



## RFP#916630 Q&A

### ***1. Background - What factors prompted MSU to undertake this shared governance assessment at this time (for example, governance challenges, organizational changes, accreditation, or strategic initiatives)?***

Answer: The Office of Academic Governance is conducting this shared governance assessment in response to recent organizational changes, evolving governance structures, ongoing bylaw revisions, and a commitment to maintaining effective, inclusive, and responsive practices in a complex higher education environment. The assessment aims to offer a comprehensive, forward-looking evaluation rather than addressing a single issue, accreditation requirement, or isolated challenge.

### ***2. Stakeholder Engagement - Could MSU provide: a) Approximate sizes of each stakeholder group (faculty, academic staff, students, administrators), b) Any priority units, populations, or governance bodies for engagement, and c) the minimum and maximum number of each of the following anticipated as part of the engagement: stakeholder interviews, listening sessions, focus groups, and/or forums.***

Answer:

- a) MSU is a large public R1 institution with a diverse population of faculty, academic staff, students, and administrators. Exact counts will be provided to the selected consultant during project onboarding.
- b) The assessment will be campus wide. Priority governance bodies include faculty governance entities, student governance organizations, and key administrative stakeholders. The consultant should design an engagement strategy that ensures broad representation across academic, administrative, and student groups.
- c) MSU has not set minimum or maximum numbers for interviews, listening sessions, focus groups, or forums. Vendors are expected to propose an engagement plan suitable for MSU's size and complexity that supports a rigorous and inclusive assessment within the project scope and budget.

### ***3. Assess Current Shared Governance: What governance-related materials will be available to the selected consultant (for example, bylaws, committee records, meeting minutes, policies, prior assessments, or survey data)? What other existing survey, such as engagement and/or effectiveness surveys, will be available to the selected consultant?***

Answer: The selected consultant will have access to relevant governance materials, including bylaws, committee charters, policies, publicly available meeting materials, and other documentation relevant to the assessment. The Office of Academic Governance will also identify any existing survey data, such as engagement or climate surveys, that may provide useful context. The availability and relevance of specific materials will be discussed at project initiation.



**4. Effectiveness Analysis: Does MSU have a defined list of peers R1 institutions for benchmarking, or should the consultant propose an appropriate peer set?**

Answer: The Office of Academic Governance has not established a fixed list of peer institutions for benchmarking. Vendors are expected to propose an appropriate peer set based on institutional size, mission, governance structure, and relevant characteristics of large public R1 universities. The Office of Academic Governance will review and confirm the proposed peer set during the project.

**5. Context: Which recent unit mergers and governance bylaw revisions should be included in the assessment, and over what general timeframe did these changes occur?**

Answer: The assessment should address governance changes from recent years, such as unit mergers and bylaw revisions that affect representation, decision-making, and shared governance. Relevant examples and documentation will be provided to the selected consultant during onboarding.

**6. Deliverables: Beyond the Steering Committee, how many presentations to other governance bodies should the consultant anticipate, and what are the typical audience sizes?**

Answer: In addition to presenting to the Governance Assessment Committee, the consultant may be asked to share findings with up to two or three other governance bodies, such as faculty or university-wide groups. Audience sizes typically range from 20 to 100 participants, depending on the group.

**7. Budget: Is there a budget range or maximum project value established for this engagement?**

Answer: The Office of Academic Governance has established an internal budget for this engagement and anticipates selecting a proposal that represents best value based on scope, approach, and overall cost.

**8. Travel Expenses: What level of on-site engagement does MSU expect? Is a hybrid model combining limited on-site work with virtual engagement acceptable?**

Answer: We are completing a comprehensive assessment of our shared governance system. We trust that vendors who are submitting proposals will be able to provide a thorough plan that would include their recommendations for the most effective modalities

**9. Incumbent: Has MSU engaged in similar work previously? If so, which firm provided these services and was the total value of the services provided?**

Answer: MSU has not recently completed a comprehensive, campus wide shared governance assessment of this scope with an external consultant. There is no incumbent vendor for this project.



**10. Interim progress report. Given the estimated contract award date of February 20, is there flexibility on the delivery date for the March 15 interim report, which would be just over 3 weeks later? Alternatively, is it expected that the March 15 interim report will serve to align on the work plan than serve as a progress report?**

Answer: Yes, the Governance Assessment Committee is open to making reasonable changes to the project timeline to help ensure a high-quality assessment. The Office of Academic Governance is ready to work together with the selected vendor to set a schedule that gives enough time for careful planning, stakeholder input, and analysis. The interim milestone is there to help everyone agree on the scope, methods, and work plan. The selected vendor can suggest changes as needed to achieve the best results.

**11. Has a university Sponsor for this project been named? If so, who will serve in this role?**

Answer: The University Sponsor is Office of Academic Governance

**12. Have additional members of the Steering Committee been named? Which MSU leaders or departments/units will be represented?**

Answer: The Office of Academic Governance has established a Governance Assessment Committee to support this work. The committee will include representatives from key groups across the university, including faculty, students, and administrative leaders. Once the members are chosen, their names and roles will be shared with the selected vendor at the start of the project.

**13. How involved will MSU's board be in this work?**

Answer: The Board will not be directly involved in this assessment. Instead, a representative from the Office of the Board of Trustees will support the project by offering advice and information as needed.

The assessment will look at how shared governance works at the university, involving faculty, academic staff, students, and administrators. The Governance Assessment Committee and the Office of Academic Governance will coordinate and oversee the project.

**14. Does MSU desire for this shared governance assessment to examine and assess the board's role in shared governance? What is the relative importance of this aspect of the assessment vis a vi other aspects of shared governance (e.g. faculty role, academic staff, administrators)?**

Answer: The assessment will take a broad look at shared governance, focusing mainly on the structures and processes within the university community. This includes faculty, academic staff, students, and administrators.

The Board's role may be considered at a high level as part of the broader governance context in which shared governance operates; however, the Board is not a primary focus of the assessment, nor is direct engagement with the Board anticipated as part of this work.

Vendors should suggest an approach that places the Board's role in the right context within the overall governance framework. The main focus should be on shared governance practices, participation, and decision-making processes within the university.