

Mississippi State University

MSU2026088 Request for Proposal

Solution for Automating the Extraction, Validation, and Ingestion of Document Data

July 21, 2026

1. What is the budget for this procurement?
 - A. There is no set budget for this procurement. We can say that the total contract value will not exceed \$250,000.00.
2. What is the implementation timeline?
 - A. The only timelines we have available are what we've posted in the schedule of critical dates. Vendors should give us their plan for implementation when they respond to this RFP.
3. Data delivery into Banner (Sections 3.d.1, 3.a.4, 3.c). The RFP requires export of extracted data to the Student Information System (Ellucian Banner) "without manual intervention," and separately permits secure export to CSV, Excel, or database outputs. Could MSU clarify the required delivery mechanism into Banner: (a) a direct API write to Banner (for example, via Ellucian Ethos); (b) a scheduled structured file — CSV or database — loaded into Banner by MSU or its Ellucian team; or (c) either approach, at the vendor's proposed design? If a direct API write is required, which Banner interface does MSU expect vendors to target?
 - A. Ethos APIs are preferred but flat files as a fallback if not feasible via API. We run Banner on-prem.
4. Extraction accuracy measurement (Section 3.d.1). The RFP specifies a minimum 85–90% extraction accuracy for key fields with configurable confidence thresholds. How does MSU intend to measure extraction accuracy for evaluation — for example, field-level accuracy against a defined document sample, and measured after human validation or on raw output prior to review? Is a human-in-the-loop validation-and-correction step prior to export (in which reviewers confirm or correct extracted values) acceptable in satisfying this requirement?
 - A. A human-in-the-loop validation-and-correction step prior to export (in which reviewers confirm or correct extracted values) is acceptable in satisfying this requirement.
5. Deployment model (Section 3.a.4 and the Software/IT section). Section 3.a.4 states the solution "shall be compatible with both on-premises and cloud deployment environments," while the Software/IT section states the system "must be cloud-based." Could MSU confirm whether a cloud-hosted (SaaS) solution fully satisfies

the deployment requirement, or whether an on-premises deployment option is mandatory for award?

A. Cloud is preferred, others are acceptable.

6. Redaction scope (Section 3.a.1). Could MSU clarify the intended use of the required redaction capability — for example, whether it applies to sensitive fields within the extraction and validation review interface prior to export, or to broader redaction across a stored document repository?

A. Broader redaction across a stored document repository

7. “Additional Desired” items and phasing (Section 3.f). With respect to Items 4 and 5 under Additional Desired — the public degree audit tool feeding from Banner and Degree Works, and the conversion of handwritten recruitment cards for Slate — could MSU confirm these are desired, future-state capabilities not required for initial award, and that vendors may propose the core transcript and credential extraction and validation solution in an initial phase, with these items scoped as subsequent phases?

A. Yes, future-state capabilities and are not required for initial award

8. VPAT and HECVAT submission timing (Section 3.a.5 and the Software/IT section). Are a completed VPAT and HECVAT Lite required to be included within the proposal submission due July 23, or may they be provided during the contracting or implementation phase?

A. It is helpful if the VPAT and HECVAT are submitted with the proposal, but it is not required at that point. Mississippi State will ask for them when needed during the contract negotiation period.

9. Is there an overall page limit on the technical proposal, or does the three-page limit apply only to the cover letter?

A. There is no page limit to the technical proposal. The three page limit applies to the cover letter.

10. How many references does the university expect, and is there a required format for presenting them?

A. Three, no format

11. Can the university share the estimated annual document and transcript volume and the anticipated number of users? We read the 5,000 pages per day figure as a peak capacity requirement and want to size correctly.

A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages.

Anticipated up to 20 users in system daily

12. Should the items listed in Section 3(f), Additional Desired, including the future public degree audit tool and the handwritten recruitment card conversion for Slate, be priced in this response, or will they be scoped as future or optional phases?

- A. Scoped as future phases
13. What is the university's preferred integration method for Ellucian Banner (Ethos APIs, flat file, or direct integration), and which Banner version and hosting model should respondents plan against?
- A. Ethos APIs are preferred but flat files as a fallback if not feasible via API. We run Banner on-prem.
14. What is the annual volume of transcripts processed by your institution?
- A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages
15. What other document types do you expect the solution to process (e.g., high school transcripts, college transcripts, international credentials, test scores, military transcripts, certificates, or other supporting documents)?
- A. All listed but initially transcripts, test scores and minimal supporting documents. We would also like the ability to redact SSN during the processing of these materials/documents.
16. Will the solution be used for undergraduate, graduate, transfer, first-year/freshman, or other applicant populations?
- A. Undergraduate, graduate, transfer, and first-year/freshman.
17. If possible, could you provide an annual volume breakdown by applicant type (e.g., first-year/freshman, transfer, undergraduate, graduate) and by document type?
- A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages (55% high school transcripts, 38% undergraduate post-secondary transcripts, 7% graduate post-secondary transcripts)
18. Should vendors' Cost Proposals include pricing for the future desired public-facing degree audit tool, or is that out of scope at this stage of procurement?
- A. Out of scope, but cost estimation could be included if available.
19. Does the project scope include processing college transcripts only, high school transcripts only, or both?
- A. Both
20. Does the project scope include transfer credit evaluation/equivalency, or is it limited to extracting transcript data?
- A. The actual evaluation will not be included in this project. Instead, it will just need to populate the correct information in the Banner form so that evaluation can be completed there.
21. Can MSU confirm whether the \$250,000 maximum contract value applies to the full five-year term, including implementation, licensing, maintenance, support, and optional services?
- A. The \$250,000 maximum contract value applies to anything that is related to this RFP. It will include all of the expenses mentioned.

22. Are transcripts the primary document type for phase one, or should the initial implementation include additional credentials, forms, or admissions/records documents?
- A. Transcripts are primary
23. Can MSU provide estimated annual, monthly, and peak-period volumes by document type?
- A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages (55% high school transcripts, 38% undergraduate post-secondary transcripts, 7% graduate post-secondary transcripts)
24. Can MSU clarify whether the stated volume of 5,000 pages per day / 2,500 documents represents average daily volume or peak processing volume?
- A. Peak volume
25. What percentage of documents are expected to be scanned images versus digitally generated PDFs?
- A. 25% scanned
26. What percentage of documents are expected to include handwriting?
- A. 15%
27. Are unofficial transcripts included in scope, or only official transcripts and credentials?
- A. Unofficial are included
28. Can MSU define the minimum required data fields for transcript and credential extraction in phase one?
- A. Identification data; high school GPA and rank; post-secondary courses, grades and credits; institution information/CEEB
29. Are course descriptions required for all courses, or only when present on the source document?
- A. Only when present on the source document
30. Should the solution extract transfer-equivalency-related data, or only source transcript data?
- A. Source transcript data only
31. How should the solution handle repeated courses, duplicate course entries, withdrawals, incomplete grades, pass/fail courses, and grade changes?
- A. Following standard MSU transfer acceptance policy
32. What validation rules should be applied before data is exported to Banner?
- A. Those pertaining to entry into Banner form SHATAEQ
33. Should extracted data require human review and approval before ingestion, or should some document types support straight-through processing?
- A. Human review in cases where OCR confidence is below a certain threshold

34. Can MSU clarify whether business users should be able to modify extraction rules independently, or whether IT oversight is expected?
- A. User modification would be preferred but IT is willing to support if needed
35. Are there specific dashboard, reporting, or audit requirements that MSU considers mandatory for go-live?
- A. No
36. Should vendors explicitly respond to the PCI section even if they believe it is not applicable?
- A. PCI is not in scope for this project.
37. Can MSU clarify the expected integration approach with Ellucian Banner?
- A. Ethos APIs preferred but other options are ok
38. Does MSU prefer API-based integration, direct database integration, flat-file export/import, Ethos integration, or another approved Banner ingestion method?
- A. Ethos integration preferred but other options are ok
39. Can MSU provide the target Banner tables, APIs, file layouts, or integration specifications required for extracted transcript data?
- A. MSU can provide this information during implementation. Preference is to work with a vendor who already has experience working with Banner for an implementation such as this.
40. Can MSU clarify whether the selected vendor will be responsible for building the Banner integration or providing output files/specifications for MSU IT to ingest?
- A. If Ethos integration is used, then the vendor would be expected to use the APIs to populate Banner data. If flat files are used for integration, MSU IT would build the processes necessary to ingest the data with vendor guidance.
41. Is Slate integration required for the initial implementation, or is Slate integration limited to future recruitment card automation?
- A. Slate integration would be necessary to populate calculate fields based on transcript data, primarily. Possibly would want extracted course information to be populated into Slate courses dataset.
42. Are there existing middleware, integration platforms, or enterprise service bus tools that vendors should assume or integrate with?
- A. Preferably Ethos
43. Should the solution support bi-directional updates with Slate and/or Banner, or only export validated data downstream?
- A. Bi-directional. Data (transcripts received via Parchment, etc.) should flow into the vendor's product, processed, and resulting output pushed to Banner and some fields possibly pushed back to Slate.

44. Are there required naming conventions, data formats, or institutional data standards for extracted outputs?
- A. None that we are aware of
45. Can MSU clarify whether a cloud-based solution is mandatory, preferred, or optional?
- A. Cloud is preferred, others are acceptable.
46. If cloud-based, are there specific hosting requirements, such as U.S.-based data centers, SOC 2 Type II hosting, or Mississippi/state data residency requirements?
- A. US based data centers.
47. Is an on-premises deployment acceptable if it meets the stated security, integration, and performance requirements?
- A. Cloud is preferred, others are acceptable.
48. Does MSU require separate production, test, and sandbox environments?
- A. Yes
49. Should the solution integrate with MSU's existing identity provider?
- A. Yes
50. Are there restrictions on use of AI, machine learning, or third-party subprocessors for document processing?
- A. No, however the architecture in use must be documented.
51. Which compliance frameworks are mandatory for award versus preferred, including SOC 2, HECVAT Lite, FERPA, GDPR, GLBA, NACHA, and Red Flags?
- A. If the HECVAT is unavailable, please substitute what security/compliance documentation the vendor has available. (European vendors often are ISO 27001 compliant, or the SOC2 certification is common in for large US vendors.
52. Can MSU clarify whether a completed HECVAT Lite is required at proposal submission or only upon finalist/award stage?
- A. Proposal submission
53. Who is the designated person the SOC audit needs to be presented to? We would need to send any SOC details securely to a designated individual.
- A. Yes; Tom Ritter – Chief Information Security Officer
54. Should original documents remain in the vendor solution after processing, or be deleted after successful export?
- A. Deleted after successful export.
55. Does MSU require field-level redaction, document-level redaction, or both?
- A. At a minimum, redact SSN
56. Are there specific audit log retention requirements?
- A. If possible, 1 year retention – based on cost.

57. What is MSU's desired go-live date for the initial production implementation?
- A. 1-1-2027
58. Which MSU departments and stakeholder groups will participate in implementation, testing, validation, and approval?
- A. Admissions, Registrar, and IT
59. What level of onsite presence, if any, is expected during discovery, implementation, training, or go-live?
- A. All remote is acceptable or travel to be included in quote.
60. Should vendors assume a phased rollout by document type, office, campus, or system integration?
- A. Office
61. What acceptance criteria will MSU use to confirm successful implementation?
- A. Time saved in manual processing
62. How will MSU measure the required 85–90% extraction accuracy rate?
- A. Document-level accuracy and human-in-the-loop input
63. Will accuracy be measured at the field level, document level, line-item level, or transaction level?
- A. Document level
64. Which fields will be considered "key fields" for accuracy measurement?
- A. Course information like subject, course number, course title, term, grade, etc. Additionally, student identity matching.
65. Will MSU provide a representative test set of documents for validation?
- A. Yes
66. How many MSU users should be included in initial training?
- A. 10
67. What user roles should training cover, such as administrators, validators, IT users, reporting users, and business office users?
- A. Administrators, validators, IT users, office processing coordinators
68. Does MSU prefer live instructor-led training, train-the-trainer, recorded sessions, written guides, or a combination?
- A. combination
69. Should training be delivered onsite, remotely, or both?
- A. both
70. Does MSU require training documentation to be customized to MSU's workflows?
- A. preferably

71. Should implementation services be priced as fixed fee, time and materials, or both?
- A. Time and materials
72. Should optional future services be priced separately and excluded from the base cost proposal total?
- A. Yes
73. Should pricing include all sandbox, test, and production environments?
- A. Yes, if these environments are available
74. Should vendors include proposed exceptions to the standard contract within the technical proposal cover letter, or in a separate exceptions document?
- A. Yes
75. For electronic submissions, how should vendors identify confidential or proprietary information if colored paper is not applicable?
- A. Follow the directions to clearly mark the page as confidential, and you should be able to use pdf to change the background color of certain pages before submitting your response.
76. Can MSU provide more detail on the desired public pre-enrollment degree audit tool?
- A. The desire is to have a tool that prospective students could use to upload transcripts and determine their time to completion of degrees offered at MSU.
77. Should the degree audit tool be considered part of this RFP response or a future separately scoped initiative?
- A. Separately scoped
78. Does MSU currently use Degree Works, and should any proposed future degree audit solution integrate with Degree Works, Banner curriculum tables, or both?
- A. We do use Degree Works
79. Regarding this statement, “The solution shall allow flexible branding and customization options without custom code”, define ‘flexible branding’. Is the intention for MSU to re-brand the IDP software application (i.e. white-label)?
- A. Yes, white-label
80. Please explain in more detail this ‘additional desired’ item: “Future development/deployment of public degree audit tool directly feeding from MSU’s curriculum tables in Ellucian Banner and Degree Works”
- A. The desire is to have a tool that prospective students could use to upload transcripts and determine their time to completion of degrees offered at MSU.
81. Please explain in more detail this requirement: “The solution should support (...) real-time/on-demand parsing through API”.

- A. on-demand parsing and exporting to Banner and slate
82. The solution mentions “.... extracting key transcript/credential data fields, including but not limited to....”, can you please provide a list of other document types and their associated meta-data fields?
- A. High school and post-secondary transcripts, ACT/SAT scores from transcripts and test documents, test fee waiver requests, NACAC fee waiver requests
83. What is MSU’s policy for AI usage & integration policy surrounding this RFP project?
- A. No explicit policy, however, any AI architecture must be explained in detail.
84. What are the document ingestion channels for this project (paper, email, fax, web, etc)?
- A. We receive transcripts in Slate via manual upload, automated imports from Parchment and other vendors, etc. These would be ingested by the vendor solution from Slate
85. Are there any Content Management Systems in place at MSU or are all documents and associated data to be exported/delivered to the applications mentioned in the RFP (i.e. Banner, etc).
- A. Applications mentioned
86. Are there any RPA tools in place at MSU?
- A. No
87. Does MSU have document scanners in use today? If so, make & model? Are scanners needed as part of this scope?
- A. Yes, Canon ImageRUNNER Advance DX c3926i
88. Does MSU have an existing document management system or is one needed?
- A. BDM/Xtender is existing document management system
89. What type of deployment model is acceptable? Is on-prem/hybrid required?
- A. Cloud is preferred, others are acceptable.
90. For the Ellucian Banner integration, which specific Banner modules and Ethos API endpoints should the solution target (e.g., Student, Admissions, Transfer Articulation)? Does MSU currently use Ellucian Ethos Integration, or would the vendor need to integrate directly with Banner APIs?
- A. Ethos Integration is preferred but open to other options
91. What is the expected scope of Slate CRM integration — should the solution ingest documents from Slate (e.g., via email or shared folder), push extracted data back to Slate, or both?
- A. Documents should be ingested from Slate and push data to Banner and some information back to Slate

92. Does MSU currently use Parchment, CollegeSource/TES, or any other electronic transcript exchange service? If so, should the solution ingest electronic transcripts from these services in addition to scanned/PDF documents?
- A. Yes—Parchment; these documents are loaded into Slate and should be ingested from there.
93. Section 9 references PCI DSS compliance. Does MSU anticipate the IDP solution processing payment card data, or is this a standard procurement clause? If PCI applies, please describe the specific payment-related use case.
- A. At this time, MSU does not anticipate any PCI requirements for this project.
94. For the 85–90% extraction accuracy threshold, how will accuracy be measured during evaluation — by field-level accuracy, document-level accuracy, or end-to-end process accuracy? Will MSU provide a representative sample of transcripts for benchmarking?
- A. Document-level accuracy. Yes, a sample could be provided.
95. Regarding the future-state public pre-enrollment degree audit tool: is this capability expected within the initial contract scope and budget, or is it envisioned as a separate future phase?
- A. Separate future phase
96. Will shortlisted vendors be invited to conduct a live demonstration? If so, can MSU provide sample transcripts in advance for the demo?
- A. If a live demonstration is considered, MSU can provide samples.
97. Does this budget ceiling encompass both the core IDP software licensing and the necessary integration work required to map transcript data directly into Ellucian Banner and Slate CRM?
- A. Yes, the total value of contracts from this RFP can't exceed \$250,000.
98. If the \$250,000 limit is strict, will the University accept a proposal where core IDP software functionality is provided under the cap, while advanced real-time Banner and Slate API integration, or custom field mapping is structured as an optional, value-added service?
- A. Yes, MSU will consider any options that a vendor responds with.
99. How many document types are expected to be included in the initial implementation phase?
- A. At least 5 (transcripts, test score reports, fee waiver requests, senior schedules, misc residency documents)
100. The RFP references transcripts, credentials, handwritten documents, recruitment cards, and future degree audit capabilities. Can MSU clarify which items are mandatory for Phase 1 versus future expansion?
- A. Transcripts, credentials, and handwritten documents mandatory for Phase 1

101. Can MSU confirm the priority order of document types for implementation?
For example: transcripts first, credentials second, recruitment cards later.
A. Transcripts first, credentials second, recruitment cards later
102. Is the public degree audit tool part of this procurement, or is it only a future desired capability?
A. Future desired capability
103. What is the expected go-live date following the anticipated October 1, 2026 contract start date?
A. 1/1/2027
104. Does MSU expect a pilot or proof-of-concept before full production rollout?
A. We expect a pilot of an existing solution
105. Will MSU provide historical sample documents for model training, testing, and validation? If yes, approximately how many samples will be available per document type?
A. Can if needed; number of samples can be discussed as necessary
106. What transcript formats are most common for MSU's use case? For example: text-based PDFs, scanned PDFs, electronic transcripts, mailed scans, international transcripts, handwritten records, or mixed formats.
A. Text-based PDFs mainly. Scanned PDFs and mailed scans as well.
107. Approximately what percentage of documents are expected to be structured, semi-structured, unstructured, scanned, or handwritten?
A. 15% handwritten, majority other structured
108. For course-level extraction, does MSU require line-item extraction for every course, grade, credit, term, and year, or only summary-level credential data?
A. Line-item extraction so that the data can be populated in transfer articulation in Banner
109. How should the system handle incomplete, illegible, or low-confidence transcript data?
A. Require human intervention/review
110. What is MSU's required process when duplicate course entries or repeated courses appear with different grades?
A. Last attempt stands
111. Are there specific business rules MSU expects the solution to follow for duplicate course ?
A. Last attempt stands
112. How will the 85–90% extraction accuracy requirement be measured?
A. Document-level accuracy

113. Is the accuracy requirement measured before human validation, after human validation, by field, by document, or by transaction?
- A. By document
114. Which fields are considered “key fields” for purposes of the 85–90% accuracy requirement?
- A. Personal identification, high school overall GPAs, post-secondary courses grades and credits, institution information/CEEB
115. Will MSU accept configurable confidence thresholds by field type?
- A. yes
116. Does MSU require human review and approval before data is exported to Banner, or should some records be automatically exported when confidence thresholds are met?
- A. Automatically exported when confidence thresholds are met
117. What is MSU’s acceptable exception rate for documents that require manual review?
- A. 10%
118. What Banner version is MSU currently using?
- A. 9x
119. What Banner integration methods are supported or preferred? For example: API, flat-file import, database staging table, XML/CSV, middleware, or another method.
- A. Ethos integration is preferred but other options are acceptable
120. What are the required Banner import formats or APIs?
- A. Unknown at this time. This will depend on vendor implementation
121. Is the Banner integration expected to be real-time, batch, or either?
- A. Either
122. Does “export directly to the Student Information System without manual intervention” mean fully automated posting into Banner, or can it mean automated creation of a validated import file for Banner ingestion?
- A. Depends on implementation method. If using Ethos/APIs, then this should be automated. If using flat-files, automating the creation of import file for Banner ingestion would suffice.
123. What Slate integration points are required in Phase 1?
- A. Hitting a API or query source import and export back into Slate and Banner
124. Is Slate expected to be a source system, destination system, or both?
- A. Both
125. Will MSU provide API documentation, test credentials, sample import/export files, and technical support resources for Banner and Slate during implementation?

- A. Yes
126. When MSU states “no restriction on the number of users,” does this mean unlimited named users are required, or would role-based institutional licensing be acceptable?
- A. Unlimited named users
127. Would concurrent-user, departmental, or role-based pricing models be acceptable if they do not limit MSU’s operational use of the solution?
- A. Would be considered
128. How many active users are expected in year one?
- A. 25
129. How many departments or offices are expected to use the system in the initial phase?
- A. Admissions, Registrars and ITS
130. Will external users, applicants, or students require access, or is access limited to MSU staff and administrators?
- A. MSU staff and administrators
131. Is HECVAT Lite required at proposal submission, finalist stage, or prior to contract execution?
- A. Proposal submission
132. Can MSU confirm whether PCI compliance is applicable to this solution? The RFP includes PCI language, but this use case appears focused on document extraction rather than payment processing.
- A. Not applicable
133. Does MSU require data residency within the United States?
- A. Yes
134. What are MSU’s data retention and deletion requirements for uploaded documents, extracted data, audit logs, and training data?
- A. If possible, 1 year retention – based on cost
135. Does MSU permit vendor personnel to access production documents for support, troubleshooting, or model tuning, assuming appropriate security controls are in place?
- A. Yes
136. Are FERPA, GLBA, GDPR, NACH, and Red Flag requirements expected as formal certifications, or does MSU require a written compliance statement describing applicable controls and safeguards?
- A. Written compliance
137. Is a completed VPAT required at proposal submission, or can it be provided before award or contract execution?

- A. At proposal submission
138. Are all administrative screens required to meet WCAG 2.1 AA at go-live, or is remediation allowed through an agreed accessibility roadmap?
- A. No – public pages must be compliant. Administrative pages are evaluated per VPAT.
139. If remediation is allowed, should vendors identify known accessibility exceptions and provide a timeline for resolution in the proposal?
- A. Yes
140. Does the \$250,000 maximum contract value include optional future services, integrations, enhancements, and all renewal periods?
- A. Yes, the total value of the contract can't exceed \$250,000.00.
141. Can optional future projects, such as handwritten recruitment card processing or the public degree audit tool, be contracted separately if they exceed the \$250,000 cap?
- A. This could be possible, but more than likely no. Any contracts entered into from this RFP can't exceed \$250,000.00.
142. Will MSU accept a phased pricing model where Phase 1 is included in the base proposal and future enhancements are priced as optional services?
- A. Yes, MSU will consider any options that a vendor proposes.
143. Can MSU confirm which standard contract clauses are non-negotiable before proposal submission?
- A. Not at this time. When this is awarded and contract negotiations begin, the vendor and MSU's Contract Administrator will work through these details.
144. If a vendor has exceptions or requested changes to MSU's standard contract terms, should those be included in the Technical Proposal cover letter, a separate exceptions document, or both?
- A. Either is fine. We'd prefer for the vendor to attach a separate exceptions document that the vendor has redlined.
145. The RFP specifies a minimum of 5,000 pages/day (2,500 documents). Is this an average or peak-period figure, and can MSU share the expected annual document volume and any anticipated growth over the contract term? This is needed to correctly size the solution and licensing model.
- A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages (55% high school transcripts, 38% undergraduate post-secondary transcripts, 7% graduate post-secondary transcripts)
146. Approximately how many source institutions / transcript formats are expected in the initial implementation, and what is the anticipated mix of document

types (domestic vs. international, typed vs. handwritten, scanned vs. digital)? Will representative samples be made available for testing during implementation?

A. All secondary and post-secondary domestic academic transcripts (up to 15% hand-written secondary) Samples will be made available.

147. Which version/edition of Ellucian Banner is in production (Banner 9 on-premises or Banner SaaS), and is export to Banner expected via native APIs (Ethos), file-based/batch exchange, or an existing middleware layer (ESB/iPaaS such as Boomi or MuleSoft)?

A. Banner 9 On-Prem; Ethos preferred but able to accommodate file-based/batch exchange.

148. Is Slate integration required within this initial engagement, or is it associated with the future handwritten recruitment-card automation item noted in Section 3(f)(5)? Confirming scope will determine whether the Slate interface is priced under this RFP.

A. Slate integration is required at initial engagement as this is where our transcripts are housed

149. Section 3(a)(1) references both on-premises and cloud, while the Software/IT section states the system “must be cloud-based.” Can MSU confirm the preferred deployment model, and whether a vendor-hosted SaaS (with hosting included in pricing) is acceptable or MSU will provide the hosting environment?

A. Cloud is preferred, others are acceptable.

150. Are the “Additional Desired” items — the public pre-enrollment degree audit tool and the handwritten recruitment-card-to-Slate automation — to be priced and delivered under this RFP, or treated as future phases outside the current scope?

A. Future phases

151. Section 9’s PCI requirements appear oriented to payment-processing solutions. Can MSU confirm whether Section 9 applies to this document-extraction solution, or whether it should be treated as standard boilerplate that is not applicable to this scope?

A. Not applicable.

152. Is the 85–90% extraction accuracy target measured per field, per document, or in aggregate, and against what sample or baseline will it be validated during evaluation and/or acceptance?

A. Per document

153. Section 3(d) references both direct export to Banner “without manual intervention” and a review-and-approve interface prior to export. Does MSU expect all records to pass human review before posting, or is automated posting

acceptable for records above a confidence threshold, with human review only for exceptions?

A. Automated posting for records above a confidence threshold is acceptable

154. Is there an existing document-processing / OCR solution in use from which historical configurations, extraction rules, or data would need to be migrated as part of this engagement?

A. No existing OCR solution

155. Given the solution will process FERPA-protected student records, is HECVAT Lite sufficient or is HECVAT Full expected?

A. If the HECVAT is unavailable, please substitute what security/compliance documentation the vendor has available. (European vendors often are ISO 27001 compliant, or the SOC2 certification is common in for large US vendors. Either HECVAT version is acceptable.

156. Will shortlisted vendors be required to complete a product demonstration or proof-of-concept, and if so, will MSU provide sample documents and a defined use case for that exercise?

A. If demo is required, sample documents will be provided.

157. Are onshore (US-based) and offshore (international-based) resources equally acceptable for implementation, configuration, and ongoing support, or does MSU require 100% onshore delivery? Are there any restrictions on data access or security protocols for offshore teams?

A. Onshore preferred – based on cost.

158. Section 3a1 requests "applicable certifications such as SOC2 documentation." Code District holds ISO 27001 certification. Will ISO 27001 satisfy this requirement? If not, will MSU accept ISO 27001 together with a completed HECVAT in lieu of a SOC2 report?

A. Yes

159. Is a completed HECVAT required at proposal submission, or may it be provided during contract negotiation? EDUCAUSE consolidated the Lite, Full, and On-Premise versions into a single workbook with HECVAT 4. Should we submit the current HECVAT 4?

A. HECVAT 4 is acceptable. Any current HECVAT version is acceptable.

160. Section 3a4 requires compatibility with both on-premises and cloud environments, while the Software/IT section states the system must be cloud-based. Please clarify which governs. For context, our proposed architecture keeps all document processing within a private AWS boundary accessed via PrivateLink, with LLM inference through Amazon Bedrock under terms where prompts and completions are not persisted, not logged for human review, and not used for model

training. Does a cloud deployment with this level of data isolation satisfy MSU's intent, or is physical on-premises deployment a hard requirement?

A. Cloud is preferred; others are acceptable

161. Is a VPAT required at submission, or acceptable within a defined post-award window?

A. At proposal submission

162. What integration mechanism is expected for the Ellucian Banner export? Ethos API, flat-file load, direct database write, or another method? Is there an existing integration pattern MSU prefers?

A. Ethos API preferred; flat-file or direct database write is acceptable.

163. Is there an incumbent solution or existing process being replaced? If so, what is failing about it?

A. No

164. What is the actual current and projected annual transcript volume, and what is peak daily volume during registration periods? The 5,000 pages per day figure reads as a floor rather than an expected load.

A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages (55% high school transcripts, 38% undergraduate post-secondary transcripts, 7% graduate post-secondary transcripts) The 5000 pages per day is a high, peak processing expectation.

165. Approximately what percentage of inbound documents are handwritten or poor-quality scans, and are non-US or non-English transcripts in scope?

A. Up to 15% hand-written, translations are required to accompany any non-English documents

166. Section 3d1 asks for extraction without creating templates while also requiring user-modifiable rules. Can you clarify the expected balance between automated extraction and user-configured rules?

A. Majority should be automated extraction then building rules to calculate and indicate an action (set an internal field in slate or banner) based upon the data extracted.

167. Is Slate integration in scope for this contract, or is it referenced only in connection with the future recruitment-card initiative?

A. Slate integration is in scope. Transcripts are housed in Slate and therefore integration is required.

168. Does the \$250,000 five-year cap encompass only the transcript processing solution, or does it also cover the future degree audit tool and recruitment-card automation described in Section 3f?

- A. The \$250,000.00 cap is for any and all contracts that we enter into from this RFP. Please note that we are asking for a one year contract and can be flexible with the total life of the contract up to 5 years.
169. Are the Section 3f items (public degree audit tool, Slate recruitment-card automation, dedicated consultant, ITS co-development) evaluated as part of this award, or anticipated as separate future procurements?
- A. Future scope
170. Should the Cost Proposal present pricing as a per-document or per-page volume model, a flat annual subscription, or is either format acceptable?
- A. Either format is acceptable
171. Section 3c references configurable reports aligned to procurement, legal, and contract performance indicators. Does this apply to the transcript processing use case, or is it template language from a prior solicitation?
- A. Boilerplate MSU RFP language
172. Section 9 (PCI Compliance) appears not to apply to transcript processing, since no cardholder data is involved. Please confirm.
- A. Confirmed – PCI is not in scope.
173. The RFP appears to request a ready, enterprise-level intelligent document processing platform for transcript and credential data extraction, validation, and ingestion. Is MSU seeking a commercially available off-the-shelf product, a configurable SaaS platform, a custom-developed solution, or any combination of these approaches?
- A. Configurable
174. Has MSU identified, evaluated, or benchmarked any specific products or vendors, including Softdocs Intelligent Transcript Processing or similar higher-education transcript automation platforms, as reference solutions for this RFP?
- A. Have participated in demos from multiple vendors.
175. Is MSU specifically seeking a Softdocs solution, or will equivalent solutions that meet the stated functional, technical, security, accessibility, and integration requirements be considered?
- A. Equivalent solutions would be considered
176. The RFP states that MSU reserves the right to award a single contract or multiple contracts. Would MSU consider a proposal in which a prime contractor provides implementation and integration services while leveraging a third-party document processing platform?
- A. Equivalent solutions would be considered

177. Are vendors permitted to propose a best-fit technology stack consisting of third-party software, cloud services, OCR/AI capabilities, integration services, and managed support under a single prime contractor model?
- A. Equivalent solutions would be considered
178. Should vendors identify all third-party software products, SaaS platforms, subcontractors, and technology partners included in the proposed solution?
- A. Yes
179. Does MSU have a preference for a higher education-specific transcript processing solution versus a general-purpose intelligent document processing platform configured for transcript and credential extraction?
- A. Higher Education/secondary education transcript solution is preferred
180. Does MSU require the proposed solution to include prebuilt transcript processing capabilities at the time of proposal submission, or is a configurable solution that can be trained during implementation acceptable?
- A. Prefer prebuilt transcript processing capabilities with configurable training.
181. Is MSU expecting the proposed solution to process transcripts and credentials immediately out of the box, or will an implementation period for configuration, model training, testing, validation, and user acceptance be allowed?
- A. Yes
182. Will MSU provide representative sample documents during the proposal, demonstration, or implementation phase for transcripts, credentials, scanned documents, handwritten documents, recruitment cards, and other document types?
- A. Yes
183. Will vendors be required to demonstrate transcript extraction using MSU-provided sample documents as part of the evaluation process?
- A. Not planned at this time, but could become necessary
184. If a demonstration or proof of concept is required, will MSU provide the evaluation criteria, sample document set, expected fields, success metrics, and scoring methodology?
- A. Yes
185. The RFP requires direct export to Ellucian Banner without manual intervention. Does MSU have a preferred integration approach, such as APIs, Ellucian Ethos, staging tables, flat-file import, or another approved method?
- A. Ethos APIs preferred; flat-file imports are acceptable
186. Does MSU currently use Softdocs or any other platform that already integrates with Ellucian Banner, Slate, Degree Works, or other systems referenced in the RFP?

- A. No
187. Could MSU please clarify the expected integration scope with Slate? Should the solution ingest documents from Slate, export extracted data to Slate, support applicant matching, process recruitment cards, or support other Slate-related workflows?
- A. Initially, ingest documents from Slate, export extracted data to Slate, and support applicant matching.
188. The RFP references a public degree audit tool using Ellucian Banner and Degree Works curriculum tables. Is this within the initial project scope, an optional service, or part of a future roadmap?
- A. Future scope
189. The RFP also references automation of handwritten student recruitment cards into actionable data for Slate CRM. Is this part of the initial scope, an optional capability, or a future requirement?
- A. Future scope
190. Please confirm whether the cumulative five-year contract value cap of \$250,000 includes software licensing, SaaS subscriptions, implementation, integrations, training, support, maintenance, renewals, optional services, and future enhancements.
- A. The cap includes any contract or cost from this RFP. Please note that the total life is flexible and can go up to 5 years. We are asking for a one year contract with the option to renew up to 5 years.
191. Should optional or future capabilities be priced separately from the base solution for evaluation purposes?
- A. Yes
192. Given the five-year contract value cap, does MSU have a preferred pricing model (e.g., document-volume-based, annual SaaS subscription, named-user, concurrent-user, or implementation plus support)?
- A. No preference
193. The RFP states there should be no restriction on the number of users. Should this be interpreted as unlimited named users, unlimited concurrent users, or unlimited users within defined roles?
- A. Unlimited named users
194. Does MSU expect the selected vendor to provide all ongoing product support directly, or is it acceptable for the prime contractor to provide first-level support while coordinating with third-party software providers?
- A. Prefer selected vendor support

195. What is the expected annual page/document volume? Is 5,000 pages per day a peak processing requirement or the average daily volume?
- A. Annual document transcript receipt totals 75K, upwards of 225K pages (55% high school transcripts, 38% undergraduate post-secondary transcripts, 7% graduate post-secondary transcripts). 5000 pages per day is high estimated Peak processing
196. Should the future degree audit tool and recruitment card automation be priced as part of this Cost Proposal within the \$250,000 contract value cap, or are these expected to be contracted separately in the future?
- A. Future scope
197. Does MSU currently license Ellucian Ethos APIs? If not, which integration methods are approved for direct export to Banner? Additionally, will a Banner test environment and a technical SME be provided during implementation?
- A. Yes; and Ethos APIs are the preferred method.
198. Can the proposed solution be deployed within MSU's own cloud tenant? If so, would MSU-managed cloud infrastructure and consumption costs be considered outside the \$250,000 contract value cap?
- A. Such a design would be evaluated based on functionality and cost
199. Will a purpose-built, vendor-managed solution hosted on Microsoft Azure be considered responsive to the RFP, or is a packaged commercial off-the-shelf product required?
- A. Such a design would be evaluated based on functionality and cost
200. Is the project scope limited to transcript data extraction, validation, and export, or is the selected vendor also expected to provide transfer credit equivalency and articulation rule processing?
- A. Limited to transcript data extraction, validation, and export with equivalency and articulation considered should MSU change SIS in the future.