REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
Strengthening Shaw University through Institutional Risk Management
Solicitation Number / ID: SHAW-IRM-01
Questions and Answers
Issued: June 16, 2026

Questions have been compiled from all submissions received by the stated question deadline. Questions may have been edited for clarity, brevity, and to remove identifying information. Responses provided herein become part of the official procurement record. Unless specifically modified by a formal addendum, all terms, conditions, requirements, deadlines, and evaluation criteria contained in the original RFP remain unchanged.

Question 1:
Can Shaw University describe any existing risk management-related practices, roles, or structures currently in place?

Response:
Shaw University currently has risk management-related practices in place across various functional areas, including finance, information technology, academic affairs, student services, grants management, and athletics. However, these practices are generally decentralized and managed within individual departments or operational areas. The purpose of this engagement is to help the University assess current practices and develop a more formal, coordinated, and enterprise-wide risk management framework.

Question 2:
Has the University already determined how enterprise risk management will be managed in the future, including responsible owners, governance structure, management involvement, and Board involvement?

Response:
The future governance structure for enterprise risk management is a desired outcome of this engagement. Shaw University expects the selected firm to recommend an appropriate ERM governance model, including roles, responsibilities, reporting cadence, risk ownership, escalation processes, and appropriate engagement by executive leadership and, where applicable, the Board of Trustees.

Question 3:
What is the anticipated timeline for the project?

Response:
The University's target completion date is September 30, 2026; however, final completion may extend no later than November 30, 2026, if necessary. Proposers should submit a realistic work

plan that includes key milestones for project kickoff, document review, stakeholder engagement, risk assessment, risk prioritization, ERM framework development, training, and final reporting.

Question 4:
The RFP references "implementing an ERM system." Is Shaw University seeking a technology solution, software platform, or broader ERM framework?

Response:
The term "ERM system" is used generally to refer to the governance structure, tools, templates, processes, workflows, reporting mechanisms, dashboards, and decision-making practices necessary to institutionalize Enterprise Risk Management. Shaw University is not seeking procurement or implementation of a specific ERM software platform as part of this RFP.

Question 5:
Has an ERM technology solution already been identified?

Response:
No. A technology solution has not been identified because the University is not seeking implementation of a specific ERM software platform through this RFP.

Question 6:
How should proposers interpret the RFP requirement for experience implementing ERM systems?

Response:
For purposes of this RFP, "experience implementing ERM systems" refers to experience helping institutions establish practical ERM frameworks, governance structures, risk registers, risk heat maps, dashboards, reporting tools, mitigation tracking processes, and related templates. The selected firm is expected to recommend and develop practical tools and processes that can be used by University leadership after the engagement ends. Technology system selection is not required.

Question 7:
Is the institution-wide risk assessment expected to include all academic, administrative, and auxiliary units, or only selected functions or departments?

Response:
The assessment is expected to be institution-wide and should include major academic, administrative, operational, compliance, auxiliary, and student-facing functions. The selected firm should propose an approach that provides broad institutional coverage while prioritizing deeper attention to areas with higher risk exposure.

Question 8:
Is Shaw University seeking an enterprise-level assessment only, or deeper process- or department-level analysis in selected areas?

Response:
Shaw University is seeking an enterprise-level assessment with targeted deeper review in selected high-risk areas identified through the assessment process. The engagement should not be structured as a full internal audit of every department, process, or transaction, but it should provide sufficient detail to support meaningful mitigation planning for priority risks.

Question 9:
Are there specific risk domains that the University would like prioritized within the engagement?

Response:
The University expects the selected firm to assess multiple risk domains, including but not limited to academic affairs, student services, finance, sponsored programs, information technology, facilities, housing, dining, athletics, enrollment, governance, and operational continuity. Priority domains will be finalized during project planning and based on input from University leadership.

Question 10:
What level of evaluation is expected for existing institutional controls and mitigation practices?

Response:
Shaw University expects a high-level enterprise assessment of existing controls and mitigation practices across major institutional risk areas, rather than a detailed internal audit of every process or transaction. The selected firm should assess whether current controls appear documented, assigned to responsible owners, reasonably designed, and sufficient to mitigate high-priority risks. Deeper review may be expected for selected high-risk areas identified during the engagement.

Question 11:
Does the University maintain a current listing of key controls across its operating departments and processes?

Response:
The University does not currently maintain a comprehensive, centralized listing of key controls across all operating departments and processes. Existing controls may be documented within departments, policies, procedures, audits, accreditation materials, compliance reports, or operational practices. Identifying and organizing relevant controls is expected to be part of the engagement.

Question 12:
Are there existing risk assessments, compliance reviews, risk registers, policy inventories, or operational continuity materials that will be made available to the selected firm?

Response:
Available institutional materials will be provided to the selected firm as appropriate. These may include strategic plans, accreditation materials, audit reports, compliance reports, policies, operational documents, insurance or risk-related materials, and other relevant records. Shaw University does not currently maintain a comprehensive enterprise-wide risk register.

Question 13:
Beyond the deliverables listed in the RFP, does Shaw University expect items such as governance models, reporting templates, presentation materials, or editable tools/templates?

Response:
Yes. Shaw University expects practical and editable deliverables that can be used after the engagement ends. These may include an ERM governance model, risk register template, risk heat map, reporting templates, mitigation tracking tools, leadership presentation materials, training materials, and an implementation roadmap.

Question 14:
What are the University's expectations for executive leadership and cabinet-level ERM training?

Response:
The University expects practical executive-level training designed to build understanding of ERM concepts, risk ownership, governance responsibilities, risk-informed decision-making, mitigation tracking, and use of the risk register and heat map. Proposers may recommend the number and format of sessions, such as an awareness session, working session, or multiple workshops.

Question 15:
Are there any specific Title III reporting, documentation, or federal grant compliance expectations that should be addressed in the proposal methodology or deliverables?

Response:
Vendors are not expected to demonstrate specialized knowledge of Title III reporting requirements in their proposals. Shaw University will be responsible for ensuring compliance with applicable federal grant requirements. The selected firm will be expected to provide standard project documentation and deliverables sufficient to document the services performed, including work completed, stakeholders engaged, assessment methods used, recommendations provided, training conducted, and final project outcomes. Vendors should also provide any required procurement certifications or disclosures requested in the RFP, including conflict of

interest disclosure, debarment and suspension certification, and any applicable minority-owned, women-owned, HUB, or small business certifications.

Question 16:
Can Shaw University provide specific references to the federal requirements applicable to the selected vendor?

Response:
This procurement is funded through a federal grant and is subject to applicable federal procurement and contract requirements under 2 CFR Part 200. Shaw University will be responsible for ensuring that applicable federal requirements are incorporated into the final contract and procurement file. Vendors are not expected to provide a detailed legal analysis of federal regulations in their proposals.

For proposal submission purposes, vendors should provide the certifications and disclosures requested in the RFP, including disclosure of any actual or potential conflicts of interest, certification that the vendor is not suspended, debarred, or otherwise excluded from participation in federal assistance programs or federally funded procurements, and identification of any applicable minority-owned, women-owned, HUB, small business, or labor surplus area firm certifications.

Applicable federal provisions, including any required contract clauses under 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix II, will be incorporated into the final contract with the selected vendor.

Question 17:
Will work be expected to be performed in person, or is the University open to remote or hybrid performance?

Response:
Shaw University is open to a remote or hybrid approach. However, proposals should describe how the firm will effectively engage executive leadership, cabinet-level stakeholders, and key institutional units. In-person or live virtual facilitation may be proposed for kickoff, leadership interviews, risk prioritization, training, or final presentations. Proposers should identify any recommended in-person activities and include associated costs in the cost proposal.

Question 18:
How important is the location of the service team?

Response:
Location is not the primary determining factor. Shaw University is open to qualified firms regardless of location, provided they can effectively meet the project timeline, engage University stakeholders, and deliver the required services. A remote or hybrid approach is acceptable.

Question 19:
Are redacted sample deliverables acceptable as part of the proposal submission?

Response:
Yes. Redacted sample deliverables are acceptable, provided they demonstrate the proposer's relevant experience and do not disclose confidential client information.

Question 20:
Who will be involved in the decision-making process?

Response:
Proposals will be reviewed by an evaluation team designated by Shaw University. The team may include representatives from procurement, project leadership, executive leadership, finance, compliance/legal, and other relevant institutional areas. Final award decisions will follow Shaw University's procurement and approval processes.

Question 21:
Has a budget been established for this project, and is Shaw University willing to share the budget or fee expectations?

Response:
A project budget has been established. However, Shaw University is not disclosing the internal budget amount during the competitive solicitation process. Offerors should submit a cost proposal that reflects the proposed scope, methodology, staffing, deliverables, and timeline.

All other terms, conditions, requirements, deadlines, and evaluation criteria contained in the original RFP remain unchanged unless modified by formal addendum.