Mississippi State University
Request for Proposals (RFP) 2025033
ARRT – Assessment Rostering and Reporting Tool

Questions and Answers

November 21, 2025

See below the questions asked and answered for RFP 2025033 and use this information to respond accordingly.

1. Can we make our submission electronically via SciQuest Jaggaer instead of making a hard copy submission as the RFP document states?
   Yes. If you did not receive an invite from "Bully Buy" to respond to this RFP, please let Jennifer Mayfield know as soon as possible.

2. The RFP specifies an "API Integration" for roster uploads. What is the source system that the Solution would be integrating with? Can you provide its API documentation?

The RFP requires that the ARRT system itself support API-based uploads and data exchange. It does not require integration with a single statewide source system. Districts may connect their own SIS or local systems to the ARRT system through the APIs your solution provides. Any system-specific API documentation would be addressed after award if MSU elects to integrate with external systems.

3. The RFP requires "input, storage, and mapping of certification scores from multiple certification providers". In what format will this data be provided (e.g., standardized CSV, custom Excel, API, XML)? Will it be required to be an automated or manual process, or both?

The RFP explicitly requires support for both automated and manual data imports from external testing providers, and for mapping those results to student records. At minimum, the system must accept Excel (.xlsx, .xls) and CSV files. API or other structured formats may be used when supported by the certification provider. The system should be able to map incoming certification scores to student records regardless of the provider's file structure.

4. Can you provide sample certification score files from key provider(s)?

De-identified or synthetic example certification files can be made available to the awarded vendor to guide design and mapping. These examples will reflect the structure and fields typically received from our major certification providers. Actual files will be shared in compliance with FERPA and any applicable data-sharing agreements.

5. Will each certification score file provided by a provider be structured in the same format?

No. Each certification provider may have its own file layout, identifiers, and scoring structures. The system must therefore be able to support certification-specific data mappings and parameters rather than relying on a single, universal file format.

6. Will each contain a unique identifier that can be 1:1 mapped to a student within the uploaded roster files?

The expectation is that each certification data file will contain at least one unique identifier (e.g., state or local student ID) and/or a combination of fields (e.g., name, DOB) that can be reliably mapped to a student in the roster data.
The ARRT system must support mapping certification records to students using one or more identifiers (e.g., student ID, name, birth date, etc.) and provide data-mapping functionality so that different providers' identifiers can be aligned with rostered students.

7. Module Tracking and Completion: Will the roster or provided certification score data sets contain module-level information per student? If not, from what source, and how, will this data be provided to the Solution?

Yes. Data sets will provide module-level information per student for certifications that require module testing.

8. How many distinct certification programs (unique rules) must the system support at launch?

At launch, the system should be prepared to support certification results from 11 national providers and approximately 37 certification tests. The number may change over time, so the rules engine must be flexible and scalable.

9. Is the expectation that a user in the system can manage certification programs and associated rules, or will these be known prior to launch and can be designed into the system?

Both. Program rules will be known and configured prior to launch, and the system must allow authorized state administrators to update, refine, and test coding rules over time as certification requirements change. After launch, authorized state administrators must be able to update or adjust rules without additional custom development (e.g., adjust required modules, attempt limits, etc.).

10. What is the user interface expectation for the Solution that allows administrators to "update, refine, and test coding rules"? Is this a simple form with drop-downs, a visual workflow builder, or a text-based/code-based editor?

The RFP does not require a specific design, but a simple form-based interface with drop-downs is preferred. The goal is to allow administrators to make updates without writing code.

11. Can you provide 2–3 complete, concrete examples of these certification rule sets, and how the data establishes whether a certification is achieved?

1. **Certification Program A – Level 1**
    - **Required modules: M1 (written), M2 (written), P1 (performance).**
    - **Sequence: Modules may be taken in any order.**
    - **Attempts: Only passing scores within the first two attempts for each module count toward eligibility.**
    - **Multi-year: Any sequence of attempts across up to 2 school years is valid.**
    - **Result: A student is "certified" when all three modules are passed within attempts 1–2.**
2. **Certification Program B – Single Written + Optional Performance**
    - **Required: Test Part 1 and Test Part 2.**
    - **Sequence: Parts may be taken in any order**
    - **Attempts: Up to 2 counted attempts for each part**
    - **Result: Certification is awarded if both parts are passed within the first two attempts.**

The ARRT system must allow configurations of this type for each certification program.

12. Is the rule that "only modules passed within the first two attempts are recognized" a universal, state-defined rule, or does this rule vary by certification provider?

This is a state-defined rule.

13. When an admin "tests" a new rule, what is the expectation? Is the ask here for a Sandbox/Beta environment of the Solution?

Yes, Administrators must be able to test rule changes without affecting production results. The vendor's solution should provide one or more of the following:

- **A sandbox or test environment that mirrors production data structure and/or**
- **A "test mode" that allows re-running rules against a sample or historical dataset, with results clearly separated from live production outcomes.**

14. Will there be a need to import Historical Data at launch? How many years of historical certification and roster data will need to be imported, linked, and processed against the rules engine at launch?

Yes. The RFP requires multi-year data validation and the ability to link module attempts across multiple school years to determine certification eligibility.

- **Historical data for at least several prior school years will need to be imported and linked so that:**
  - **The system can establish eligibility based on module attempts from more than one year, and**
  - **Audit trails show which years contributed to final eligibility determinations.**

15. When an admin "updates" a rule (e.g., changes an attempt limit from 2 to 3), what is the expected behavior? Does it need to change results retroactively?

Updated rules and changes should apply going forward from an effective date chosen by MSU/RCU.

- **The system should allow re-processing of historical data under the new rules when requested, but must maintain:**
  - **Auditability of prior results under the old rules, and**
  - **Clear documentation of when and why rules changed.**

Vendors should describe how their solution handles retroactive recalculation, effective dating, and audit trails.

16. When the RFP asks vendors to "demonstrate the ability to design, configure, test, and maintain these rules," what is the expectation prior to development of a Solution?

Before full development or configuration, MSU/RCU expects:

- **A clear architectural and functional description of your proposed rules engine.**
- **Evidence from prior or existing implementations showing you have successfully implemented similar rules for multi-module, multi-attempt, multi-year certifications.**

- **A demonstration or prototype of how rules would be configured, tested, and maintained in your solution (or in a comparable existing product).**

17. Interactive Visualizations: The RFP requires "interactive data visualization tools (e.g., charts, graphs, and dashboards)." Will all visualization be based only on pre-determined KPIs? Can you provide those, or an example?

The RFP names several key reporting dimensions that must be supported and are natural KPIs:

- **Test scores by school district, course code, or teacher**
- **Certification results by student, school, district, and certification type**
- **Certification completion rates**
- **Comparative analysis across schools or testing centers**
- **Trend analysis of certification pass rates over time**

Visualizations must allow filtering, sorting, and drill-down. Additional KPIs and dashboards may be added over time.

18. Can you provide a specific example of a "drill-down" path?

Yes. For example, an administrator might:

1. **Start at a statewide dashboard of certification pass rates.**
2. **Drill down to a specific district.**
3. **Drill down to a specific school within that district.**
4. **Drill down to a course or certification program.**
5. **Drill down to a teacher associated with that course.**
6. **Finally, drill down to individual students and see their module attempts and outcomes.**

Users should be able to drill-down:

1. **Start at a district/school dashboard**
2. **Drill down to a course**
3. **Drill down to a teacher**
4. **Drill down to individual students**

The system should support similar hierarchical drill-downs and cross-filters.

19. API-Based Exports: The RFP lists "API-based exports to integrate with third-party systems." Is the expectation that data is received via API, or that data is sent to a system via API?

The explicit RFP requirement under Reporting & Analytics is for API-based exports. The requirement refers to exporting data via API so authorized systems can retrieve ARRT

data programmatically. Inbound APIs are optional and may be used where providers support them.

20. What system(s) are you requiring to send this data to, and what is the goal of that integration?

The RFP does not name specific target systems. The goal is to enable integration with current or future data warehouses, dashboards, or state systems and avoid locking MSU into a closed system where data cannot be programmatically accessed. Vendors should design API exports to be flexible and standards-based, enabling support for multiple possible integrations.

21. The RFP allows admins to "Create custom data fields." Are these fields expected to be simple text/number inputs, or do they need to be integrated into the reporting, filtering, and certification logic engines?

At minimum, custom data fields must be usable for additional tracking and reporting needs, meaning these fields should be available for use in reports and filters (e.g., as additional dimensions or filters in queries/dashboards). Integration into the certification rules engine is preferred, but not strictly required for all custom fields. Vendors should explain which custom field types are supported (text, numeric, date, etc.), and how those fields can be incorporated into reporting, filtering, rules, etc.

22. Document and File Management: Our initial assumption is that "uploads" referred to imported data files (rosters, certification scores). Is this assumption correct, or is there a separate need for document uploads with another purpose?

Yes. The primary purpose of document/file management is:

- **Roster uploads**
- **Certification score uploads**
- **Other structured data files related to assessment and certification reporting.**

The ability to store additional supporting documents (e.g., audit files) is a plus, but not the primary focus.

23. Can you provide a simple workflow example for a "request and submission"?

Yes. One example consistent with the RFP's description of real-time tracking of requests and submissions is:

1. **An RCU administrator uploads a certification score file (submission) for a given testing window.**
2. **The system validates the file and flags any errors (e.g., unmatched students, missing modules).**

3. **The submission enters a "Pending Review" status visible to both the district and RCU staff.**
4. **An RCU administrator reviews the file, corrects or requests corrections, and approves it.**
5. **Once approved, the submission is marked "Finalized", and its data is incorporated into reporting and eligibility calculations.**
6. **All steps (upload, review, approval, finalization) are logged in an audit trail.**

24. The RFP states that the solution must include quality assurance processes to verify accurate implementation and ongoing compliance with both state and certification provider requirements. What is the expectation with the Vendor for verifying ongoing compliance? If an admin within the Solution updates a provider's unique rules for certification, is there an expectation that the Solution automatically corrects this? If so, where would the Solution access the "source of truth" for compliance and requirements?

The RFP requires the vendor to demonstrate robust QA processes for both initial implementation and ongoing maintenance of certification rules. MSU/RCU will serve as the "source of truth" for rules and updates (e.g., updated documentation from the state or certification providers).

- **The vendor's solution should:**
    - **Make it straightforward for admins (or vendor support) to configure those updates**
    - **Provide tools to validate that new rules produce expected results (e.g., spot-check reports, test runs on sample data)**
    - **Maintain clear audit logs of rule changes and their impact.**

There is no expectation that the system will automatically detect or scrape rule changes from external providers. Once new requirements are communicated (if applicable), the system should support the accurate and efficient application of those changes and re-processing where needed, under administrator control.