



Wichita-100018 *ADDENDUM #2*

**FROM:** Robby Murray

Campus Box 38

Ph: 316-978-5185

Fax: 316-978-3107

**TO: Interested Bidders,**

**DATE:** 02/5/2026

**SUBJECT:** Wichita -10001

## CLARIFICATIONS TO THE BID DETAILS:

## **1. Correction to Section 2 Instructions and Conditions to Bid 2.9 – Submission of Proprietary Information**

The previously published language under **Section 2 Instructions and Conditions to Bid 2.9 – Submission of Proprietary Information** is replaced in its entirety with the corrected wording below.

**2.9 Submission of Proprietary Information:** Trade secrets or proprietary information legally recognized as such and protected by law may be requested to be withheld if clearly labeled “Proprietary” on each individual page and provided as separate from the main Proposal. Pricing information is not considered proprietary, and the Bidder’s entire Proposal will not be considered proprietary. All information requested to be handled as “Proprietary” shall be included as a separate attachment; the attachment must be clearly identified and submitted separately from the main proposal in Unimarket. The Bidder shall provide detailed written documentation justifying why this material should be considered proprietary. WSU reserves the right to accept, amend, or deny such requests for maintaining information as proprietary in accordance with Kansas law. WSU does not guarantee protection of any information which is not submitted as required.

## **2. Correction to “PHASE 3: FACILITY NEEDS AND DESIGN” in “Attachment 3: Description of Services and Performance Specifications”**

## **Objectives and Deliverables**

Bidders shall describe cost and proposed methods to achieve the following objectives and tasks in Phase 3:

1. Advise and report on recommended facility needs based on program size and best practices, including educational and clinical facilities and individualized space at FHSU and WSU
2. Advise and report on recommended state-of-the-art equipment and technologies to support high-quality education and care
3. Make recommendations on facility options, including build, lease, or existing occupancy opportunities based on projected program size and existing spaces at WSU and FHSU

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RELATED TO THE BID:**

**Question #1:** Please confirm that firms involved in the Dental School Financial and Strategic Feasibility and Consulting Services RFP are not precluded from consideration for any subsequent professional services (architecture & engineering) RFQ/RFP for design and/or construction services

**Answer #1:** This RFP is not linked to consideration for any future RFQ/RFPs.

#### **RE: Stakeholder Engagement Scope (Attachment 3, Page 15, Objective #4)**

**Question #2:** Because there is a broad range of stakeholders, from patients and parents to practicing dentists, other health professionals, and legislators, how many stakeholder engagement sessions (meetings, presentations, forums) do you anticipate the consultants facilitating or attending?

**Answer #2:** We are looking for vision regarding this question from consultants. There is no predetermination for the number of events, meetings or forums required. Instead, proposals should provide a compelling description of activities that will result in strong statewide support among diverse key stakeholders.

**Question #3:** What is the expected duration of active implementation support (e.g., 3 months, 6 months)?

**Answer #3:** There are no predetermined number of months expected. Instead, proposals should provide a compelling description of activities and an appropriate timeline to match that will result in strong statewide support among diverse key stakeholders.

**Question #4:** Are there specific stakeholder organizations that WSU/FHSU considers a "must engage" organization?

**Answer #4:** Securing legislative support is critical to advancing our efforts. Accordingly, proposal reviews will place priority on experience and proposals that demonstrate strong plans to educate, inform, and build a coalition of support around vision and statewide needs.

#### **RE: Strategic Communications & Advocacy Support (Attachment 3, Page 15, Objective #5)**

**Question #5:** How many distinct communication pieces are anticipated (fact sheets, executive summaries, legislative briefs)?

**Answer #5:** There is no prescribed number of distinct communication pieces; rather, the focus should be on presenting a plan designed to achieve the intended objectives. Thus, proposals should articulate intended audiences, objectives of communications, and descriptions of the communication pieces and methods of engagement.

**Question #6:** What presentations and formats will be required, and what formatting guidelines—such as page limits, page orientation, or other specifications—apply to the proposal response?

**Answer #6:**

Page limits: No more than 40 pages total.

Page orientation: Prefer portrait but not required.

Formatting: No specific formatting, however, proposal should address all RFP requests.

Other: Top proposals will be invited to present proposal and engage with key stakeholders and respond to questions.

**Question #7:** Does "support implementation" mean the consultant will deliver presentations or prepare materials for WSU/FHSU personnel to deliver?

**Answer #7:** The consultant should plan to have a strong role in coordinating and leading implementation but also in partnership with WSU/FHSU and should articulate a plan for how this will occur.

**Question #8:** Is there a specific legislative session or funding cycle driving the timeline?

**Answer #8:** Consultant work shall be critical to inform and educate legislative initiatives planned for the 2027 session.

**Question #9:** How many review/revision cycles should be anticipated?

**Answer #9:** Unsure what is being asked or what this is in reference.

**RE: Phase 1 Financial Analysis Scope  
(Attachment 3, Pages 14-15)**

**Question #10:** What level of detail is expected in the expenditure analysis (aggregate state spending vs. line-item program analysis)?

**Answer #10:** The appropriate level of detail in the expenditure analysis should be driven by what is necessary to help policy makers and stakeholders fully understand the scope of the state's current investment – both in direct and indirect costs – in addressing oral health care accessibility challenges. Accordingly, the analysis should be sufficiently detailed to illuminate where resources are being deployed, how effectively they are being used, and how these expenditures relate to the underlying accessibility challenges. The requirement of aggregate spending figures, line-item program analysis or a combination should be determined and articulated within proposals.

**Question #11:** Should the cost-benefit analysis compare the dental school to specific alternatives (expanded incentive programs, support for existing schools, collaborations with nearby dental schools)?

**Answer #11:** The cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to leverage support from Kansas policy makers and stakeholders. Consultants should therefore present a rigorous cost-benefit analysis of establishing a Kansas School of Dental Medicine including clear methodology, contextually germane comparisons, and a plan for effectively communicating findings.

**Question #12:** Are there specific state data sources WSU has identified, or should the consultant conduct independent research?

**Answer #12:** We are looking for the consultant to make these determinations as part of their proposal.

**RE: PHASE 2: ACADEMIC & ACCREDITATION PLANNING**  
**Accreditation Planning & Site Visits (Attachment 3, Page 15)**

**Question #13:** Should the consultant prepare preliminary CODA accreditation documentation or provide strategic guidance on pathways and timelines? Document preparation is a substantial effort.

**Answer #13:** The consultant work does not include preparing preliminary CODA accreditation document but rather the full scope of Phase 2 work shall inform guidance on viable (feasible and efficient) pathways and timelines for achieving CODA accreditation. Consultants should focus on outlining key milestones, decision points, and sequencing required for accreditation, along with estimated costs associated with major areas of focus within the proposed timeline to support informed planning and sequence of decision making.

**Question #14** What level of budget detail is required (planning-level vs. detailed line-item), and can WSU provide the project budget and indicate whether it applies to all phases or only specific ones?

**Answer #14:** Proposals are intended to inform the budget.

**Question #15:** How many site visits to WSU (Wichita) and FHSU facilities should be anticipated? Typically, our firm completes this onsite engagement in two to three days for an institution considering a dental school.

**Answer #15:** The number of site visits to WSU and FHSU is not prescriptively defined. Rather than specifying a fixed volume or duration of onsite engagement, consultants are expected to remain focused on the overall objective and propose a detailed, fit-for-purpose site visit plan that supports a thorough, accurate and effective assessment. This proposal should include the number, duration, and sequencing of distinct site visits to achieve the stated goals.

**RE: PROJECT MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE Timeline & Phase Authorization**  
**(Attachment 3, Page 16)**

**Question #16:** What is WSU's anticipated Phase 1 completion date, and does this project require a KBOR-compliant program statement or align with any legislative or KBOR approval deadlines?

**Answer #16:** Consultant's work is intended to inform future program statements and relevant legislative and KBOR requirements. Work shall be completed to inform and educate legislative initiatives planned for the 2027 session.

**Question #17:** Will all three phases be authorized simultaneously, or sequentially pending Phase 1 findings?

**Answer #17:** Phase timing and authorizations will be driven by sequence of information made available as the result of the pursuit of phase objectives by the Consultant. Proposals should include recommendations on the method and information that should inform and drive phase timing and authorizations. Consideration should be given to best and efficient use of resources and any substantiated timeline constraints.

**RE: Decision Authority & Governance**

**Question #18:** Who serves as the primary decision authority for deliverable approval—WSU, FHSU, or joint review?

**Answer #18:** Wichita State University is leading this project, in consultation with FHSU.

**Question #19:** If joint approval is required, what process applies if institutions have differing perspectives?

**Answer #19:** Not applicable.

## **RE: CONTRACT TERMS & ADMINISTRATION**

**Question # 20:** Will payment be milestone-based, deliverable-based, monthly progress payments, or upon phase completion?

**Answer #20:** Proposals should include payment preferences and terms will be negotiated upon award.

**Question #21:** What are the standard payment terms (Net 30, Net 60, Net 90)?

**Answer #21:** Standard payment terms are Net 45 days, but proposals should include any payment term requirements.

**Question #22:** Are there retainage provisions?

**Answer #22:** No.

## **RE: Consultant Staffing & Subcontracting**

**(Attachment 4, Section 3.3, Page 18) Section 3.3 requires prior written approval for subcontracting.**

**Question #23:** For more than two decades, our firm's standard practice is to engage specialized dental education consultants as independent contractors (1099) who work under our firms direction using our firms methodologies. Would these team members be considered "subcontractors" requiring individual approval under Section 3.3, or is this provision intended for separate firms performing distinct work components?

**Answer #23:** WSU is willing to negotiate this provision to exclude individual independent contractors from prior approval if they are identified as key team members.

**Question #24:** If individual consultant assignments require approval, what is the process and timeline?

**Answer #24:** See above.

**Question #25:** Does WSU require résumés for all team members in the proposal, or only key personnel?

**Answer #25:** Resumes are not required. Proposals should inform key team members, and format and information is at the bidder's discretion.

## **RE: Phase 3 Facility Consultant Role**

**(Attachment 3, Pages 15-16)**

**Question #26:** Should the consultant provide facility programming documents (space requirements, functional relationships), or comprehensive design guidance?

**Answer #26:** This RFP is not intended to solicit construction services, architectural design, or design decision-making. WSU is not seeking schematic design, design development, construction documents, or recommendations that would constitute architectural or engineering judgment. The consultant's role is limited to facility programming and planning support. Any deliverables should remain conceptual and programmatic in nature and must not provide comprehensive design guidance, architectural solutions, or construction direction. The intent of this RFP is to inform future decision-making and potential downstream design efforts, which would be procured separately, if pursued.

**Question #27:** Regarding "consult on solicitations for lease, design and/or build," does WSU expect the consultant to draft RFP specifications, participate in vendor evaluation, or provide advisory support?

**Answer #27:** See *Clarification to the Bid Details*. This specification has been removed.

**Question #28:** Regarding Phase 3, will the awarded team be contracted to provide full architectural design services conceptual design through Construction Administration? Or, will Phase 3 be focused on programming and conceptual architectural design with a full design services team selected through a future RFP?

**Answer #28:** This RFP is not intended to solicit construction services, architectural design, or design decision-making. WSU is not seeking schematic design, design development, construction documents, or recommendations that would constitute architectural or engineering judgment. The consultant's role is limited to facility programming and planning support. Any deliverables should remain conceptual and programmatic in nature and must not provide comprehensive design guidance, architectural solutions, or construction direction. The intent of this RFP is to inform future decision-making and potential downstream design efforts, which would be procured separately, if pursued. Attachment 3 was modified to clarify this.

**Question #29:** Are there major milestones or deadlines that will help inform the timeline of our scoped activities?

**Answer #29:** Consultant work shall be critical to inform and educate legislative initiatives planned for the 2027 session.

**Question #30:** Is Wichita State willing to review proposals from a consortium of vendors with specific areas of expertise (market research/financial forecasting, facilities planning, CODA accreditation)

**Answer #30:** Yes, but the expectation is that these are presented as one team with a lead or coordinator of the consortium of vendors. WSU does intend to coordinate multiple vendors.

**Question #31:** Who will be Wichita State's primary project sponsor and what will the project governance structure be from Wichita State leadership?

**Answer #31:** Senior Executive Vice President and Provost is the primary project sponsor. The project governance structure.

**Question #32:** Attachment for Section 6 reads that "travel shall not be subject to reimbursement except as set forth in this Agreement or as agreed to in advance by the parties." Is Wichita State requesting pricing inclusive of expected travel costs to campus?

**Answer #32:** Yes. Pricing should include expected travel costs. If travel is difficult to anticipate, proposal should inform general expectations of any travel costs that would be outside of pricing.

**Question #33:** Does Wichita State intend to relocate existing dental-related programs (BS and online BS in Dental Hygiene, and the AEGD residency) into the proposed School of Dental Medicine?

**Answer #33:** This remains to be determined and should be part of the study to be conducted by the consultant.

**Question #34:** Beyond a DDS program, what additional programs are anticipated to comprise the school's academic portfolio?

**Answer #34:** WSU seeks insight from the consultant's work for additional program opportunities that would yield high student demand and high impact outcomes for the region.

**Question #35:** Does Wichita State anticipate utilizing space within existing clinical facilities at FHSU and/or the proposed Biomedical Campus for the School of Dental Medicine? Have any specific sites or space

requirements already been identified, or is facility planning expected to begin without predetermined locations?

**Answer # 35:** Performs study of existing space and what space should remain and be leveraged and recommend other facility needs and opportunities. These recommendations should be informed by academic excellence and financial feasibility.

**Answer #36:** The RFP suggests that the collaborative structure between WSU and Fort Hays will be evaluated through the consulting effort. How is Fort Hays currently positioned in the partnership: as an equal partner, an end user, or primarily in a consultative role?

**Answer #36:** Wichita State University is leading this project, in consultation with FHSU.

This Addendum is hereby made part of the solicitation documents and shall be acknowledged in the Bidder's response. The purpose of this Addendum is to clarify and correct the requirements regarding the submission of proprietary information.

**NO. OF PAGES (including cover sheet): 7**

Bid Responses must be submitted prior to the bid closing date and time in the format as described in the original bid solicitation!

**Wichita State University**

Office of Purchasing  
Robby Murray  
Sr. Procurement Officer  
1845 Fairmount, Campus Box 38  
Jardine Hall, Room 201  
Wichita, KS 67260-0038  
Phone: 316-978-5185  
Fax: 316-978-3107