprehensive training materials and sessions tailored to different user types (e.g., administrators, faculty, staff), including access to a sandbox environment.

Describe training approach, audiences, and materials provided:

7.3 Maintenance: Describe how maintenance is planned, managed, communicated, and delivered, and at what cadence. Explain how predictive updates and/or product roadmap updates happen versus emergency releases and/or bug fixes.

Describe maintenance practices noted above:

7.4 Customer Support: For the duration of the contract, the selected solution **must** include 24/7 technical support or a robust service level agreement (SLA) defining *expected* response times for bug fixes and critical system issues. Describe dedicated staffing available after implementation, help desk services, user communities, and annual conferences that may be available to clients.

Describe customer support that is fee-based and includes SLAs, staff and other supports:

8 Available Add-on Tools and Services with Fees

8.1 Predictive Analytics: The system **should** offer tools to analyze curriculum effectiveness, enrollment patterns, and "toxic" course combinations to improve on-time completion rates.

Describe availability of predictive analytics tools and fees:

8.2 Scheduling Module that is integrated and configurable to MSU needs.

Describe the availability of a scheduling module, its functionality, and fees to implement:

8.3 AI-enabled Functionality

Describe any AI-enabled functionality in the products recommended by vendor and any additional fees:

8.4 Available LMS Integrations: Provide a brief description of your tool's ability to integrate with Learning Management Systems such as Desire2Learn.

Describe how or if your product(s) integrate with Learning Management Systems such as Desire2Learn

8.5 Other Services. Are there other services your organization offers that you would like MSU to be aware of?

Describe other services or products that are relevant to this RFP that you have not yet mentioned:

9. Syllabus Management System Tools

9.1 Core Functionality

9.1.1.Centralized repository for all course syllabi, organized by term, department, course, and section, with full version history retained across terms.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.1.2 Standardized templates configurable per department/college, enforcing required fields(learning outcomes, grading policy, required texts, accessibility statements, etc.).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

--	--	--	--	--	--

9.1.3 Structured approval workflow supporting draft → department chair review → curriculum committee sign-off → publish, with configurable routing per academic and respective administrative units.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.1.3 Bulk import/export of syllabi (CSV, DOCX, PDF) for migration and mass updates.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.1.4 Full-text and metadata search across course, instructor, term, and learning outcomes.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.1.5 Cross-term/section comparison to support consistency review across multiple sections of the same course.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.1.6 Term-based locking so a published syllabus cannot be altered after the add/drop period without a logged amendment.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

--	--	--	--	--	--

9.1.7 Multiple syllabus views and access levels configurable by audience (public, students, instructors, advisors, staff, administrators), with role-based access and visibility controls for different syllabus content without requiring duplicate records.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.2 Template Architecture & Dynamic Content Generation

9.2.1 Configurable Template Builder: A flexible drag-and-drop interface enabling administrators to set locked institutional policies while allowing colleges, departments, and programs to define localized required fields.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.2.2 Bi-Directional SIS & Curriculum Syncing: Automated data population pulling real-time course attributes (title, section, credit hours, schedule, pre/co-requisites, instructor of record) from the SIS and Curriculum module to eliminate manual data entry.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

9.2.3 Dynamic Policy Management: Centralized policy blocks (e.g., academic integrity, ADA statements, religious accommodations) that automatically update across all active syllabi whenever university policy language is revised.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

--	--	--	--	--	--

9.2.4 Instructor Autonomy & Guardrails: Customizable component areas for instructors to build section-specific schedules, assignment weightings, and instructional expectations within predefined institutional boundaries.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

9.2.5 Granular Component Visibility: Ability to toggle visibility at the component level to designate elements as public-facing versus student-facing (e.g., shielding instructor’s personal contact information while maintaining public access to learning outcomes).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

9.2.6 Localizable branding: Uniform look and feel across all syllabi, while allowing departmental-level branding to be integrated into the broader MSU brand.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

9.3. Repository & Tiered Access Control

9.3.1 Organizational Hierarchy Mapping: Hierarchical permission structures mirroring the institutional structure (University → College → Department → Program → Course Section).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

9.3.2 Role-Based Access Control (RBAC): Configurable permissions (System Admin, Dean/Department Chair, Curriculum Committee, Instructor, Teaching Assistant, Student) integrated with institutional SSO.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

9.3.3 Archiving with Version Tracking: Automated semester-by-semester archiving of all published syllabi with complete version control, effective dating, and historical audit logs for accreditation and grade dispute resolutions.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.4. Integrations

10.4. 1 LTI 1.3 / Advantage Compliance: Native embeddability within the primary LMS (e.g., D2L Brightspace) allowing instructors and students to access, edit, and view the syllabus directly within course navigation.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.4.2 Two-Way Content Synchronization: Automatic syncing of assignments, quizzes, and calendar dates between the LMS gradebook and the syllabus schedule.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.4.3 Responsive Multi-Device Rendering: Fully responsive interface optimized for desktop, mobile, and tablet views.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.4.4 Single sign-on via SAML 2.0 or OAuth 2.0/OIDC integrated with the institution's identity provider.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.4.1 LMS integration (MSU currently uses D2L Brightspace) to sync syllabi into course shells.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.4.2 SIS integration MSU currently uses Campus Solutions and Modern Campus) to auto-populate course, section, and instructor data.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.5. Searchability, Discovery, & Public Repository

10.5.1 Centralized Public Syllabus Directory: A searchable public repository enabling a campus-wide review of current and archived syllabi.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.5.2 Multi-Parametric Search Engine: Search filters supporting queries by term, coursecode, department, instructor, modality (in-person, hybrid, online), and student learning outcomes.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.5.3 Export & Output Options: One-click batch or individual exports into clean, WCAG-compliant PDF or CSV formats.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.6. Data Governance, Accessibility, & Compliance

10.6.2 WCAG 2.2 AA compliance: Built-in accessibility checkers (alt-text validation, heading structure enforcement, contrast checking) that prevent syllabus publishing until compliance with standard errors are resolved.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.6.2 In-Line Audit Trails: Complete changelog tracking every template edit, component modification, approval timestamp, and user action.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.6.3 Regulatory & Accreditation Readiness: Standardized data fields mapped directly to regional, state, and programmatic accreditation requirements.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.7. Analytics & Administrative Dashboards

10.7.1 Data Dashboards: Real-time dashboards surfacing unit-level completion metrics, unsubmitted syllabi, and missing policy acknowledgments prior to term start dates.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.7.2 Student Engagement Insights: Analytics detailing student views, time spent on the syllabus, and digital policy acknowledgment signoffs.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.8. Compliance & Accreditation

10.8.1 FERPA compliance for any student-identifiable data captured or referenced within the system.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.8.2 Accessibility conformance with WCAG 2.2 AA and Section 508 for all published/exported syllabus documents.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.8.3 Accreditor reporting support (e.g., SACSCOC, HLC, ABET, or applicable regional/programmatic accreditors), including mapping of syllabi to stated learning outcomes and on-demand audit reports.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.8.4 Configurable retention policy to meet state/institutional requirements (typically 3–7 years) for grade-dispute and program-review purposes.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.8.5 HECVAT (Higher Education Community Vendor Assessment Toolkit) will be completed for security/privacy review for selected vendors only.

10.9. Governance & Workflow

10.9.1 Role-based access control with distinct permissions for instructor, chair, dean, registrar, and curriculum committee roles.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.9.2 Configurable approval chains that can vary by college/department without requiring vendor intervention.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.9.3 Full audit trail of edits, approvals, and amendments, including timestamp and responsible party.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.9.4 Delegation support so administrative staff can act on behalf of faculty when authorized.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.10 Security & Data

10.10.1 Encryption of data at rest and in transit (minimum TLS 1.2, AES-256 at rest).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.10.2 Data residency meeting institutional/state requirements (e.g., U.S.-hosted or state-hosted data)

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.10.3 Independent security attestations such as SOC 2 Type II, refreshed annually, and results of recent penetration testing are made available.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.10.4 Data portability with contractual guarantee of full data export in an open format upon contract termination, and defined data-deletion timelines.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5

10.11. Non-Functional Requirements

10.11.2 High availability during peak periods (start/end of term), with published uptime SLA (99.9% or better).

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.11.2 Disaster recovery with defined Recovery Point Objective (RPO) and Recovery Time Objective (RTO), and regular backup testing.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.11.3 Mobile-responsive access for faculty and administrators without requiring a native app.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.11.4 Scalability to support institution-wide enrollment volumes and concurrent usage during peak submission windows.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

10.11.5 Vendor Support SLA defining response times by severity level, and a named implementation/support contact.

Comments that demonstrate the functionality and explain Vendor rating:	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX 1: Catalog Questions

Undergraduate Academic Program Description Template

Review the sections of a common higher education catalog template and answer questions about its characteristics and production below.

0. Undergraduate Degree Programs

A. Program Title

Degree:

College:

Department/School:

B. Program Overview

Provide a concise (100–175 words) description of the academic program.

Include:

- The discipline or field of study.
- The primary educational focus.
- Distinguishing features of the curriculum or academic approach.
- Broad preparation for graduate study, professional practice, or careers, when appropriate.

C. Admission to the Program (if applicable)

Describe any additional admission requirements beyond University admission.

Examples include:

- Secondary admission
- Minimum GPA
- Portfolio or audition
- Required prerequisite coursework
- Application process or deadlines

D. Overview of Requirements for the Degree

Include or reference:

- University graduation requirements
- College requirements
- Major requirements (specify below)
- Concentration or specialization requirements (if applicable)
- Experiential learning requirements
- Capstone requirements (if applicable)

E. Academic Standards (if applicable)

Describe any program-specific academic standards such as minimum grades, GPA requirements, residency requirements, progression requirements, and repeat policies.

F. Licensure or Certification (if applicable)

Describe professional licensure or certification eligibility using approved institutional language.

G. Accreditation (if applicable)

Identify any specialized accrediting body.

H. Major Requirements

Suggested layout for major requirements:

Core Courses (required) Elective

within College Courses Elective

outside College Courses

Available concentrations, if applicable

Examples

Major Requirement Courses

- Core Course 1
- Core Course 2
- Core Course 3
- Core Course 4
- Core Course 5
- Core Course 6
- Core Course 7
- Core Course 8
- ...

Elective Option Courses (Within College)

- Inter-College Elective Course 1
- Inter-College Elective Course 2
- Inter-College Elective Course 3
- Inter-College Elective Course 4
- ...

Elective Option Courses (Outside College)

- Intra-College Elective Course 1
- Intra-College Elective Course 2
- Intra-College Elective Course 3
- Intra-College Elective Course 4
- ...

I. Concentrations

Available concentrations, if applicable, and which elective satisfy requirements from those listed above (must be simply stated as a list)

J. Additional Notes (if applicable)

Include only information necessary for students to understand program requirements or completion.

Catalog Appendix 1: Undergraduate Program Description Template & Vendor Technical Requirements

This Appendix defines the functional requirements, baseline program layout, and technical questionnaire for evaluating catalog and curriculum management platforms. Vendors must review the specifications, answer all questionnaire prompts, and complete the compliance matrix.

1. Target Undergraduate Academic Program Description Template

The following table outlines the desired structural specification and logic for undergraduate program pages. Vendors should use this specification as the baseline reference when answering the technical questions in Section 2 and completing the matrix in Section 3.

Section	Content & Structural Specification	Expected Data Type / Logic
A. Degree & Metadata	Program Title, Degree Type, College, Department/School.	Structured Metadata; synced with SIS.
B. Program Overview	Concise narrative (100–175 words) covering discipline, educational focus, distinguishing features, and career/graduate preparation.	Rich text; real-time word count validation.
C. Admission to the Program	Secondary admission, minimum GPA, auditions/portfolios, prerequisites, and deadlines.	Rich text; conditional suppression if blank.
D. Overview of Degree Requirements	High-level summary / credit breakdown across University, College, Major, Concentration, and Capstone requirements.	Configurable rule blocks; dynamic credit summation.
E Academic Standards	Program-specific minimum grades, GPA, residency, progression, and repeat policies.	Rich text; conditional suppression if blank.
F. Licensure or Certification	Professional licensure/certification eligibility statements.	Rich text; conditional suppression if blank.
G Accreditation	Specialized programmatic accrediting body identification.	Rich text; conditional suppression if blank.
H. Major Requirements: Core Courses	Required core courses (Course ID, Title, Credits, interactive descriptions).	Relational table linked dynamically to central Course Inventory.
H. Major Requirements: Elective Pools	Categorized electives: (1) Within-College electives, and (2) Outside-College electives.	Rule-based course pickers / dynamic attribute filters.
I. Available Concentrations / Tracks	List of concentrations and mapped elective tracks satisfying major requirements.	Hierarchical parent-child program structure.
J. Additional Notes	Essential student completion notes and footnotes.	Rich text; conditional suppression if blank.

2. Vendor Technical Questionnaire

Layout, Page Structure & Validation

- **2.1. Layout Rendering:** How does your platform render the proposed program layout in the published, student-facing catalog? Provide screenshots or sandbox links demonstrating this exact structure.
- **2.2. Page Navigation:** Does the platform present complete program specifications on a single scrolling page, or does it enforce multi-tabbed navigation (e.g., separate tabs for Overview, Requirements, Concentrations)? Explain how this layout is configured administratively.
- **2.3. Word & Character Limits:** How does the authoring form enforce length constraints (e.g., restricting Program Overview to 100–175 words)? Does the UI provide real-time word counters and prevent workflow progression if limits are exceeded?

Layout, Page Structure, and Validation Comments

Course Inventory Automation & SIS Integration

- **2.4. Course Data Population:** Describe how course data (Course Code, Title, Credits, Descriptions, Prerequisites) is populated in Core and Elective requirement tables. Explain the query mechanism to the central Course Inventory / SIS.
- **2.5. Relational Updates:** When a course title, prerequisite, or credit value changes in the course inventory, does that update propagate automatically to all linked program pages, or does it require manual re-linking?
- **2.6. Dynamic Credit Calculation:** Does the platform automatically calculate, validate, and display cumulative credit-hour ranges based on selected core and elective rules?

Course Inventory Automation & SIS Integration Comments

Conditional Logic & Visibility

- **2.7. Public Suppression:** For sections marked (*if applicable*)—including Admission, Academic Standards, Licensure, Accreditation, Concentrations, and Additional Notes, the public catalog automatically suppress empty headers and containers?
- **2.8. Administrative Form Logic:** Can administrative form fields be dynamically hidden or required based on program metadata (e.g., displaying Licensure/Certification only for pre-approved professional degrees)?

Conditional Logic & Visibility Comments

Elective Pools & Concentration Modeling

- **2.9. Dynamic Elective Rules:** How are elective option pools (Within-College vs. Outside-College) configured and maintained? Can elective pools be populated dynamically via metadata filters (e.g., College code, Subject attribute) rather than hardcoding static course lists?
- **2.10. Concentration Hierarchy:** Describe how concentration-specific requirements and elective mappings are structured relative to the parent degree program. How does your architecture prevent redundant maintenance across overlapping core requirements?

Elective Pools & Concentration Modeling Comments

Implementation & Administrative Effort

- **2.11. Production Workflow:** Outline the exact steps required for an administrator to build, test, and publish this program template within your system.
- **2.12. Administrative Effort:** What is the estimated total effort (in functional hours) required by institutional staff to configure and validate this template during implementation?

Implementation & Administrative Effort Comments

3. Template Capability & Customization Matrix

Vendors must complete the table below for each section of the template. Explain your answers in this table in the Comment box below.

Template Section	Supported Out-of-the-Box? (Y/N)	Configurable via Admin UI? (Y/N)	Requires Custom Code / Dev? (Y/N)	Population Method (Auto-Sync / Dynamic / Manual)	Supports Conditional Suppression? (Y/N)
A Degree & Metadata					N/A
B. Program Overview					N/A
C. Admission to the Program					
D. Overview of Degree Requirements					N/A
E Academic Standards					

F. Licensure or Certification					
G Accreditation					
H.1 Major Requirements Core Courses					N/A
H.2 Major Requirements Elective Pools					
I. Available Concentrations / Tracks					
J. Additional Notes					

Template Capability & Customization Matrix Comments

APPENDIX 2: VPAT

The [Section508.gov website](#) points to [Voluntary Product Accessibility Template files](#) available from the Information Technology Industry. The VPAT 2.5Rev WCAG edition is what we'd be looking for. Ideally, the VPAT would be completed using the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2 standard.

If a supplier already has a completed VPAT (also known as an Accessibility Conformance Report/ACR) available, we prefer that it be less than two years old.

- i. The University is required to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), and has adopted a formal policy regarding accessibility requirements for websites and software applications which is based on the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2 Level AA.
- ii. If this purchase is related to a digital product or service, then the supplier is required to submit a completed VPAT as part of their proposal for MSU's review.
 - a. VPAT Version 2.5 or 2.5Rev should be used.
 - b. WCAG 2.2 Level AA should be included in the applicable standards/guidelines.
 - c. The report should be completed within the last two years to be considered current.
 - d. The report should include manual testing in the evaluation and methods.
- iii. Reports prepared by third-party accessibility professionals are preferred over reports prepared internally by the supplier. Detailed explanations of the evaluation methods and of criteria remarks/explanations should be present in internally prepared reports. As part of MSU's review of product accessibility, MSU may request access to a test or sample environment.

PRICING

Please include a Pricing proposal as identified below on a separate sheet.

Please list all associated costs for your product and services using the format below:

REQUIRED COSTS:

Curriculum Management

Annual Software Subscription / License Fees:	List Price	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
1 Yr Agreement			
3 Yr Agreement			
5 Yr Agreement			
Subtotal:			

Comments

Installation / Implementation Fees:	List Price	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
Subtotal:			

Comments

Support / Service Level Agreement:	List Price Per Yr	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
1 Yr Agreement			
3 Yr Agreement			
5 Yr Agreement			
Subtotal:			

Training and Documentation:	List Price	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
Subtotal:			

Comments

Add Ons

Predictive Analytics			
Scheduling Module			
AI-enabled Functionality			
LMS Integrations			
Other			

Comments

Predictive Analytics	List Price	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost

Catalog Management

Annual Software Subscription / License Fees:		List Price	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
1 Yr Agreement				
3 Yr Agreement				
5 Yr Agreement				
			Subtotal:	

Comments

Installation / Implementation Fees:		List Price	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
			Subtotal:	

Comments

Support / Service Level Agreement:		List Price Per Yr	\$ or % Discount	MSU Cost
1 Yr Agreement				
3 Yr Agreement				

5 Yr Agreement			
----------------	--	--	--

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

	<i>Subtotal:</i>	
--	------------------	--

<i>Training, Documentation:</i>	<i>List Price</i>	<i>\$ or % Discount</i>	<i>MSU Cost</i>
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	

Comments

Add Ons

<i>Syllabus Tool</i>	<i>List Price</i>	<i>\$ or % Discount</i>	<i>MSU Cost</i>
<i>Predictive Analytics</i>			
<i>Scheduling Module</i>			
<i>AI-enabled Functionality</i>			
<i>LMS Integrations</i>			
<i>Other</i>			

Comments

Syllabus Management

<i>Annual Software Subscription / License Fees:</i>	<i>List Price</i>	<i>\$ or % Discount</i>	<i>MSU Cost</i>
<i>1 Yr Agreement</i>			
<i>3 Yr Agreement</i>			
<i>5 Yr Agreement</i>			
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	

Comments

<i>Installation / Implementation Fees:</i>	<i>List Price</i>	<i>\$ or % Discount</i>	<i>MSU Cost</i>
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	

Comments

<i>Support / Service Level Agreement:</i>	<i>List Price Per Yr</i>	<i>\$ or % Discount</i>	<i>MSU Cost</i>
<i>1 Yr Agreement</i>			
<i>3 Yr Agreement</i>			
<i>5 Yr Agreement</i>			
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	

<i>Training and Documentation:</i>	<i>List Price</i>	<i>\$ or % Discount</i>	<i>MSU Cost</i>
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	

Comments

MASTER SERVICE AGREEMENT

(In separate Document)

Please refer to Section 9 of the RFP Instructions when reviewing the Master Services Agreement terms and conditions.