

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON IHL RFP #12.29.2020

### QUESTION SET #1

- 1) RFP page 14 requires the completion of a Solicitation and Offer document, with the offer portion filled out by the bidder. We cannot seem to locate this form within the RFP; can IHL System please provide this document?

The bidder's response to this request for proposals is considered the Solicitation and Offer document. The cover page of this solicitation should be submitted with the proposal.

- 2) Section O on RFP page 15 states that original signatures must be included; however, we understand IHL System is requesting a PDF version of our proposal. Is an electronic signature acceptable?

Yes, an electronic signature is acceptable.

- 3) In regards to the expected sampling:
  - a. What is your "tolerable rate of deviation (%)" in the sample?

IHL Internal Audit prefers a 95% confidence interval.

- b. What is your "expected rate of deviation (%)" in the sample?

IHL Internal Audit prefers a 95% confidence interval.

- c. What is the expected population size in dollars and quantity of applicable contracts for each of the pre- & post- strata?

See exhibits J through M for the available information. See exhibits J through M for the available information.

- d. Will IHL provide the tolerable misstatement (or other materiality amounts) for sampling? Or will those be determined by the firm?

IHL Internal Audit prefers a 95% confidence interval; however, all sample sizes must be approved by IHL Internal Audit. Therefore, should a firm believe that another confidence level is appropriate for efficiency or effectiveness, any firm is free to propose alternative sampling methodologies.

- 4) What accounting system (and procurement system if separate) does each institution use?

ASU, DSU, MSU, JSU, MUW, & MVSU use Ellucian. UM-Oxford uses SAP. USM uses PeopleSoft/Oracle. UMMC uses Workday for accounting purposes and Meditract Contracts Lifecycle Management for contract management. See exhibit C for more detail.

Were there any changes in accounting systems during the test period?

No, except UMMC converted from Lawson to Workday in April 2020, and from Lawson Contracts Management to Meditract Contracts Lifecycle Management in March 2020.

- 5) Have these services been provided by an external firm previously?

This is the first system-wide solicitation of these services.

If so, can you please provide the following:

- a. a copy of the deliverable
- b. the fees paid for said services
- c. the projected number of hours expended to complete the contract

- 6) As a follow up to question #5 - if these services were provided internally by IHL's internal audit department, please provide the following:

This is the first system-wide performance of this service.

- a. a copy of the deliverable/report
- b. the number of hours expended to complete the work
- c. a description of each strata tested and the number of items sampled in each strata, if not included in the deliverable

## QUESTION SET #2

1. The RFP (Part III – Instructions to Offerors, K, 1.1) makes references to the need for personnel to be on site at each institution. In consideration of the COVID-19 pandemic, would MS IHL consider removing all requirements for onsite work performance?

Yes, should a firm provide an effective and efficient alternative to on-site personnel this requirement may be removed. Provision of reports and references that indicate successful off-site review of similar engagements would be preferred along with the proposal for consideration.

2. The RFP (Part II – Scope of Work Statement) states that, “The attestation services will be made in conformity with the following guidelines and regulations: 1. The Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements as prescribed by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants”. The AICPA has released SSAE-19 related to Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements which is to become effective for all AUP reports dated on or after July 15, 2021. Early implementation of SSAE-19 is permitted. Does MS IHL expect this report to be issued in accordance with SSAE-18 or SSAE-19?

Early adoption of SSAE-19 is permitted.

3. The RFP (Part III – Instructions to Offerors, K, 1.1) requires that supervisory personnel have experience performing attestation services in accordance with the financial audit standards contained within Government Auditing Standards. RFP Part II however requires the engagement be performed in accordance with SSAE issued by the AICPA. Would MS IHL consider revising the RFP to remove any experience requirements related to Financial Audits within Government Auditing Standards issued by the Government Accountability Office and replacing it with similar experience requirements related to the requested AICPA SSAE?

Yes, the appropriate standard is the SSAE.

4. The RFP (Part III – Instructions to Offerors, K, 1.2) requires that supervisory and other key personnel have prior experience specific to the audit of federal awards. RFP Part II however requires the engagement be performed in accordance with SSAE issued by the AICPA. Would MS IHL consider revising the RFP to remove any experience requirements related to audit of federal awards and replacing it with similar experience requirements related to the requested AICPA SSAE.

Yes, the appropriate standard is the SSAE.

5. Under SSAE-18 issued by the AICPA, AT-C Section 215 Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements, paragraph 17, “The procedures agreed upon...should specify the nature, timing and extent of the procedures.”. Further, paragraph 19 states, “The practitioner should not agree to perform procedures that are open to varying interpretation.”

As such, would MS IHL consider revising the list of requested agreed-upon procedures on pages 9-10 of the RFP, to clarify the exact nature and extent of procedures to be performed? This includes removal of language such as “including, but not limited to” from the procedures and adding information about the requested extent of each procedure (the sample size, expected coverage by percentage or dollar amount, etc.).

**SSAE-19 appears to allow this type of service. Available information on is provided in the exhibits. The expected coverage is a 95% confidence interval.**

6. The RFP (Part II, Scope of Work Statement) discusses the use of stratified random samples with a goal of obtaining 95% confidence interval for results. The determination of confidence intervals requires certain risk assessments to be used as inputs to the calculations. However, such a risk assessment involves a wide range of procedures, inputs, and judgement that are not a part of the procedures performed during an AUP engagement. Does MS IHL intend to perform the required risk assessments and provide the results thereof for use in determining the requested sample sizes to be used in this engagement?

**IHL internal audit does not intend to perform the risk assessments.**

7. Agreed-upon procedures reports, under SSAE-18 as issued by the AICPA, do not contain recommendations. SSAE-18 limits the AUP report to a form that reports the procedures and findings. Would MS IHL be open to receiving a consulting report in addition to the AUP report which provides our recommendations.

**Yes. Please break estimated cost for Agreed Upon Procedures and a possible consulting report separately when submitted.**

8. Under SSAE-18 issued by the AICPA, AT-C Section 215 Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements, paragraph 19, “The practitioner should not agree to perform procedures that are open to varying interpretations. Terms of uncertain meaning (such as general review, limited review, check, or test) should not be used in describing the procedures unless such terms are defined within the agreed-upon procedures.” Would MS IHL consider revising the list of AUP contained on pages 9-10 of the RFP to remove, clarify, and/or define the words “proper”, “timely”, “adequate”, and “effective”/“effectively”.

**These terms are in the contracts policy approved by the Board. These are a necessary part of the engagement. The definition of these terms should be understood in reference to the definition of a “significant impairment” on page 4.**

### QUESTION SET #3

1. Is this a new service provided to IHL or have similar services been provided in the past?  
**This is a new service due to a change in the contracts policy in Fall 2020 (Board Policy 707.01).**

2. If similar services have been provided in the past,
  - a. may we be provided copies of the reports issued for the past 3 years?
  - b. may we be provided with Hours billed and fees for the past 3 years?
  - c. How did the fees charged compare to the fees quoted in the proposal?
  - d. Are you satisfied with the current provider's (a) timeliness (b) pro-activeness on communications (c) and value they provide to your organization?

**This is the first system-wide performance for these services.**

3. What is driving the need for the requested services?

**A revision to the IHL contracts policy in Fall 2020 adopted by the Board (Board Policy 707.01).**

4. May we discuss amendments or alternative provisions to the standard contract and if so, what is the process?

**Yes, amendments and alternative provisions are allowed. These may be submitted with the RFP. Legal staff will review any amendments and alternative provisions along with IHL Internal Audit.**

5. Page 5 of 23 states that “the contract will be for 3 months to up to 1 year.” When is IHL expecting to receive final reports?

**The IHL institutions are willing to allow staggered work schedules from proposing firms in order to allow university accounting and procurement staff scheduling flexibility in order to meet deadlines related to the IHL external audit and other regulatory accounting deadlines. Likewise, it is also allowable for firms to propose scheduling such that firm staff will be available to perform the work up to 1 year. It is assumed that this engagement will take at least 3 months to complete for any firm.**

6. Does IHL prefer that one single report be issued or separate reports, by institution, as completed?

**IHL prefers a separate report for each institution. According to the revised contracts policy, management of contracting and procurement functions without “significant**

impairment” is a component of Institutional Executive Officer performance evaluations. Therefore, a report is needed for each institution.

## QUESTION SET #4

1. Regarding the following excerpt from Part II, will the stratification involve two strata – a) institution b) expenditure year?

For the pre-procurement processes, it is anticipated that the FIRM will conduct stratified random samples of all contracts and procurements for all institutions for all contracts of an expenditure amount of \$250,000 or less entered into during calendar years 2020 and 2019. The universe for

Each instruction's' contracting and procurement systems will be evaluated separately. Therefore, this will be performed separately for each institution. Both years will be included in the sample in order to expand the universe for the sample size. Therefore, 2020 and 2019 will be considered as one sample universe.

2. For the contracts and procurements above \$250,000, please see questions as it relates to the following excerpt:

- The University of Mississippi Medical Center – stratified random sample of contracts entered into during the most recent calendar year of 2020
- Jackson State University, Mississippi State University, the University of Mississippi – Oxford, and the University of Southern Mississippi – All contracts and procurement entered into during the most recent calendar year of 2020
- Alcorn State University, Delta State University, the Mississippi University for Women, and Mississippi Valley State University – All contracts and procurement entered into during the most recent five calendar years of 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017, and 2016.

Bullet point #1 – What are the different strata here?

UMMC and contracts above \$250,000 at UMMC are a single, separate sample universe.

Bullet point #2 and #3 – The sampling would not be stratified by institution or expenditure/contract year?

Each institution separately and above \$250,000 at each institution are a separate sample universe. For example:

- For bullet point #2, contracts and procurements above \$250,000 at Jackson State University is a single, separate sample universe. Each institution in this bullet will be treated as separate sample universes for the year provided.
- All contracts and procurements during 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017, and 2016 at the Mississippi University for Women are a single, separate sample universe. Each institution in this bullet will be treated as separate sample universes for the years provided.

3. As it relates to the post-procurement population, would those contracts need to be stratified by status (active, completed and expiring) in addition to the other strata previously described in the above questions?

Stratification by these categories is not necessary.

4. Does IHL have an approximate population (number of transactions or dollars) by school that will be subject to testing?

See exhibit A for volumes requested as available.

5. The following excerpt from the Purpose section mentions a report on compliance and internal controls.

For each Institution within the IHL System, the timely issuance of an Independent Accountant's Report on Compliance and Internal Controls Based on the Processes to include

Would a compliance audit under AU-C 935 be more appropriate than an AUP?

This should be understood as providing the deliverables contained in the purpose section on page 4. Specifically, the determination of whether a "significant impairment" exists as described in that section. This is not to be understood as a report related to a financial audit under GASB standards. Should a firm believe that a compliance audit under AU-C 935 be a more appropriate standard to follow, this may be submitted for consideration.

6. Does/should each institution have its own policies and procedures documentation?

Yes, each institution has separate policies and procedures.

Does IHL expect the awarded Firm to be responsible for process documentation that would need to be provided to the IHL Chief Audit Executive?

Yes, workpapers and other relevant information should be provided to the Chief Audit Executive.

7. Is supporting documentation for the samples selected maintained electronically?

See exhibit B for description of each institution's supporting documentation.

If so, could there be an intentional effort to perform a substantial amount of testing remotely?

Remote testing is allowable. It is preferred that firms proposing to test remotely provide samples and references of similar engagements where remote testing was done successfully.

8. With estimated start of this project being toward the end of February 2021 with an executed contract term of 3 months to 1 year, what is IHL's expectations for delivery of reports/work to be completed?

The IHL institutions are willing to allow staggered work schedules from proposing firms in order to allow university accounting and procurement staff scheduling flexibility in order to meet deadlines related to the IHL external audit and other regulatory accounting deadlines. Likewise, it is also allowable for firms to propose scheduling such that firm staff will be available to perform the work up to 1 year. It is assumed that this engagement will take at least 3 months to complete for any firm.

## QUESTION SET #5

- 1) For each university, can we expect an available project coordinator to gather our requests, set up meetings, and go through findings as we encounter them?

IHL expects that each institution will designate a project coordinator for this purpose.

- 2) When requesting meetings or conducting walk-throughs, can we expect the option for both virtual and in-person meetings?

Virtual walkthroughs and meetings are allowable. It is preferred that firms proposing to test remotely provide samples and references of similar engagements where virtual work was done successfully.

- 3) Should we anticipate an on-site visit at each campus/university?

Virtual walkthroughs and meetings are allowable. It is preferred that firms proposing to test remotely provide samples and references of similar engagements where off-site work was done successfully.

- 4) How many systems for each university are utilized for the contract process (For example: procurement, contract administration, payments)?

See exhibit C for off-site capacity for IHL member institutions

- a. Can we expect off-site access and on-site access to the system(s) for each university?

See exhibit D for off-site capacity for IHL member institutions.

- 5) Is each university's contract and accounting activities centralized or decentralized as it relates to contracts?

See exhibit E for each institution's structure.

- 6) For each university, explain the degree of formalization of the pre- and post-contracting processes. Are there policies and procedures developed?

See exhibit F for each institution's structure.

- 7) Can we expect an electronic spreadsheet listing all contracts for each university?
  - a. Please explain what type of data we should expect for each university. For instance: A query of purchase orders (each linked to a contract)? Or a complete list of contracts that includes the purchase order(s) for each contract on an individual basis?

See exhibit G for each institution's data availability.

8) For each university, can we expect digital or paper copy contracts?

See exhibit H for each institution's contract availability.

9) For each university, can we expect digital or paper copy procurement files/data?

See exhibit I for each institution's procurement file availability.

10) Pre-contracting and procurement processes –

a. Contracts with expenditure amounts of \$250,000 or less entered into for the calendar years 2019 and 2020 –

i. What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?

See exhibit J for available information.

ii. How many contracts per university meet this threshold?

See exhibit J for available information.

iii. How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?

See exhibit J for available information.

b. Contracts with expenditure amounts greater than \$250,000 –

i. What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?

See exhibit K for available information.

ii. How many contracts per university meet this threshold?

See exhibit K for available information.

iii. How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?

See exhibit K for available information.

iv. For universities with a 5-year review period –

1. Please explain how this scope will be affected by a contract entered into in 2016 (for example). Will the documents (specifically for procurement) be available for review?

It is anticipated that there will be a low volume of contracts in excess of \$250,000 at these institutions. The larger time period is suggested to capture a larger universe for sampling. See exhibit K for available information.

- a. Please explain if all pertinent documents will be provided in digital or other form.

See exhibits G, H, & I.

11) Post-procurement processes –

- a. Contracts with expenditure amounts of \$250,000 or less that are active, completed, and/or expiring during the calendar year 2020 –
  - i. What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?

See exhibit L for available information.

- ii. How many contracts per university meet this threshold?

See exhibit L for available information.

- iii. How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?

See exhibit L for available information.

- b. Contracts with expenditures amounts greater than \$250,000 –
  - i. What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?

See exhibit M for available information.

- ii. How many contracts per university meet this threshold?

See exhibit M for available information.

- iii. How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?

See exhibit M for available information.

- iv. For universities with a 5-year review period, the RFP states, “all contracts and procurements that are active, completed, and/or expiring during the most recent five calendar years of 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017, and 2016.” Does the scope include a 5- year contract (for example) entered into in 2011 and completed in 2016?

Yes, although we expect there to be few contracts greater than 5 years that are still active.

- 12) In the requested schedule of professional fees and expenses, do you recommend or prefer the fee presented by university? Or another method?

A single fee and expense schedule for all services at all institutions is the minimum requirement, but fees and expenses estimated at each institution are welcome to be submitted for clarity.

- 13) In the RFP Part VI – IHL Standard Services Contract –
- a. The footer contains a different RFP number and date reference. Should we include the document as is in our proposal or update the footer to correspond to the RFP info related to RFP No. 12.29.2020?

This has been corrected. Please use RFP No. 12.29.2020.

- 14) At the conclusion of the engagement, should we provide a single final report or separate reports for each university

The revised IHL contracts policy provides that the Institutional Executive Officers of each institution will have management of contracts and procurement practices as a component of job performance evaluation. Therefore, separate reports and assessments are needed for each institution listed.

**Exhibit A**  
**December 2019 to November 2020**

	<b>Number of Transactions</b>	<b>Dollar Value of Transactions</b>
Alcorn State University	3	216,193.70
Delta State University	1	120,000
Jackson State University	4537	60,087,113.00
Mississippi State University	3466	\$52,243,458.63
Mississippi University for Women	1 \$	230,000.00
Mississippi Valley State University	1 \$	156,307.00
University of Mississippi - Oxford	39 \$	45,772,293.59
University of Mississippi Medical Center	approx 5600 contracts	\$ 4,738,214,701.00
University of Southern Mississippi	5 \$	3,905,399.00

Note: Values from ASU, DSU, MUW, MVSU, UM-Oxford, & USM are contracts above \$250,000. Values from JSU, MSU, and UMMC represent all transactions.

## Exhibit B

	<b>Is supporting documentation for the samples selected maintained electronically?</b>
Alcorn State University	Yes
Delta State University	Yes
Jackson State University	Yes
Mississippi State University	Yes
Mississippi University for Women	Yes
Mississippi Valley State University	Yes
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Yes
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Yes
University of Southern Mississippi	Yes

**Exhibit C**

**How many systems for each university are utilized for the contract process (For example: procurement, contract administration, payments)?**

Alcorn State University	1- Ellucian Banner
Delta State University	1- Ellucian Banner
Jackson State University	Elucian Banner
Mississippi State University	3 - Contracts: Blueridge Software Contract Assistant. Purchase Orders: Ellucian/Banner. Payments: Ellucian/Banner
Mississippi University for Women	1 - Elucian
Mississippi Valley State University	1 - Procurement Bid Process for RFP only
University of Mississippi - Oxford	2 - SAP, UM contract database
University of Mississippi Medical Center	2 - Workday and Meditract
University of Southern Mississippi	4 - ImageNow, PeopleSoft, Adobe Acrobat, Net Docs (possibly others)

**Exhibit D**

**Can we expect off-site access and on-site access to the system(s) for each university?**

Alcorn State University	Yes, when capabilities exist
Delta State University	Yes, when capabilities exist
Jackson State University	JSU would prefer to get their requests and we run them and return the data.
Mississippi State University	From a security perspective we prefer MSU get their requests and we run them and return the data.
Mississippi University for Women	Yes, when capabilities exist
Mississippi Valley State University	Yes, when capabilities exist
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Yes, when capabilities exist
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Yes
University of Southern Mississippi	Yes, when capabilities exist

**Exhibit E**

**Is each university's contract and accounting activities centralized or decentralized as it relates to contracts?**

Alcorn State University	Centralized
Delta State University	Centralized
Jackson State University	Decentralized
Mississippi State University	Centralized
Mississippi University for Women	Centralized
Mississippi Valley State University	Centralized
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Decentralized
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Centralized
University of Southern Mississippi	Centralized with regard to review and approval; some decentralization with regard to storage

**Exhibit F**

**For each university, explain the degree of formalization of the pre- and post-contracting processes. Are there policies and procedures developed?**

Alcorn State University	Yes, procedures are used
Delta State University	Yes, procedures are used
Jackson State University	Yes, procedures are used
Mississippi State University	Formalized process documented by "Mississippi State University Procurement and Contracts Manual" and Mississippi State University Contract Guidelines"
Mississippi University for Women	Yes, procedures are used
Mississippi Valley State University	Yes, procedures are used
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Procedures and some formal policies are in place
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Yes, procedures are used
University of Southern Mississippi	Yes, procedures are used

**Exhibit G**

**Please explain what type of data we should expect for each university.  
For instance: A query of purchase orders (each linked to a contract)? Or  
a complete list of contracts that includes the purchase order(s) for each  
contract on an individual basis?**

	<b>Can we expect an electronic spreadsheet listing all contracts for each university?</b>	
Alcorn State University	Yes, for IHL approved contracts	A query of purchase orders
Delta State University	Yes, for IHL approved contracts	
Jackson State University	For IHL approved contracts, yes	For IHL approved contracts, a list of contracts including PO number
Mississippi State University	yes	We typically do not issue a PO if a contract has been issued. We can provide a list of Contracts and/or a list of Purchase Orders
Mississippi University for Women	Yes, for IHL approved contracts	
Mississippi Valley State University	Yes	
University of Mississippi - Oxford	For IHL approved contracts, yes	For IHL approved contracts, a list of contracts including PO number
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Yes	Either
University of Southern Mississippi	Yes, for IHL approved contracts	A query of purchase orders

## Exhibit H

**For each university, can we expect digital or paper copy contracts?**

Alcorn State University	Digital
Delta State University	Digital - PDF
Jackson State University	Digital - PDF
Mississippi State University	Digital
Mississippi University for Women	Digital
Mississippi Valley State University	Digital
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Digital
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Digital
University of Southern Mississippi	Digital

**Exhibit I**

**For each university, can we expect digital or paper copy procurement files/data?**

Alcorn State University	Digital
Delta State University	Digital
Jackson State University	Digital - PDF
Mississippi State University	Digital
Mississippi University for Women	Digital
Mississippi Valley State University	Digital
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Digital
University of Mississippi Medical Center	Digital
University of Southern Mississippi	Digital

**Exhibit J**

**Pre-contracting and procurement processes – Contracts with expenditure amounts of \$250,000 or less entered into for the calendar year 2020**

One year is provided as a representative sample - December 2019 to November 2020

	<b>What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?</b>	<b>How many contracts per university meet this threshold?</b>	<b>How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?</b>
Alcorn State University	varies		small %
Delta State University	1 to 5 years	unknown	very small
Jackson State University	varies	Unknown	small %, if any
Mississippi State University	5.75 years		2014 <span style="float: right;">14</span>
Mississippi University for Women	varies	Unknown	small %
Mississippi Valley State University	Varies		1
University of Mississippi - Oxford	Vary widely	Contracts less than \$250K (excluding leases and revenue) are not sent to IHL for approval	12 leases less than \$250K were sent to IHL for approval
University of Mississippi Medical Center	2.16 years	approximately 1400	13 leases less than \$100k were sent to IHL Commissioner for approval
University of Southern Mississippi	Generally 3 - 5 years	Unknown	Less than 5 percent

**Exhibit K**  
**Pre-contracting and procurement processes – Contracts with expenditure amounts greater than \$250,000**  
**December 2019 to November 2020**

	<b>What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?</b>	<b>How many contracts per university meet this threshold?</b>	<b>How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?</b>
Alcorn State University	5 years		0
Delta State University			
Jackson State University	3-5 and 10 year		1
Mississippi State University		5.89	38
Mississippi University for Women	5 years		1
Mississippi Valley State University	5 years		1
University of Mississippi - Oxford	3-5 years		27
University of Mississippi Medical Center	3.5 years	approximately 125	approximately 57
University of Southern Mississippi	5 years		5 Less than 5 percent

**Exhibit L**

**Procurement processes – Contracts with expenditure amounts of \$250,000 or less that are active, completed, and/or expiring during the calendar year  
One year is provided as a representative sample - December 2019 to November 2020**

	<b>What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?</b>	<b>How many contracts per university meet this threshold?</b>	<b>How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?</b>
Alcorn State University			
Delta State University		None	0
Jackson State University	3-5 years	Unknown	
Mississippi State University	5.55 years		3354 91
Mississippi University for Women			
Mississippi Valley State University		1	1 0
University of Mississippi - Oxford	See Exhibit J	See Exhibit J	See Exhibit J
University of Mississippi Medical Center	3.25 years	5055 active during 2020; 1608 expired during 2020	See Exhibit J
University of Southern Mississippi			

**Exhibit M**  
**Post-procurement processes – Contracts with expenditures amounts greater than \$250,000**  
**December 2019 to November 2020**

	<b>What is the average contract term for contracts within this threshold?</b>	<b>How many contracts per university meet this threshold?</b>	<b>How many of that total per university are lease/rental contracts falling within this threshold?</b>
Alcorn State University			
Delta State University	5 years with option to extend		5
Jackson State University	3-5 years	Unknown	
Mississippi State University		5.75	112
Mississippi University for Women			
Mississippi Valley State University			
University of Mississippi - Oxford	See Exhibit K	See Exhibit K	See Exhibit K
		351 active during 2020; 102 expired during 2020	
University of Mississippi Medical Center	4.75 years		See Exhibit K
University of Southern Mississippi	5 years		5 Less than 5 percent