

PALM BEACH STATE COLLEGE

15/16-16 INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE (ITP) ERP SYSTEM PUBLIC FINALIST MEETING September 15, 2016 10:30 a.m. CE118, Lake Worth, Florida

COLLEGE STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

David Chojnacki, Procurement Director	Pam Harrison, ERP Project Director
Ginger Pedersen, Vice Pres Info Services	Cheryl Hare, Asst Director Human Resources
Richard Becker, Vice Pres Admn & Bus Svcs	Amy McDonald, College Registrar
Peter Barbatis, Vice Pres Stud Svc & Enr Mgmt	William Zaugg, Administrative Assistant
Tracy Montagnino, Enterprise Systems Director	Eddie Viera, College Financial Aid Director
Laurel Serra, Payroll Manager	Chuck Zettler, Dean Enrollment Mgmt.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Lisa A. Moore, Highstreet	Robert Steele, Workday
Joshua Amos, Palm Beach State College	Eunice Gaston, Palm Beach State College
Allison Eng-Perez, Deloitte	Phuong Nguyen, Deloitte
Debbie Carver, Oracle	Rose Holliday, Sierra-Cedar
Paul Strother, Ciber	

- I. Meeting Call to Order by Procurement Director, September 15, 2016 at 10:35 a.m.
- II. Mr. Chojnacki introduced himself and explained the following:
 - a. Today's meeting was publicly posted as amendment six of the invitation to participate.
 - b. Today, the College Evaluation team is charged with providing a recommendation for an ERP project partner that will be presented to the Palm Beach State College District Board of Trustees.
 - c. It is not imperative that a final decision on the recommendation be concluded today. If consensus on a recommendation cannot be reached, the Committee is welcomed to table the discussion, adjourn, and come back to the table at a later date.
 - d. Each member of the Committee was given a folder that included:
 - o Original Individual Score Sheets that each Committee Member completed individually and submitted to the Procurement Office prior to the August 26th public meeting.
 - o Original Summary Score Sheet that was shared at the August 26th public meeting.

- Individual note sheets recorded by each Committee Member during the software demonstrations. One for Workday, and one for Oracle.
 - Comments made by the College community. One for Workday, and one for Oracle.
 - The Cumulative Scoring Sheet of the Implementation Services proposals.
- III. Mr. Chojnacki then provided for all guests in attendance to receive a copy of the Original Summary Score Sheet from the August 26th meeting, as well as the new Cumulative Scoring Sheet of the Implementation Services proposals (EXHIBIT 1).
- IV. Mr. Chojnacki continued to explain:
- a. This is the first time that the compiled scoring for Implementation Services has been shared with the Committee. To comply with the Sunshine Law, the cumulative scoring of the Implementation Services proposals prior to today had not been shared prior to today
 - b. Committee: Your software preference, the decision you make today, should take into consideration the potential implementation partners that would provide professional services to the College in getting the college community up and running on the new software system.
 - i. In addition to your folders that include the items mentioned, I have the original copy of the proposals here in case you need to look something up.
 - ii. Therefore, you should have all of the information that has been accumulated through your work to assist you in making a sound decision today.
- V. Mr. Chojnacki asked if the committee had questions with respect to the information at hand. No questions were posed.
- VI. Mr. Chojnacki further explained:
- a. Today's discussions and decision by the Committee will complete Phase III of the process. The intention of Phase III of the process was to focus on the best overall approach to deliver the ERP system, all components including Software, Hosting, and System Implementation Services.
 - b. The Committee shall take into consideration all of the information provided to meet the objective of this process as noted in the original Invitation to Participate Section 11.2: To Identify the overall best solution to provide the required functionality and software support services.
- VII. Mr. Chojnacki asked if anyone in the audience or committee had questions or comments about where we are in the process. No questions or comments were posed.
- VIII. Mr. Chojnacki turned the meeting over to the project sponsor, Ginger Pedersen.

- IX. Ms. Pedersen welcomed the committee and audience attendees, and thanked the participants for their work thus far.
- X. Ms. Pedersen volunteered herself as meeting chair; motioned by Chuck Zettler; seconded by Peter Barbatis. Approval was unanimous.
- XI. For the evaluation, Ms. Pedersen suggested a SWOT analysis (strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats), based on the demonstrations and applications. Motioned by Pam Harrison; seconded by Amy McDonald; Approval was unanimous.
- XII. Mr. Becker commented that if Workday was selected, that he was comfortable with their implementation partner; but if Oracle/PeopleSoft was selected, he did not feel enough information had been provided to make a decision and that further meetings with implementation partner for Oracle/PeopleSoft would be required.
- XIII. Mr. Zettler posted a clarification question that today's meeting was to select the software and how it will benefit the college. Ms. Pedersen confirmed that was the case.
- XIV. Ms. Pedersen and the committee completed a SWOT analysis for Workday and then Oracle/PeopleSoft.
- XV. At the conclusion of the analyses, Mr. Chojnacki recommended a ten minute break, but reminded the committee of the cone of silence, and not to discuss anything pertaining to the ERP project.
- XVI. Upon return, Ms. Pedersen suggested the committee take a vote by secret ballot.
- XVII. The committee recorded their selections on secret ballot, which were read aloud by Ginger Pedersen and recorded by William Zaugg. Workday was the unanimous selection.
- XVIII. Mr. Chojnacki concluded the meeting by reminding the committee and audience that today's selection is only a recommendation to the District Board of Trustees, whom have final approval authority. He further reminded everyone that, as indicated in the original solicitation, the College does reserve the right to negotiate with any shortlisted bidder, should negotiations with the recommended winning bidder fail.
- XIX. Adjournment at 12:07 p.m.

Palm Beach State College 9/15/2016

Compiled Scoring: Implementation Services Proposals

		Ciber, Inc	Deloitte Consulting LLP	Highstreet IT Solutions, LLC Option B	Sierra-Cedar
9.4.9	Implementation Services: Proposers Experience and Qualifications				
	SUBTOTAL POINTS	93	98	90	88
	Rank	2	1	3	4
9.4.10	Implementation Services: Methodology				
	SUBTOTAL POINTS	21	21	22	20
	Rank	2	2	1	4
9.4.11	Implementation Services: Implementation Plan				
	SUBTOTAL POINTS	149	171	163	180
	Rank	4	2	3	1
9.4.12	Implementation Services: Cost				
	SUBTOTAL POINTS	15	9	5	15
	Rank	1	3	4	1
	IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES CATEGORY POINT TOTALS 9.4.9 - 9.4.12	278	299	280	303
	IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES RANKING	4	2	3	1

Ciber, Inc

Deloitte Consulting LLP

Highstreet IT Solutions, LLC
Option B

Sierra-Cedar