



*North Carolina A&T State University  
1601 E. Market Street  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411*

## **IMPORTANT BID ADDENDUM**

**FAILURE TO RETURN THIS BID ADDENDUM IN ACCORDANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS WILL SUBJECT YOUR BID TO REJECTION.**

BID Number: **59-P2405** SOLICITATION: **Dining Services Management**  
ADDENDUM Number: **#4** USING AGENCY: **North Carolina A&T State University**  
PURCHASER: **Stephen Pass** OPENING DATE/TIME: **Friday, May 22, 2026 at 3:00 p.m. ET**

### **INFORMATION**

This **addendum** serves as the University responses to Supplier questions

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Reference Page/Number</b>	<b>Supplier Question</b>	<b>University Response</b>
<b>1</b>		Since this is the second RFP issued within a relatively short timeframe, what key factors led to the previous process being paused or canceled, and how has that shaped your priorities in this current process?	The prior process was paused to ensure alignment with evolving institutional priorities, leadership transition, and deeper stakeholder input—particularly from students. That pause allowed the university to reassess expectations around service quality, financial structure, capital investment, and partnership philosophy.
<b>2</b>		Among the financial components—guaranteed return, commissions, capital investment, and program reinvestment—which carries the most weight in your evaluation?	No single financial component stands alone. The university is evaluating total value, which includes a balanced combination of predictable financial return, sustainable commissions, meaningful capital investment, and reinvestment that directly enhances the student experience. Proposals that demonstrate how these elements work together will be most competitive.
<b>3</b>		How does the university prioritize immediate cash return versus long-term value creation through capital and program investment?	The university evaluates financial proposals based on total value, not a single financial metric. That said, access to meaningful upfront cash is of interest in this process to allow the university to make early, visible investments that address immediate needs across the dining system.

			<p>This includes:</p> <p>Expanding food access and options in food-desert locations, such as Athletics and other high-use areas with limited service today, and Funding upfits and targeted enhancements in existing dining facilities to improve capacity, throughput, variety, and overall student experience early in the contract term.</p>
4		What are the top 2–3 outcomes the new administration is most focused on achieving through this partnership in the first 2–3 years?	<p>A measurably improved student dining experience, including food quality, access, variety, hours, and perceived value. Operational stability and trust rebuilding, ensuring consistent service and transparent performance management. Establishing a true strategic partnership that aligns dining with enrollment growth, student success, and campus life.</p>
5		If you had to choose, what is more critical: maximizing financial return to the university or elevating the student experience—and how do you balance those in evaluation?	<p>Elevating the student experience is the priority. A strong student experience ultimately drives participation, revenue growth, and financial sustainability. The evaluation balances financial outcomes with qualitative and operational measures that demonstrate how the partner will grow engagement and long-term value.</p>
6		What does an ideal financial partnership look like over the full contract term?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Predictable and transparent financial performance</li> <li>• Shared incentives tied to participation growth and quality outcomes</li> <li>• Ongoing capital and program reinvestment</li> <li>• Flexibility to adapt to enrollment shifts, cost pressures, and student needs</li> </ul> <p>The university is seeking alignment, not rigidity.</p>
7		How important is a partner’s ability to grow participation and overall program revenue versus simply maximizing financial guarantees?	<p>Growing participation and overall program revenue is significantly more important. Guarantees provide baseline stability, but sustainable success comes from designing programs that students choose to engage with consistently.</p>
8		What level and type of capital investment would be considered meaningful and competitive in this process?	<p>Competitive capital investment should directly address current gaps—modernization of facilities, technology, equipment, and concepts that improve throughput, quality, and flexibility. Proposals should clearly connect capital investments to improved outcomes, not just dollar amounts.</p>



9		Where do you see the biggest gaps today in the student dining experience (access, quality, hours, value, etc.)?	<p>Student feedback has consistently highlighted gaps in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Late-night and extended-hours access</li> <li>Variety and food quality</li> <li>Value and flexibility of offerings</li> <li>Convenience, speed, and mobile solutions</li> </ul> <p>Addressing these gaps is central to this RFP.</p>
10		What behaviors or attributes differentiate a true strategic partner from a vendor in your view?	<p>A strategic partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Takes shared ownership of outcomes</li> <li>Proactively identifies challenges and solutions</li> <li>Communicates transparently and uses data to drive improvement</li> <li>Aligns investments with institutional priorities</li> </ul> <p>A vendor simply meets contract minimums.</p>
11		How does the university view risk-sharing in the financial model, particularly with enrollment growth and cost pressures?	<p>The university is open to thoughtful risk-sharing structures that align incentives and reflect market realities. Proposals should demonstrate realism, flexibility, and shared accountability rather than transferring all risk to one party.</p>
12		How open is the university to piloting new concepts, service models, or pricing strategies over the life of the contract?	<p>Very open. The university values innovation and expects the partner to bring forward pilots and new ideas, supported by data, with mechanisms to evaluate, refine, and scale successful initiatives.</p>
13		What feedback from students or stakeholders most influenced the redesign of this RFP?	<p>Student feedback—particularly around food quality, variety, value, hours, and cultural relevance—was the most influential input. Stakeholders also emphasized the need for transparency, responsiveness, and alignment with student success goals.</p>
14		Given the timeline between contract award and the January 1, 2027 commencement of operations, how is the university thinking about transition expectations, and are there any flexibilities or considerations to ensure a successful and seamless launch?	<p>The university recognizes this is an ambitious timeline and expects a well-defined transition plan, early onboarding, transparent communication, and close collaboration. Thoughtful phasing and flexibility will be important to ensure continuity and quality from day one.</p>
15		What risks has the university identified with this timeline, and how would you expect a partner to mitigate them?	<p>Key risks include staffing transitions, supply chain readiness, systems integration, and student communication. The university expects bidders to proactively identify these risks and propose clear mitigation strategies, contingency planning, and accountability structures.</p>



16		Supplier Financial Proposal Workbook Revised 10 years	<a href="#">Attachment G - Supplier Financial Proposal Workbook - Revised 10 years-5.4.2026.xlsx</a>
----	--	---	--

---

Execute Addendum:

BIDDER: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS (CITY & STATE): \_\_\_\_\_

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME and TITLE (Typed): \_\_\_\_\_

