



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 6045 AMENDMENT #1

TITLE: CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY MASTER PLAN

DATE: SEPTEMBER 14, 2026

BUYER: CHARITY WOODS

EMAIL: cwoods@semo.edu

PHONE: (573) 651-2588

PROPOSAL MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN:

DATE: September 22, 2026

TIME: 1:30 P.M.

DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS

For USPS/FedEx/UPS, etc.

Proposals must be mailed to:

Purchasing Department

**Southeast Missouri State University
One University Plaza, Mail Stop 3280
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701**

OR delivered by offeror to:

**Purchasing Department
Academic Hall Room 200F
Normal Avenue
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701**

The notice of award is made subject to availability and appropriation of funds, as specified in the Request for Proposal, and the selection of the offeror is made in accordance with all applicable public procurement laws.

MUST BE SIGNED TO BE VALID

The offeror hereby agrees to furnish items and/or services, at the firm, fixed prices quoted, pursuant to all requirements and specifications contained herein, upon either the receipt of an authorized purchase order from the Purchasing Department or when this document is countersigned by the Purchasing Department as a binding contract, and further agrees that the language of this document shall govern in the event of a conflict with his or her proposal. Additionally, the authorized signer of this document certifies the contractor (named below) and each of its principles are not suspended or debarred by the federal government.

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE		PRINTED NAME/TITLE	
COMPANY NAME		CURRENT DATE	
MAILING ADDRESS		TELEPHONE NUMBER/EXT.	
CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	
CONTACT PERSON		CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	
DELIVERY DATE: _____ DAYS ARO, FOB DESTINATION PROMPT PAYMENT TERMS: _____ % _____ DAYS NET _____ DAYS			
NOTICE OF AWARD (SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY USE ONLY)			
AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE FOR SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY		DATE	

**SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY MASTER PLAN
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 6045**

AMENDMENT #1

A. The offeror is hereby notified that Request for Proposal 6045 is **CLARIFIED** as follows:

1. Would the University clarify the relative weight it places on the physical infrastructure lifecycle assessment versus the strategic, governance, and organizational components of the plan? **The weights on each of these components are balanced. There should be an evaluation of governance, organizational structure, change management to support a modern Higher Education IT organization. The evaluation on current infrastructure is requested to facilitate the development of a 5-year plan regarding improvements or investments to enhance and sustain (lifecycle) infrastructure and services associated with a modern campus. The statement regarding “not the specific services or business operations themselves” is intended to limit the scope to supporting technology, not the specific use of that technology by different departments.**
2. Is the University seeking an asset-level condition assessment, or a category-level lifecycle and risk analysis sufficient to support the five-year replacement and modernization schedule? **A category-level lifecycle and risk analysis is appropriate.**
3. Does the University have existing documentation to support the assessment outlined in Requirement 1.2 in the Scope? **Yes, but your response can include a list of documentation or information needed.**
4. Should the assessment address the physical facilities that house technology infrastructure, such as data center power, cooling, and telecommunications spaces, or is the scope limited to the technology assets themselves? **The scope is focused on technology, not the physical facilities.**
5. Would the University describe the current state of its technology asset inventory—specifically, the completeness and currency of data available in Lansweeper, TeamDynamix, and any other systems of record—and confirm that inventory exports will be made available to the selected contractor? **The IT Department maintains different inventories of end point equipment, classroom equipment and network equipment. Systems such as Lansweeper and network management provide insight into equipment use across campus. IT staff will be available to respond to questions and assist in reviewing equipment inventories, and use, as well as budgets to facilitate replacement and upgrades.**
6. Does the University maintain current documentation of asset acquisition dates, warranty and support status, and vendor end-of-life dates for the asset categories listed in Requirement 1.2? If so, in what form? **Purchasing documentation and warranty information can be provided for most technology. Some research may be required.**

7. Will the University provide historical expenditure data for the maintenance and upgrade funds identified in Addendum A (General Computer Labs, Classroom Technology, Academic Software, University Computer Replacement Cycle, University Business Software, Academic Labs)? **Yes, the University will provide historical expenditure data to the awarded contractor upon request.**
8. Does the University expect the contractor to conduct on-site assessment work at the Cape Girardeau, Sikeston, and Kennett campuses, or may the assessment be conducted remotely with University-provided data and virtual stakeholder engagement? **Since a category-level lifecycle and risk analysis is appropriate, a remote assessment can be employed. The response to the RFP can include costs/benefits of each.**
9. Mandatory Report Deliverable II.1 requires the contractor to present findings, methodology, and the initial plan to campus leadership on or before April 1, 2027. Does the University expect this presentation to be delivered in person or virtually? **The response to the RFP can include costs/benefits of each. The presentation is not required to be in-person.**
10. Are there on-site expectations at any other point in the engagement (for example, a project kickoff, stakeholder interviews or focus groups, or delivery of the final plan)? **There are no-site expectations: however, the response to the RFP can include costs/benefits of each.**
11. The RFP identifies satellite locations in Sikeston and Kennett in addition to the main Cape Girardeau campus. Should the infrastructure lifecycle assessment cover the technology at all three locations on the same basis, or is a lighter assessment expected for the satellite sites? **The satellite locations will require a much lighter assessment but should be included to support remote teaching technologies and potential networking services or security concerns.**
12. Cost is weighted at 50% of the evaluation criteria. Has the University established a budget or budget range for this engagement that it is able to share with offerors? By understanding your budget expectations, bidders can maximize their scope of work within your financial constraints and recommend ways to meet your requirements with your budget. **The university has not established a set budget but would set a not-to-exceed price of \$120,000.**
13. Item 8.2 asks offerors to break out expenses by project phase. If on-site work is expected, should travel expenses be included within the total guaranteed not-to-exceed price, or identified separately as a reimbursable line item? **Travel expenses should be included but can be separated when providing on-site vs remote assessment options.**
14. Item 10.3 asks for the proposed method to engage the campus community. Approximately how many stakeholder interviews, focus groups, or survey populations does the University anticipate, and will the University coordinate scheduling and participant recruitment? **The response should include a recommendation on the most effective approach to campus engagement that informs the IT Master Plan. The IT Department will assist with scheduling focus groups/interviews or sending out surveys.**

15. Has the University conducted any recent technology-related surveys or assessments (for example, EDUCAUSE surveys, prior consulting engagements, or internal reviews) that would be made available to the contractor? **No.**
 16. Will the University identify a single primary point of contact who will coordinate document requests, scheduling, and stakeholder access for the duration of the engagement? **Yes.**
 17. General Contractual Requirement 13 states that all reports, documentation, and material developed or acquired by the contractor as a direct requirement of the contract shall become the property of the University. Will the University acknowledge that the contractor retains ownership of its pre-existing intellectual property—including proprietary methodologies, assessment frameworks, maturity models, and document templates—used in the performance of the work, while the University receives full ownership of the deliverables produced under the contract? **Yes.**
 18. Item 3.1 states that offerors may not request that any part of a proposal be treated as confidential or proprietary. Item 9.4 requires the offeror to provide an example of a developed IT Master Plan. Given that submitted materials become open to public inspection following award, will the University accept a publicly available master plan, or a redacted or anonymized sample, in satisfaction of item 9.4? **The university will accept whatever the offeror is willing to share.**
 19. Is there a page limit or preferred format for the proposal narrative? **No page limit is set. A PDF document would be preferred. The document should be structured to assist in its evaluation against the goals stated in the RFP.**
 20. Item 9.3 asks for profiles on all staff who will lead and support this initiative. Should these profiles be included within the proposal narrative or submitted as an appendix? **Either is acceptable;#1# an appendix is preferred.**
 21. Is the University open to a compressed or extended schedule between the October 15, 2026 award and the April 1, 2027 draft delivery date, and are there institutional milestones (budget cycles, board meetings, or strategic planning checkpoints) that the project schedule should accommodate? **This initiative is not dependent on any other campus activities except to be prepared by the April 1, 2027, delivery day. A compressed timeline would be considered but evaluated on the demands and capacity of SEMO staff to assist with development of the Campus Master Plan.**
 22. Does the University anticipate any organizational changes during the project period that the contractor should be aware of in planning stakeholder engagement and governance recommendations? **The university does not anticipate any organizational changes that would affect this initiative during the scheduled timeline.**
- B. . The RFP closing date and time remain the same. All other terms and conditions of Request for Proposal 6045 remain the same.

If you have any questions regarding this Amendment, please contact Charity Woods, Buyer, at 573-651-2588.

To acknowledge receipt of this amendment, the offeror should complete, sign, and return such with the proposal response.