



April 15, 2021

CLARIFICATIONS
NP-21-0008 – Feasibility Study

- 1. What technology does the foundation have in place (e.g., CRM, wealth screening, analytics and business intelligence, fund management, scholarship management, etc.)?**

We have Blackbaud RENXT, FENXT, Blackbaud Target Analytics- Affluence Insight

- 2. Who will be involved in the decision-making process?**

We have an evaluation team composed of knowledgeable staff from appropriate departments. To keep evaluations ethical and unbiased, we are unable to release names of evaluation team members. After contract award, direct contact names and information shall be released to awarded contractor.

- 3. How many staff members does the Foundation have? What are their roles?**

Three (3); Executive Director (Fundraising), Accounting Coordinator (Financials), Foundation Coordinator (grants, back-office, fundraising)

- 4. Are you currently or have you recently worked with fundraising counsel? If so, are you anticipating a proposal from that firm?**

No.

- 5. Do you have a budget in mind for the feasibility study? If so, are you willing to share it?**

Budgets shall not be shared at this time.

- 6. Section 2.1 –Does National Park College have an estimated campaign goal in mind they would like to test during the feasibility study?**

This is what we want the feasibility to offer. We are anticipating the consultants will share with us that information, landing on something realistic, yet aggressive.

- 7. Section 2.3 – Have capital projects been identified and are estimates and plans established for each project?**

We are currently working on a revised campus master plan. We should have that information later this year.

- 8. Section 2.3 – Has National Park College conducted a campaign within the past 10 years and, if so, what was the result?**

No.

- 9. Section 2.3 – Over the past 3 years, what has National Park College raised annually through philanthropic fundraising?**

We are not releasing that information at this time. Verbal conversations can be had when a consultant is chosen.

- 10. Section 2.3 – Does National Park College expect that counsel will take the lead in drafting the case statement to be tested during the study or does National Park College expect to lead that process with assistance from counsel?**

Counsel to take the lead.

- 11. Section 2.3 – Does National Park College expect that most of the feasibility study interviews would be conducted in person or virtually? If in-person, are most prospective interviewees located with a 50-mile radius of the campus?**

Both. Virtual for those who feel more comfortable in such a setting. Most interviewees will be located within a 50 mile radius of campus, but we want to explore possibilities that are statewide.

- 12. Section 2.3 g and i – The RFP states that the names of potential major donors/funders and what their interests might be and then names and potential dollar amounts should be addressed in the feasibility study report. Our process would not have us include this information in the written report but rather be verbally discussed with leadership after the study, in the interest of confidentiality. Is National Park College expecting that names and dollar amounts be listed in the report? If so, would there be an opportunity to discuss this area with NPC if we were selected, as stated in the note at the bottom of the section?**

A conversation is appropriate in the interest of confidentiality.

- 13. Section 2.7 – This section states that state law requires that performance standards have to be included. How are those standards determined and at what point during the contract discussion? Who manages and monitors those standards during the contract period?**

Performance standards shall be created after contract award. Standards are based on the actual/finalized scope the contractor will be performing. Foundation and contract management shall be managing/monitoring during the contract period.