



Procurement and Contracting Services

Request for Proposals for Online Brand Strategy and Creative Development

ADDENDUM #1

**Sealed RFP # L192611
Due on May 22, 2026, no later than 2:00 PM, MST**

The following questions were received prior to the close of the Technical Question period on May 14, 2026 at 12:00 PM MST:

SCOPE, PROCESS & AWARD STRUCTURE

- 1. Should vendors bidding on both phases provide one integrated timeline or separate timelines by phase?**

An integrated timeline is preferred.

- 2. Are the milestone dates fixed targets, or are you open to recommendations that include a modestly adjusted schedule?**

Milestone dates are not fixed and we are open to modest adjustments.

- 3. §3.9.8 Phase 1 / Phase 2 Award Structure
If Phase 1 is awarded to one agency and Phase 2 is awarded to another, what is the University's expected handoff process? Will the Phase 1 vendor be expected to participate in Phase 2 kickoff, brief the Phase 2 agency on rationale and deliverables, or provide support beyond the Phase 1 deliverables outlined in Steps 1A through 1C?**

The U of A team will handle the transition. The Phase 1 agency should not plan to be involved in any kind of handoff to Phase 2.

- 4. Phase Bidding – If we submit for both phases, will each phase be scored independently or evaluated as a single combined submission?**

They will be scored independently but we appreciate seeing a holistic view of the project.

- 5. Who is involved in the proposal review and presentation phases? The optional third leadership input phase?**

We have established a Core Team and an Extended Team comprised of representatives from University MarCom, UAGC and AZO. The Core Team will be extensively involved in both phases, with optional participation from the Extended Team. The optional Leadership Phase will involve senior leaders from the university if deemed necessary by the Core and Extended Teams.

6. Can the University clarify whether the work will include audience research and stakeholder facilitation workshops as part of the strategy phase?

In the RFP, Section 1A clearly states that both are expected.

7. Will the selected vendor be expected to support implementation beyond the initial strategy and creative development phases?

They will not be expected to do it but may be invited to provide additional implementation support if the university is satisfied with the partnership.

8. Are there preferred project management or collaboration platforms the University expects vendors to utilize?

The university utilizes Monday.com for project management but does not expect our partner to use it.

9. Do you have a RACI, OARP, etc. identified for the project?

10. Can you clarify the anticipated decision-making structure for this project? We are interested in understanding how many layers of approval there will be, which will need to be factored into timing of each sequence.

11. We appreciate the university's emphasis on a collaborative and iterative approach. How many rounds of presentations and revisions does the team anticipate for each phase of work?

12. We're assuming there will be team members from UofA, UoA Online and UAGC, is that correct? How would you describe the final decision making process across the 3 UofA entities?

There will be both a Core Team and an Extended Team comprised of representatives from University MarCom, UAGC and AZO. The Core Team of lead marketing professionals will review the first round deliverables and determine when it is ready to escalate to the extended team for input. We recommend planning for 3 rounds of revision at each phase. Ultimately final decisions rests with the University's Chief Communications and Marketing Officer under the advisement of the Core and Extended Teams.

13. What organizational barriers could slow implementation?

The university is ready to move forward with this implementation. As with any large organization, barriers may appear, but we do not anticipate any significant obstacles at this time.

14. Can the University provide additional detail regarding the anticipated deliverables for phases A–F referenced in the evaluation criteria?

No. We believe we have provided sufficient detail on expected deliverables to inform an effective proposal.

15. Remote Collaboration – Can you confirm that all project phases, including stakeholder interviews, presentations and reviews, can be conducted fully remotely via Zoom or similar platforms?

Most phases can and should be conducted remotely to be inclusive of distributed staff. However, there may be key milestones where in person is warranted to convene the teams, such as a retreat setting. Please plan for at least one in-person visit in each phase as part of your proposal.

16. Will vendor presentations be onsite only?

Yes, vendor presentations are intended to be on-site and in-person at the University of Arizona.

17. Will preference be given to local agencies vs. agencies outside of Arizona?

No.

ELIGIBILITY & QUALIFICATIONS

18. What evaluation criteria will matter most beyond price?

19. §3.9.8 Evaluation Criteria — Scoring Weights

Section 3.9.8 lists Phase 1 evaluation criteria in 'descending order of importance' but does not assign numerical weights. Can the University share approximate weights for the Phase 1 (Steps A-C) criteria — Brand Strategy Expertise, Firm Profile, and Price — to help vendors calibrate proposal emphasis appropriately?

The scoring weights for Brand Strategy Expertise for Phase 1 and Creative Expertise for Phase 2 are both 60%, and remaining criteria are identical across both phases (Firm Profile – 30%, Price – 10%).

20. §3.9.8 Limiting Criteria — Online Environment Qualification

For the limiting criterion 'demonstrated experience with at least 2 brands in the last 5 years that operate primarily in an online environment, whether that's online education, e-commerce or services,' does this require the client brand itself to be a digital-native company, or does it include traditional institutions whose primary engagement with their audience occurs through digital channels (for example, online tools and services delivered by a healthcare system or membership organization)?

We are looking for experience marketing a purely online offering. If your experience is with an organization that has online offerings, but you have not been responsible for a branding/marketing campaign for said offerings, you would not meet the limiting criteria.

21. For the higher education and online brand experience requirements, will the University consider subcontractor or teaming partner experience as part of vendor qualifications?

No.

22. How heavily will direct higher education enrollment marketing experience weigh against broader brand strategy expertise for mission-driven organizations?

We are seeking firms that are sufficiently experienced in navigating brand and marketing challenges within the higher education space.

23. Will preference be given to agencies who work exclusively in higher ed, or do you see value in working with agencies who work across several different industries?

No preference will be given to higher ed exclusivity, as long as the proposing firm has sufficient higher ed experience as outlined in the limiting criteria.

24. What characteristics define a “strong organizational and cultural fit” within the evaluation process?

We will consider the firm’s overall profile and experience, personnel assigned to the project and proposed methodology to assess fit.

25. What traits are you looking for in the selected partner? For example, a guiding, expert team; strong project management/communication; breakthrough creative capabilities, etc?

Along with capability, experience and methodology, as stated in section 5.3.2, we seek a partner that will work very collaboratively and iteratively, respecting the knowledge and professionalism of our expert team as equal partners in the project.

26. Geographic Eligibility – Can you confirm that Florida-based agencies are fully eligible to respond and be considered for award regardless of location?

Yes.

27. Subcontractors – Is partnering with subcontractors permissible for specific deliverables, and if so, at what stage should subcontractor details be disclosed?

Pairing with subcontractors is permissible and should be disclosed clearly at the proposal stage. Any subcontractors, agents, employees, would be subject to the same terms and conditions as the awarded vendor.

28. Our agency doesn't have in-depth quantitative research or full video production capabilities in-house. But we can recommend partners for those aspects or work with partners of your choosing. Are you open to working with an agency who will partner with other companies for those components of the project?

See question 27. We would expect the proposing agency to serve as a general contractor for all elements that are subcontracted.

PHASE 1: BRAND STRATEGY & RESEARCH

29. Have you conducted:

- **Brand perception studies?**
- **Enrollment funnel analysis?**
- **Search behavior research?**
- **Website UX studies?**

Yes.

30. Are there political or reputational sensitivities we should understand before concept development begins?

We will share any sensitivities with the selected partner as appropriate.

31. Are there positioning territories or messaging directions already ruled out internally?

No.

32. Can the University clarify expectations for generative AI disclosure when AI is used for internal research, analysis, or ideation versus final work product creation?

We support the use of AI tools but expect that all work will be enhanced by a human prior to delivery. The use of AI in creative production (such as video or photography) should be carefully used as an enhancement rather than a replacement for human subjects, for instance.

33. Are there priority geographic markets — domestic or international — where the university sees the greatest opportunity for growth?

|
34. Are there specific regions where you are looking to grow enrollment?

This will be a nationwide brand. Arizona Online and UAGC have complementary regional strengths that make this a nationwide play.

PHASE 1: BRAND STRATEGY & RESEARCH AUDIENCES

35. Are there specific audience segments that must be included in research beyond prospective students, current Arizona Online students, current UAGC students, business partners, and military audiences?

|
36. Does the university have priority audiences or audience segments for its consolidated online offering?

|
37. Who are the primary target audiences for this work?

Both Arizona Online and UAGC are tailored for working adults. In addition to prospective students, current Arizona Online students, current UAGC students, business partners, and military audiences, research may consider adjacent groups such as transfer students, stop-out learners, alumni, and employer decision-makers where strategically relevant. Priority should remain focused on working adults, employer-sponsored learners, military-affiliated audiences, and transfer-ready students, as these groups are most aligned to the future unified brand. We also welcome the selected partner's recommendation on whether additional stakeholder segments would strengthen the research approach.

38. Which audiences have demonstrated the greatest momentum for each online program (Arizona Online, UAGC)? Which does the university see as biggest growth areas?

|

39. Which audience is the highest strategic priority?

|

40. You mention conducting research with prospective and current students from both current entities as well as a general population of prospective online students. What specific audiences under these should we be prioritizing, if any? (For example, adult learners, military, employer-sponsored learners, first-time online students, transfer students, graduate students, specific areas of study, etc..)

The audiences outlined in question 37 are the highest priority.

41. What audience research already exists?

We have conducted a number of studies over the years which can be shared with the selected partner.

42. Are there existing audience personas, enrollment research, or market perception studies that will be shared with the selected partner?

Yes.

43. Are there distinct audience segments that require different messaging architectures?

Please see the answer to Question 37.

44. How important are employer perceptions and workforce partnerships to the future positioning of the consolidated online offering?

Very important.

45. What do you know about current online learner motivations, objections, and barriers?

Both entities have been operating successfully in the online education category, which would indicate that we understand online learners thoroughly.

46. How does the university currently segment adult learners vs. traditional-aged students?

Segmentation is based less on age and more on life stage – the audience for this brand will be working adults 18+ who are not seeking an on-campus experience. The vast majority will have some higher ed experience already.

PHASE 1: BRAND STRATEGY & RESEARCH STAKEHOLDERS

47. Are there known internal stakeholder groups that must be included in discovery, such as enrollment, marketing, academic leadership, advisors, corporate partnerships, military partnerships, or student support teams?

We are seeking the partner's recommendation on which groups and how many individuals to include in research but the above list is sensible.

48. What internal stakeholder groups will be involved in strategy alignment and approvals throughout the engagement?

49. What do you expect your internal review and feedback process to be like? For example, for each round of deliverables, do you expect to need multiple presentations to various internal stakeholders?

Please see the answer to Question 12.

50. Approximately How many stakeholders will need to be interviewed and/or involved in the project?

51. Approximately how many stakeholder interviews are you anticipating?

52. For stakeholder interviews during the upfront discovery phase, do you have a sense for the # of individuals involved?

- a. Will they be internal-only (faculty, enrollment counselors, etc.) or might they include external participants (e.g. B2B partners, alumni associations , etc.)?

53. Which departments or stakeholders must approve strategic recommendations?

54. Can you clarify the decision-making structure for the engagement, including the core working team, executive sponsors, and final approvers for strategy, naming, and creative recommendations?

Please see the answer to Question 47.

PHASE 1: BRAND STRATEGY & RESEARCH QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

55. Referencing §5.2 Phase 1A — Quantitative Research Sample Size Is there a target sample size for the quantitative research with prospective and current students from Arizona Online and UAGC, as well as the general online-learner population? Should vendors budget for samples sized to

statistical significance for subgroup analysis, or is directional research acceptable for Phase 1 strategic decisions?

We are seeking the partner's recommendation on the quantitative research approach.

56. For quantitative research, could we use the University of Arizona's email marketing platform to send surveys to current students? Or are you looking for the partner to contact current students through their own channels? Additionally, do you have contact information for non-University of Arizona students that we can use for surveys and/or interviews, or are you looking for your partner to find and contact those audiences independently?

Outreach through university systems to current students is a possibility if we deem it most effective for the survey methodology. We would ask the partner to identify non-university audiences.

57. Based on current students, what is the distribution of students by region -- West, South, Midwest, and East Coast? Understanding this will help ensure research samples are representative of your actual student base and that any brand positioning can account for regional nuance or growth targets.

Students are fairly evenly distributed nationwide, and our ambition is to operate as a national brand.

58. The RFP suggests quant data, but we're wondering if you're open to us running a few focus groups with current UofA Online and UAGC students first?

- a. **We think getting that "real-world" feedback early on will help us build a much smarter survey for the quant phase.**

We are seeking the partner's recommendation on the best research approach.

59. Quantitative research: Are you okay with us splitting the quant work into two parts?

- a. **An input phase earlier in the process to gauge sentiment (around positioning & pathways) with current students.**
- b. **An validation phase with prospective students to gain feedback on positioning (& potentially messaging & pathway nomenclature)?**

We are seeking the partner's recommendation on the best research approach.

60. Requirements for prospective students:

- a. The RFP mentions “gen pop” which was reiterated on the call. Are there segments (e.g. military) where we’d be interested in ensuring a quota/% of recruits to at least gain directional feedback?

We are seeking the partner’s recommendation on the best research approach.

61. We'd like to confirm:

- a. Are research hard costs (panel, fielding, incentives) inside the budget or passed through?
- b. Does UA have a preferred research partner or panel partner?
- c. Are we free to manage the research directly and/or sub-contract?

Hard costs must be included in the budget. While we have research partners we like, we prefer the partner to manage the research for this project, whether directly or through sub-contracting.

PHASE 1: BRAND STRATEGY & RESEARCH INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

62. What prompted the university to issue this RFP now?

We have reached a state of institutional readiness to move to a one online brand scenario.

63. What specific institutional or market challenges are you hoping this initiative solves?

As stated in section 5.1.1 of the RFP, the desired outcomes of this strategic shift are:

- Financial efficiency and fiscal stewardship
- Improved brand equity in the online space
- Strategic deployment of staff and partner expertise

64. Has the university attempted similar branding initiatives before?

Both Arizona Online and UAGC have undertaken branding initiatives independently, but we have not pursued a one-brand initiative until now.

65. What are the primary business objectives driving this initiative (enrollment growth, awareness, reputation, audience diversification, program adoption, etc.)?

66. Is the primary goal:

- Enrollment growth?
- Brand repositioning?
- Audience expansion?

- Revenue diversification?
- Reputation enhancement?

See response to question 63.

67. Which outcomes matter more:

- Awareness?
- Inquiry growth?
- Enrollment conversion?
- Market share?
- Brand perception?

See response to question 63.

68. What would make this initiative feel unquestionably successful 2–3 years from now?

69. Beyond enrollment growth, what business outcomes will define success for the initiative over the next 2–5 years?

The University of Arizona is established and respected as a leader in the online higher education space – not necessarily leading in enrollment numbers, but leading in brand reputation and student success outcomes.

70. How much of an uplift in enrollment do you anticipate after consolidation?

We expect to achieve greater efficiency and progressive enrollment growth.

71. How will success be measured internally?

72. What KPIs matter most to leadership?

Please see the answer to question 63.

73. Are there any brands outside of higher education that you find inspiring or aspirational?

We have not discussed this collectively.

PHASE 1: BRAND STRATEGY & RESEARCH CURRENT STATE OF ONLINE

74. How is “online education” currently defined internally? Does it include:

- Fully online degrees?

- **Hybrid programs?**
- **Professional/continuing education?**
- **Workforce credentials and certificates?**

All except hybrid programs.

75. Who owns the online education brand internally?

The brand will be owned by the University's Chief Communications and Marketing Officer and the Chief Brand Officer, in close consultation with the leadership of the online enterprise.

76. Is the intent to create a distinct online education sub-brand, or strengthen alignment under the broader University of Arizona master brand?

Both. We do not see this as an either/or.

77. How does the University currently differentiate its online education offerings from peer institutions, and where do you believe the current brand positioning falls short?

|
78. What differentiates Arizona's online experience from competitors in your view?

Each entity (Arizona Online and UAGC) have defined their own points of differentiation. Assessing the effectiveness of this differentiation to the positioning of the new combined entity will be part of the selected agency's discovery process.

79. How are prospective online learners currently finding the university?

In all the ways you would expect them to find us.

80. What perceptions do you most want to change among prospective online learners?

This will be part of the discovery process.

81. Which competitors concern you most in the online space?

ASU Online is a concern because the market often confuses U of A with ASU. Otherwise, we aspire to compete effectively with the large online providers from public institutions such as Purdue Global, University of Maryland Global Campus, Penn State World Campus, Colorado State University Global/Online, etc.

82. For the competitive analysis, are there specific competitors you consider aspirational or particularly important beyond the list included in the RFP?

No.

83. What role does online education play in the university's long-term strategic plan?

Online education is an important part of U of A's land grant mission to make an excellent university education accessible to all learners.

84. How aligned are leadership stakeholders around the vision for online education today?

Closely aligned.

85. Are there meaningful differences in enrollment performance, audience profile, or acquisition channels between Arizona Online and UAGC today?

Very minor differences in audience profile, moderate differences in enrollment performance and channels; which will all be shared with the selected partner.

PHASE 1: BRAND RESEARCH & STRATEGY 2023 RESEARCH STUDY

86. Can the University share more detail on the 2023 baseline study referenced in the RFP, including audience segments, methodology, and key findings?

The study will be shared with the selected partner.

87. Is the 2023 research mentioned in the RFP the same research in which the Arizona Online name was tested, or was that a different study? Will the winning agency have access to all of the names that were previously tested?

There have been multiple name testing studies. The 2023 research was not specific to naming but some inferences about naming may be drawn from the results. To the extent it is available, all proposed and tested names will be shared with the selected partner.

88. Existing Research Access – Will the selected agency receive full access to the 2023 baseline study at project kickoff?

|

89. Referencing §5.2 Phase 1A — Existing 2023 Research Study The RFP references 'an existing 2023 study that can serve as a baseline for new research.' Can this 2023 study be reviewed by vendors at proposal stage to inform our research scope and pricing, or will it only be shared with the

selected vendor? If post-award only, can the University provide a summary of the topics covered and the approximate sample size used?

|
90. Will the 2023 baseline research materials be made available to the selected partner?

We will not share the 2023 study at the proposal stage but will share it with the selected partner at kickoff. We are seeking the partner's recommendation for an appropriate research methodology for this phase of the project.

91. Were qualitative methodologies (IDIs, focus groups) included in the 2023 research?

No.

92. Which audiences were surveyed in the 2023 research effort? Is the university looking to replicate those audiences, or would it be open to expanding beyond them?

We are seeking the partner's recommendation for an appropriate research methodology for this phase of the project.

PHASE 1B: NAMING

93. The RFP notes that Arizona Online has been identified as a preferred naming direction based on prior research. How much flexibility exists to further evaluate or refine that name as part of this engagement?

We would not be pursuing a naming exercise if there were not flexibility.

94. Approximately how many naming options do you envision testing under each of the three components (primary brand, AZO pathway, and UAGC pathway)?

We are seeking the partner's recommendation for an appropriate naming exercise.

95. Has the university already developed any preliminary naming territories, themes, or internal candidate names that you would like incorporated into the exploration?

Yes.

96. Are there any names or directions that have already been ruled out, whether through legal review or internal stakeholder preference?

Not entirely.

97. For the naming exploration, should vendors assume legal trademark screening will be handled by the University, the agency, or a third party?

|

98. Will the university provide trademark/legal review support for finalist naming options, or should the responding agency include preliminary trademark screening within scope?

We will handle trademark review. As we expect that the names will be descriptive, we believe they will be covered within the University of Arizona's broad trademark protection.

99. Do new name candidates need to be tested internationally for cultural sensitivity and pronounceability?

No.

100. Should the naming recommendation include SEO/GEO implications for existing domains, program pages, and brand search demand?

Yes.

101. §5.2 Phase 1B — Naming Approval and Concept Volume Who holds final approval authority on naming recommendations — University Communications and Marketing, the Office of the President, the Arizona Board of Regents, or another body? Additionally, how many naming concepts (for the primary brand and for each pathway) would the University like to see tested in the quantitative research phase?

Final approval will rest with the President of the university on the recommendation of the University's Chief Communications and Marketing Officer. Consultation with ABOR will be facilitated through the President's office if needed.

PHASE 1B: NAMING AI DISCOVERABILITY

102. How does the University define success for AI-driven search and retrieval evaluation in the naming process?

|

103. For the AI/search discoverability evaluation, are there specific KPIs or success criteria you want assessed (e.g., SEO performance, AI retrieval clarity, uniqueness, confusion risk, domain/social availability)?

All of the above, with the exception of domain availability as the unified brand will be a subdomain of arizona.edu.

104. The RFP mentioned evaluating potential name candidates for discoverability and competitiveness in modern search environments including LLMs. Is the university also interested in proposals to maintain and improve AI discoverability moving forward?

Not as part of this project.

105. AI-search discoverability — methodology expectations. The RFP calls out evaluating names in "AI-driven search and retrieval (e.g., LLMs, generative search)." Does UA have a defined methodology (e.g., prompt testing across major LLMs, SEO/GEO audits, share-of-voice analysis in AI-generated responses), or are you open to us proposing one? Are there existing baselines on how Arizona Online and UAGC currently surface in AI search that we should build from?

We do not have a defined methodology we expect partners to use. We do have baseline AI performance data that can be shared with the selected partner.

106. Are there specific AI/search environments the University wants included in the discoverability assessment, such as Google AI Overviews, ChatGPT, Perplexity, Gemini, or others?

|
107. To what extent should the "modern search environment" evaluation for naming include specific AI-driven search platforms beyond general LLMs and generative search?

We would want the brand to appear appropriately and effectively in all the current major search environments.

PHASE 1C: BRAND MIGRATION

108. Are Arizona Online and UAGC currently managed through separate websites, martech systems, CRM instances, enrollment teams, or media programs that should be considered in the migration strategy?

|
109. Are Arizona Online and UAGC currently operating within separate CRM, marketing automation, and enrollment technology ecosystems?

|

110. Are Arizona Online and UAGC currently managed within the same CMS/platform, or separate systems?

Arizona Online and UAGC are currently using separate websites, enrollment teams and media programs, but these will be unified as part of the one-brand initiative. We use separate CRMs for enrollment but the same CRM for current student relationships. We share some MarTech solutions and others are distinct. There will be ongoing opportunistic movement toward shared systems but the two pathways may have some distinct operational components on an ongoing basis.

111. How many CRM instances are you currently using and/or are you planning to consolidate?

Two. No immediate plans to consolidate, although it's under discussion.

112. Should the brand migration strategy include detailed website migration recommendations, or should it remain a strategic roadmap for future implementation?

We'd like an appropriate level of detail to guide our worksteps and decision-making.

113. Are there any planned domain or URL structure changes already being considered as part of this migration?

As one brand, the two existing websites, UAGC.edu and online.arizona.edu will eventually merge into one website that is a subdomain of arizona.edu. This should be considered as part of your migration strategy.

114. Are there any existing websites, landing pages, or digital experiences that are considered especially critical to enrollment performance?

These will be shared with the selected partner as part of the discovery process.

115. Has the university already conducted SEO, search equity, or digital discoverability analyses related to a potential transition or consolidation?

Not extensively.

116. Are there legal, accreditation, compliance, enrollment, or operational constraints that may limit how quickly or fully a migration from existing brands can occur?

The priority for timing will be to protect the viability of the enrollment funnel during the transition. There are no other currently identified significant constraints.

117. Is the university anticipating a phased migration and rollout strategy, or a more comprehensive launch approach?

We would like the partner's recommendation for what's best, but in general we favor soft launches and gradual rollouts.

PHASE 2: CREATIVE SCOPE

118. How does the University define the appropriate level of creative ambition or risk for this initiative?

|
119. How bold is the institution willing to be creatively?

We favor some amount of boldness to help distinguish us in a crowded field, but not boldness for the sake of it. We must be able to demonstrate that whatever level of creative ambition we pursue is in service of creating preference for prospective students.

120. For the :30 brand spot and cutdowns, should vendors assume live action production, animation, existing footage, student talent, or a recommended production approach?

|
121. For the :30, are we pricing full production (concept, casting, location, shoot, post, music) or pricing on the assumption of using existing UA footage/assets?

We will rely on the partner to develop a creative concept for the spot that is aligned with the budget they proposed. We do not have preconceived notions about the production approach. You should price full production and should not assume use of existing footage, except possibly as needed for b-roll material.

122. Can the University clarify if the creative production process is subject to specific union mandates, geographic restrictions, or institutional procurement regulations?

The University does not have information related to production-specific union mandates. There are no geographic restrictions, and this RFP process is designed to meet institutional procurement regulations.

123. Are there any restrictions on usage rights, talent contracts, or asset reuse across channels?

Existing photo/video assets carry a variety of ownership, rights management, and talent management considerations that are best addressed on a case-by-case basis, if those assets are to be used. The University anticipates that the agency will address usage rights and talent contracts for newly created assets, and to consider asset reuse potential across the institution in partnership with internal U of A teams.

124. Is talent on-camera (paid actors, students, or mix)? Are there usage/rights expectations (term, geography, media types)?

On-camera talent may consist of a mix of paid actor or actual students depending on the nature and goals of the approved creative in pre-production. In general, unlimited usage rights across all media in perpetuity is the goal, to maximize asset reuse, however we understand that talent and music licensing contracts may preclude this scenario. See questions 120 and 123 for additional information.

125. Does U of A expect talent and student representation to be cast and filmed separately for Arizona Online and UAGC, or can a unified pool of talent be leveraged across both?

It may depend on the concept but the demographics of the two student populations are not very different. If the concept uses real students, though, we would not want to present an actual Arizona Online student as a UAGC student or vice versa.

126. Will assets need to support long-term reuse across multiple campaigns or academic years, or are they primarily for the initial launch?

We would prefer to look at a multi-year horizon but if there is a concept that supports a different strategy we would be open to that possibility.

127. Is photography expected as a distinct deliverable, or is it assumed to be embedded within the video and digital executions?

Likely embedded.

128. What existing creative, photo, and video assets are available, and how much should the new work build on versus replace them?

129. Will U of A provide existing photo and video assets for the agency to work from?

Both entities have existing assets, particularly related to student testimonials. They may not be applicable in a new brand setting, however. Ideally we would pursue a new direction with new assets.

- 130. Will the selected agency be expected to develop only strategic creative concepts, or also production-ready campaign assets across channels?**

We expect production-ready assets for the deliverables identified in 5.2 - 2F

- 131. How many display variants, social variants, and OOH executions per concept are expected for pricing purposes? (We can propose a reasonable set, but a floor would standardize comparison.)**

We have not identified a specified number. Please propose what you think is reasonable within the budget.

- 132. Which channels are considered highest priority for the resulting creative executions (social, paid digital, streaming, OOH, email, search, etc.)?**

The digital environment is the highest priority, but we will have a well-rounded media plan that will draw on all the listed channels.

- 133. Will there be incumbent creative or media agency partners involved during implementation?**

- |
134. Are there incumbent agency partners or internal teams that would remain involved in media, creative production, enrollment marketing, or implementation?

- |
135. Are there incumbent agencies or consultants currently involved?

We have incumbent media agenc(ies) whose scope of work is entirely separate from that outlined in this RFP, but with which the selected partner might need to interface in the final stages of implementation. There may also be agencies working on current-state marketing programs as this work is being pursued, with the understanding that their work will wind down as the new One Brand strategy is implemented. We do not anticipate the selected partner needing to collaborate with any incumbents beyond the media firm(s.)

- 136. Does the University anticipate the need for multilingual or culturally targeted campaign creative?**

- |
137. Are translations or non-English versions expected?

Not at this time.

- 138. Out-of-Home Scope – For billboard and bus shelter executions, is the agency responsible for creative files only, or does this extend to production and placement coordination as well?**

Final creative files that can be handed to the media agency for trafficking and production.

- 139. Does the RFP submission need to include spec work for the creative platform?**

No spec work is requested or required.

- 140. Have any recent studies been conducted to evaluate campaign effectiveness or creative performance? If available, can you share those findings?**

Yes, we consistently evaluate creative performance. We can share those evaluations with the selected partner.

- 141. What current creative work no longer reflects where the university is headed?**

Since this is an entirely new brand strategy, none of our creative work reflects where the university is headed.

PRICING STRATEGY

- 142. Will the pricing analysis be based on per-credit cost, per-course cost, or are you also envisioning per-program cost?**

Likely per-credit, as that is how we currently present our pricing to the market.

- 143. Does pricing vary across modalities such as certifications, degrees, etc., or is a consistent pricing structure in place?**

It is not consistent.

- 144. Is there a current pricing position you are looking to move away from?**

Not necessarily.

- 145. Will the agency have access to current UA pricing data, enrollment-by-program revenue, and any existing competitor pricing intelligence?**

Yes, to the extent we have it. Your proposal can assume we can provide the first two. The competitor pricing intelligence should be embedded in your proposal for this phase.

- 146. Should competitive pricing benchmarks be framed against a national audience or a specific regional competitive set?**

National.

- 147. We understand that Step D is optional and outside the \$500K–\$750K budget, with goals of recommending pricing for the two pathways and for B2B/military discounting.**

Correct.

- 148. Is the deliverable a strategic recommendation only, or does it include financial modeling and scenario testing?**

We'd like to understand the rationale behind the strategic recommendation and would expect that it represents market dynamics.

MASTER BRAND RELATIONSHIP & SUPPORT

- 149. How do you currently envision Arizona Online living within the broader University of Arizona master brand? Are there existing brand architecture parameters or governance guidelines the selected partner should work within?**

The online brand will be a sub-brand of the University of Arizona and will align with the master brand visual identity.

- 150. §5.2 Phase 1 — Internal University Team Structure What is the size and composition of the internal University of Arizona team that will partner with the selected vendor on Phase 1? Is there a dedicated brand strategy or marketing operations team within UCM, or will the agency be expected to provide more of the operational backbone for stakeholder coordination and day-to-day decision-making across the engagement?**

We can assist with stakeholder coordination and decision-making.

- 151. Are you looking for the agency to provide trainings to your internal teams about how to implement the new brand?**

Not necessarily, although this might be considered as part of a migration strategy.

- 152. Is UA seeking operational guidance, beyond "Enrollment counselor and advisor messaging and cadence"? We are looking to understand if we should be scoping actual development of solutions (e.g., training materials, web content, etc.) or if the request here is purely strategic and the institution (or another RFP process) will cover any technical development?**

The request is strategic. Development of materials can be handled separately as required.

- 153. Is the online education offering currently perceived as distinct from the broader university brand?**

About half of our target audience understands the relationship between the university and the online entities.

- 154. Are there existing tensions between central university branding and online program marketing?**

There are normal tensions related to integrating the two brands into one, but the teams have been effectively collaborating for years and all parties are prepared for the change to come.

- 155. How centralized or decentralized is marketing across colleges and online programs?**

Marketing for both Arizona Online and UAGC is centralized. U of A colleges that offer online programs provide input into marketing but generally align with the central team's recommendations. UAGC is more centralized, with less marketing input from colleges and programs.

- 156. Are there schools/units currently marketing online offerings independently?**

Not to any significant extent.

BUDGET & CONTRACT

- 157. Should pricing be submitted as fixed-fee by phase, hourly estimates, or a blended approach?**

Pricing should be submitted by phase and itemized. Hourly rates are welcome as an additional information point.

158. The RFP requires travel to be inside the budget. Roughly how many on-site visits should we plan for across the project life? (This drives our budget allocation.)

Please plan for at least one in-person visit in each phase as part of your proposal. (see question 15)

159. Does the stated budget range include optional research, production, and travel expenses, or should those be itemized separately?

All expenses should be included within the budget range.

160. Will the University consider phased or modular engagement structures if additional strategic needs are identified during discovery?

|
161. Is the university open to phased budgeting or modular scopes depending on research findings and implementation requirements?

|
162. Is there flexibility in scope if strategic opportunities emerge during discovery?

Yes, we will consider changes in scope as dictated by the project's progress.

163. Can the University clarify expectations around intellectual property ownership for pre-existing agency frameworks, methodologies, or proprietary strategic tools? (This is important because their contract language is very ownership-heavy.)

The University is open to negotiation of included language in the event of award.

164. Should production costs for video, photography, talent, music, editing, and licensing be included in the base Phase 2 pricing, or can these be estimated as hard costs?

Production costs should be included.

165. Is the stated budget range of \$500-750K inclusive of creative asset production?

Yes.

166. If add-ons and additional value proposals are provided, in excess of the budget range provided, via the requested optional pricing addendum, will those items be considered when scoring / reviewing the proposal or

will the institution review the base recommendation from a cost perspective against the base recommendation of other firms?

The University will score price on the base project costs only. Add-ons in excess of the budget range, provided they do not include critical core services, are for information only.

167. For the Additional Optional Services, are you open to an overview of capabilities in these areas, or do we need to include specific pricing as well? In some cases (e.g., website design and development) more work would be required to align on the ideal solution, which would be required prior to development of a proper scope

An overview of capabilities is sufficient at this stage.

RFP SUBMISSION & ADMINISTRATION

168. Per Sections 5.8.2 and 4.3.1 regarding VPAT/WCAG accessibility documentation, can you confirm whether submission of a completed VPAT is required for this RFP? If the proposed work/product does not fall under these accessibility requirements, is a VPAT still required?

|
169. The terms require submission of a completed Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (4.3.1), however VPAT is traditionally applicable to products, not services. Is this item required for responding agencies?

VPAT submission is not required as part of the RFP proposal submission packet, but the University reserves the right to request it prior to award if necessary.

170. The RFP references “pen and ink” initials/signatures, but submissions are required digitally via Box upload only. Will electronic signatures (DocuSign/Adobe Sign/scanned signatures) satisfy all proposal signature requirements?

a. For instance, section 3.7.13 says “Authorized individual initials each correction using pen and ink”

Yes, you may submit electronic signatures.

171. The RFP states only two files may be uploaded (response + redacted response), but also requests supporting materials such as forms, pricing, case studies, references, accessibility documentation, etc. Should all materials be consolidated into a single PDF response? Are appendices or external links permitted?

All materials should be consolidated into a single PDF response (+ redacted version if needed). Appendices and external links are permitted within the context of the single file.

172. Is there a maximum upload size for Box submissions, and are external portfolio/video links acceptable?

Box submission uploads are recommended to be less than 5GB in size. External portfolio/video links are acceptable.

173. There are several areas that appear to contain unfinished template language, including the items below. Can the University confirm there are no missing procedural requirements associated with these sections?

- “Buyers name”
- “insert Celeste Kanzig”
- “enter Date and time”

There are no missing procedural requirements for the first two. The last point should contain the question due date and time.

174. The agreement term appears to end July 2027, while portions of implementation also extend into July 2027. Should vendors assume implementation support beyond July 2027 would occur under a renewal term?

The initial term of the agreement ends July 2027; however, it can be extended for up to four (4) additional one (1) year terms, and implementation support of individual project phases may occur under one or more of these renewal terms.

The following questions were received and responded to during the non-mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference on May 12, 2026 at 2:00 PM MST:

Q: What is the preferred approach for stakeholder discovery and engagement across the two campuses, particularly regarding in-person versus virtual participation?

A: Because the UAGC team is highly distributed across the country, virtual engagement options are essential for stakeholder participation. While the University of Arizona and Arizona Online teams are more centralized in Tucson, they are also well-equipped to participate effectively in online sessions. The preferred approach is to design the discovery process with a distributed audience in mind, while incorporating in-person campus visits or focus groups where timing and logistics allow, though in-person engagement is not considered a requirement.

Q: Is there a need for change management support as part of this initiative, particularly given the history and integration of the different organizations?

A: Yes. Ongoing marketing communications tactics and messaging that supports change management will be an important component of the transition from two brands to a unified brand, and this is expected to be addressed as part of the migration strategy. While broader organizational restructuring efforts may occur on a separate track, the UAGC team has experienced significant organizational and leadership transitions over time, including changes from Ashford to Zovio and later integration into the University of Arizona. In contrast, Arizona Online has experienced greater organizational stability. As a result, change management efforts will be important in helping both groups recognize and align around the strengths and opportunities associated with coming together as a unified organization.

Q: How does this brand strategy relate to the broader University of Arizona brand strategy, and in what ways will it differ?

A: The brand strategy for this initiative is expected to harmonize with the broader University of Arizona brand strategy while remaining distinct and tailored to its specific audience. The intent is not to create a direct one-to-one alignment with the university's brand pillars, but rather to ensure the strategy complements and fits within the broader institutional framework. Because the University of Arizona brand serves a wide range of audiences, this initiative requires a more focused approach that resonates with its unique environment and stakeholders.

From a visual identity standpoint, the initiative will remain closely aligned with established University of Arizona brand standards, including the use of Block A branding, university colors, and other core visual elements. The primary flexibility will come through positioning, messaging, and creative expression, which may evolve to better connect with the target audience while still remaining consistent with the overall university identity and values. The resulting strategy does not need to align in a strictly linear way with the university's broader brand framework, and flexibility is expected throughout the strategy development and refinement process.

Q: What level of segmentation and depth is desired for the quantitative research component, and which audiences or markets are most important to evaluate?

A: The specific segmentation approach for the quantitative research has not yet been fully defined and is expected to evolve collaboratively during the process. However, understanding the perspectives of both prospective students and employers is considered

to be important. There is also interest in exploring whether military audiences should be evaluated as a distinct employer-related segment.

Extensive geographic segmentation may not be necessary, as prior research has already identified areas where each brand has regional strength. Instead, the primary focus is likely to center on marketing segments and audience types. Key distinctions currently exist between the two organizations' marketing approaches: UAGC's audiences are fairly equally split between military (active, veterans, spouses), B2B (employer-sponsored/employee benefit) and B2C, while Arizona Online has emphasized a broader direct-to-consumer approach while also inclusive of military and B2B. These operational differences will need to be reconciled as part of the future marketing strategy.

Q: What level of naming, trademark, and intellectual property support is expected from the selected vendor as part of the naming exploration process?

A: The expectation is primarily for strategic naming recommendations and preliminary screening rather than comprehensive trademark clearance or full legal review. Because the anticipated direction is for the resulting brand to operate within the existing University of Arizona brand architecture, likely as a subdomain of Arizona.edu and under the broader University of Arizona trademark portfolio, extensive trademark clearance may not be necessary in most cases.

The primary consideration will be ensuring that proposed names do not conflict with existing entities or naming conventions already within the University of Arizona portfolio. If a naming direction emerges that extends beyond the anticipated university-branded framework, the University's internal IP and legal teams would likely manage any additional trademark or legal review requirements.

Q: What existing research related to naming and brand equity will be made available to the selected vendor?

A: Some prior studies related to naming and brand equity already exist and are expected to help inform the engagement. These include research conducted during the original naming of University of Arizona Global Campus, as well as findings from a 2023 brand equity study that may provide relevant insights for future naming considerations. In addition, at least one other naming-related exploration was conducted in the intervening period. Collectively, these existing materials are expected to provide foundational context and direction for the selected vendor's naming and brand strategy work.

Q: Should naming exploration include extensive cultural and linguistic validation for international audiences?

A: While international student recruitment is part of the broader institutional scope and is growing through strategic partnerships, extensive cultural and linguistic validation is not currently viewed as a major requirement for this initiative. International recruitment efforts are largely managed through Arizona International, with this organization primarily serving in a supporting role rather than leading the international brand presence independently from the broader University of Arizona identity.

Because the anticipated naming direction is expected to remain closely tied to the University of Arizona brand and lean toward more descriptive naming conventions, the team does not anticipate the need for significant additional cultural validation or extensive international naming sensitivity analysis as part of the process.

Q: Why is the organization pursuing this brand integration effort now, and what factors are driving the timing of the initiative?

A: The timing of this initiative is being driven by a combination of strategic, operational, and regulatory factors. A key priority is the need to present a clearer and more unified story to prospective students and external audiences, particularly as evolving AI-driven search and discovery environments increase the importance of brand clarity and consistency.

In addition, recent federal policy changes and accreditation-related developments have created conditions that now make this transition more feasible from an operational standpoint. Beyond these structural considerations, there is also a broader recognition that maintaining two brands operating in the same space under the University of Arizona umbrella is not the most efficient long-term approach. The initiative is therefore intended to address that inefficiency by creating a more unified and streamlined brand strategy moving forward.

Q: Who will serve as the primary points of contact for the selected vendor, and how will the engagement team be structured?

A: The selected vendor will work primarily with a core cross-functional team representing both UAGC and Arizona Online, as the organization continues efforts to bring those teams into closer alignment. Day-to-day engagement and project management responsibilities are expected to be led by Christie Harper, Becky Geddie from UAGC, and Mike Southworth from Arizona Online.

Additional leaders, including Christine Hardy, Caleb Simmons, Frank Dooley, and Johnny Cruz, will provide executive-level guidance, strategic input, and oversight throughout the engagement. The structure is intended to provide the vendor with a centralized working team while also ensuring leadership alignment and stakeholder engagement across the organization.

Q: Are there examples in the higher education market of organizations successfully navigating a similar brand integration or positioning strategy? (i.e. is there anybody that is doing it right?)

A: Purdue was identified as one of the closest examples of an institution that has approached this type of integration effectively, particularly through the distinction between Purdue Online and Purdue Global. However, there is still perceived market-facing confusion within that model, and the University of Arizona team believes there is an opportunity to build a clearer and more cohesive approach.

One key difference is that Purdue has been able to create stronger differentiation between product lines, with Purdue Online focusing primarily on graduate offerings and Purdue Global serving broader audiences. The University of Arizona approach is not expected to separate offerings to that same extent, which increases the importance of developing a strong and clearly articulated brand strategy. The broader goal is not only to successfully unify the current brands, but potentially to establish a leading example for how similar integrations and acquisitions can be positioned in the future

Q: For the brand migration strategy phase, is the expectation for high-level strategic guidance or fully executable implementation deliverables?

A: The expectation is primarily for high-level strategic recommendations and a migration roadmap rather than detailed executional deliverables. Internal U of A teams expect to manage the tactical implementation components themselves once an overarching strategy and framework are established.

A key area of interest is developing thoughtful guidance around sequencing and timing, particularly determining when and how to begin communicating changes internally and publicly. We are especially focused on how to effectively prepare and guide prospective students and current students through the transition process, ensuring communications are introduced in a way that builds understanding and confidence throughout the migration journey.

Q: Are there key enrollment cycles or seasonal considerations that should inform the timing of the brand rollout and migration strategy?

A: Yes. January was identified as a major enrollment period for both Arizona Online and UAGC, making it an especially important consideration for any external rollout or transition timing. Additional peak periods for Arizona Online include March and August, while UAGC also sees significant activity in August.

At the same time, UAGC operates with a more continuous enrollment structure, with new student starts occurring every two to three weeks and monthly enrollment volumes typically ranging between approximately 1,500 and 2,000 students.

Q: Does the stated budget range apply only to Phase 1, or does it include both Phase 1 and Phase 2 deliverables?

A: The stated budget range is intended to cover both Phase 1 and Phase 2 work, with the exception of the pricing strategy component referenced as Step D. The budget also includes production for the four sets of core assets specifically identified in Section 2F of the scope. While we anticipate producing many additional materials over time as part of the broader rollout, pricing proposals are only expected to account for those defined core deliverables rather than the full range of future implementation assets. For the video asset, a full production is requested.

Q: How is U of A thinking about program and product architecture, including differentiation and overlap between Arizona Online and UAGC offerings?

A: U of A has had extensive internal discussions regarding program architecture, positioning, and go-to-market differentiation between Arizona Online and UAGC, and greater clarity continues to emerge through that process.

Currently, UAGC is generally positioned around more applied degree programs, while Arizona Online is associated with more traditional degree pathways. Additional distinctions include differences in academic term structure and enrollment cadence, such as the number of starts and program pacing. There is also an important distinction at the credential level: Arizona Online degrees are awarded as University of Arizona degrees, while UAGC degrees are awarded as University of Arizona Global Campus degrees, and leadership anticipates that distinction will likely remain in place.

The academic teams are also actively working to streamline and further differentiate program offerings to minimize overlap where possible. While some overlap still exists in

select disciplines, for example, psychology programs offered by both entities, U of A expects to continue clarifying the differences between those offerings. A more unified brand structure could create marketing efficiencies in overlapping areas, provided the distinctions between offerings are communicated clearly to prospective students. As an example: AZO students must meet University admission standards, while UAGC is open admission.

Q: Are there different accrediting bodies for each of the institutions?

A: No, it's the same accreditor for both.

Q: Would you be open to a vendor bidding on just one of the two parts?

A: Yes, we can do that.

Q: How should vendors present additional value-added recommendations or out-of-scope enhancements within their proposal responses?

A: Vendors are encouraged to incorporate additional value-added recommendations directly into the proposal timeline and workflow where they fit most logically, rather than presenting them entirely separately. However, any elements that fall outside the defined project scope or budget should be clearly identified as out-of-scope enhancements, with associated pricing or incremental costs explicitly noted.

End of addendum, all else remains the same.