

TO: All Proposers

FROM: David Morris
Assistant Vice President for Development
Delaware Technical Community College
Office of the President

DATE: August 19, 2016

SUBJECT: Addendum #1
Request for Proposal-Contract #DTCC 16822-OOPCAPCAMP

ADDENDUM #1 – Questions and Answers

- 1. In order to best assess donor/prospect base, what is your current file size of donor and non-donors?**

Delaware Tech has a total of 45,737 records in the database, with 5,791 who have ever made a gift to the College. In calendar year 2015 2,000 made gifts to the College.

- 2. Is acquisition intended to be part of this Campaign?**

Growing the donor base, particularly in terms of alumni giving is a goal for the campaign.

- 3. In order to describe approach, important to first ask if you're currently doing wealth screening, and if so, with whom?**

No wealth screening has been done on the database. The staff individually uses Lexis Nexis for Development regularly to research prospects on an individual basis.

4. What are your current primary drivers of revenue today? (Direct mail? major gifts? etc.)

Major gifts are the College's primary driver for gifts. The College also has started to execute annual giving campaigns via direct mail and email over the last year.

5. Is your current partner participating in this process as well?

The College does not have any current partners regarding fundraising support.

6. What is the timeline that this campaign will be running on?

The College is interested in recommendations from the selected partner(s) for this RFP to help determine the length of the campaign.

7. What is the possible range for the campaign goal?

The goal for this campaign can range from \$5M up, depending on the results of the feasibility study and recommendations regarding the length and goal for the campaign.

8. How and when will campaign objectives be established?

It is our hope that the selected consultant will help establish these objectives via conversations with College leadership. Needs for the College have been identified but would need to be vetted with leadership and donors regarding the specific funding priorities for the campaign.

9. Are you considering a comprehensive campaign (i.e., including capital, endowment and annual fund/current programs) or is it focused only on capital?

Yes, the College is interested in funding more than just capital through this campaign.

10. In our experience, a traditional feasibility study would require a minimum of four months. Is there a reason that you want the findings two months after retaining counsel?

The timeline for the feasibility study can be negotiated with the selected vendor. Any recommendations regarding the timeframe should be included in any submitted proposals. The reason for the short turnaround is because the College is currently celebrating its 50th Anniversary in 2016 and leadership is interested in taking advantage of this opportunity, although it is not required.

11. Would you consider extending the timeline or considering an alternative approach?

An extended timeline for the feasibility study is welcome to be included in any consultant's proposal.

12. As the average campaign lasts 4.6 years (and longer in higher education), do you anticipate working with the consulting firm beyond 2017?

Yes, the College is interested in maintaining this relationship for as long as the campaign is underway.

13. Should the proposal be limited to this time period?

See response to Question 6. No, the proposal may lay out alternative time frames.

14. How many staff members are involved in fundraising?

Currently Delaware Tech has four frontline fundraisers who are soliciting prospects, four Development Coordinators who perform research and make annual gift level asks and two administrative support staff. In addition, the President and five vice presidents are also involved in solicitation.

15. What will be the role of the foundation in this campaign?

The College has an Educational Foundation Board who currently serve in an advisory capacity. They are not currently soliciting gifts as volunteers. The College also has Development Councils in each of the state's three counties who are very involved and assist with prospect identification.

16. Will the President, development staff, board of trustees and foundation board members be accessible to the consulting firm during the feasibility study process?

Yes, the President, development staff, foundation board, board of trustees and development councils will be accessible during the feasibility study.

17. What donor data system do you use?

The College currently uses the Raiser's Edge.

18. How many donors are in the system?

See response to Question 1.

19. How would you characterize the accuracy and functionality of the database?

A database cleanup was performed in 2015 on the database. The functionality is strong although there are a few additional tools such as appeal tracking that the staff is implementing this fall.

20. Have you conducted a wealth screening? If so, when and with which vendor?

See response to Question 3.

21. When was your last campaign and how much was raised?

The last campaign for Delaware Tech, titled "Shaping the Future" ran from 2006-2008 and raised more than \$4.2M.

22. Was the campaign a success?

Yes – it exceeded the campaign goal.

23. Are you working with fundraising counsel now or have you in the past?

The College is not currently working with a fundraising consultant. The College concluded a development assessment in 2013.

24. If so, are you anticipating a proposal from that firm?

No.

25. Do you have a budget in mind for this project? If so, would you be willing to share it?

The College does have an idea what we would like to spend on the consultant and feasibility study but are open to various price points.

26. What role will pricing play in the decision?

Price will be a factor in the selection decision but not the only factor.

27. It is a thoughtful and comprehensive RFP, may we ask how you put it together?

Samples from other schools were used as a basis for the RFP as well as experience from existing staff in the content.

28. How many firms are you inviting to propose?

This is an open RFP and any firm is able to apply.

29. Has Delaware Tech successfully completed a campaign(s) previously? If so, how was the campaign structured (e.g., as a comprehensive campaign or a project-specific campaign), and how much was ultimately raised?

See response to question 21.

30. Acknowledging that the Scope of Services references a “multi-million campaign goal with a range yet to be determined,” is there a minimum amount that Delaware Tech aspires to raise for the campaign?

The absolute minimum goal for this campaign would be \$5M although after analysis of the portfolio it is believed this goal could be much higher, particularly if the campaign spans several years.

31. Have campaign fundraising priorities been identified? If so, what are they?

See responses to questions 7, 8, and 9.

32. In reviewing the timeline, it is noted that Delaware Tech would like to begin the Feasibility Study on September 16. A key aspect of the feasibility study process is sharing a preliminary case for support with interviewees in advance, and subsequently seeking their perceptions, feedback, advice, and willingness to support the preliminary campaign objectives during the interview process. The preliminary case for support serves as a draft of the institution’s campaign plans. Has this draft document been created? If not, is it anticipated that the preliminary case for support will be drafted and ready to distribute to prospective interviewees when the Feasibility Study process commences on September 16?

A preliminary case for support has not been drafted and the College would look to the consultant(s) to help draft the case.

33. The final item on the proposed feasibility study and campaign timeline at the top of page three of the RFP titled “Assist in conducting campaign” shows a timeline of December 2016 to December 2017. Is it Delaware Tech’s intent to limit the comprehensive campaign counsel service to a period of just one year following completion of the feasibility study? Or will the College consider a longer timeframe for campaign counsel?

This is simply a proposed timeline. The College will work with selected consultant(s) to develop the appropriate timeline and would work directly with them throughout the duration of the campaign.

34. Section IV, paragraph B, page 6 states: *“Please provide a separate electronic pricing file from the rest of the RFP proposal responses.”* This is echoed in Appendix B, page 40: *“Copy of electronic price file shall be a separate file from all other files on the electronic copy.”* Please confirm whether the fee information also needs to be in a separate hard copy from the rest of the proposal. Section III, paragraph A, item 5 (titled “Fees”) on page 4 makes it sound as though the fee section should be included in the same hard copy as the rest of the proposal, so maybe it is just for the electronic copies that the fee section needs to be separated.

The fees information can be included in the same hard copy.

35. Section IV, paragraph D, item 4.b (titled “ACA Safe Harbor”) on page 18 states: *“The Common-law Employer Safe Harbor Exception can be attained when Delaware Tech and/or its agencies are charged and pay for an ‘Additional Fee’ with respect to the employees electing to obtain health coverage from the Vendor. The Common-law Employer Safe Harbor Exception under the ACA requires that an Additional Fee must be charged to those employees who obtain health coverage from the Vendor, but does not state the required amount of the fee. Delaware Tech requires that all Vendors shall identify the Additional Fee to obtain health coverage from the Vendor and delineate the Additional Fee from all other charges and fees. The Vendor shall identify both the Additional Fee to be charged and the basis of how the fee is applied (i.e. per employee, per invoice, etc.). Delaware Tech will consider the Additional Fee and prior to award reserves the right to negotiate any fees offered by the Vendor. Further, the Additional Fee shall be separately scored in the proposal to ensure that neither prices charged nor the Additional Fee charged will have a detrimental effect when selecting vendor(s) for award.”* Some parts of this section refer to this “Additional Fee” being charged to Delaware Tech, while other parts state it is to be charged to the Vendor’s employees (please refer to the text I bolded). Can you provide some clarity and more direction on how this fee operates and the type of response needed to satisfy this requirement in the proposal?

This part of the RFP is form language which is inapplicable to this particular contract as no Vendor employees will be considered temporary employees of the College per the Agreement executed. No ACA safe harbor fee applies in this RFP. This addendum shall be considered to have stricken all references in the RFP to the same.

All other terms of the RFP remain the same.