

PALM BEACH STATE COLLEGE

15/16-16 INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE (ITP) ERP SYSTEM PUBLIC SHORTLIST MEETING

August 26, 2016 8:30 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	

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Jason Buckley, Workday	Chris Devlin, SAP
Alex Serna, Campus Management	Vlad Soran, Deloitte
Gloria Kurik, Ciber	Betty Fleurimond, Deloitte
Daniel Torrens, SAP	Meg Phillips, Highstreet
Susan Thomas, Jenzabar	Debbie Carver, Oracle
Katie Gay, Ellucian	Allison Eng-Perez, Deloitte
Matthew Alex, Deloitte	

- I. Meeting Call to Order by Procurement Director
 - II. Introductions by evaluation committee members
 - III. In accordance with F.S. 286.011, Mr. Chojnacki opened the floor to public comments; no comments were proposed by the public
- Mr. Chojnacki explained the following:
- a. ITP 15/16-16 Amendment number 5, which revised the schedule for the ITP
 - b. Evaluation committee began independent evaluations on August 3, and submitted results to the office of the Procurement Director
 - c. 9.1 of the ITP provides that the college will select finalists to participate in the vendor software demonstrations
 - d. As allowed by the ITP, the college received proposals from three companies offering implantation services only; the committee will not consider those proposals today. The purpose of today's meeting is to select the finalists to present at the vendor demonstration meetings, beginning September 12.
 - e. There were a total of eight companies that submitted a proposal for software solutions.

- IV. Mr. Chojnacki asked if anyone had questions about the process thus far; no questions were proposed
- Mr. Chojnacki continued to explain the following:
- a. Each member of the committee has individually recorded his or her evaluation of the proposals, which were submitted to the Procurement Director
 - b. In accordance with F.S. 286.011 the proposal scoring material has not been shared with among the members of the committee or anyone else before today
- V. Mr. Chojnacki handed, to the committee and all public members in attendance, out a collective summary of the individual evaluations. An opportunity for questions about the summary sheet was provided for the committee and public; no questions were proposed
- Mr. Chojnacki further explained:
- a. The ITP does not indicate how many finalists will be selected but that task is up to the evaluation committee
 - b. Participation in this process carries with it real costs, both for the college and proposers. The College supports competition but recognizes the importance of efficiency. Mr. Chojnacki suggested that only those vendors with a reasonable chance of being selected for award at the conclusion of the process, should be selected to provide demonstrations.
 - c. Clarified that the committee is not asked to make a final award recommendation today' the selection today should be based on their understanding of the proposals and how they view the proposers strengths and weaknesses based upon evaluation criteria in section 9.4 of the ITP.
- VI. To allow the open discussion of each other's views among the committee, the cone of silence was temporarily lifted for this meeting.
- VII. Mr. Chojnacki turned the meeting over to Ginger Pedersen, nominated by the college president as the ERP sponsor.
- VIII. Ginger Pedersen welcomed the committee and audience, and volunteered herself as meeting chair; motioned by Pam Harrison; motion was seconded and adopted.
- IX. Ginger Pedersen asked how the committee would like to evaluate each proposal for inclusion in the demonstrations; Pam Harrison motioned to evaluate each proposer individually; seconded by Tracy Montagnino. Approval was unanimous.
- X. Ginger Pedersen read aloud each proposer company by name and asked if there was a motion to consider said company, a motion to discuss said company, followed by a vote of the committee, to in/exclude said company for inclusion in the demonstrations.
- a. All companies were motioned and seconded to consider
 - b. No discussion was introduced regarding any company

- c. Results of voting are as follows:
 - i. Campus Management Corp: no – not selected; unanimous
 - ii. Ellucian Company, LP: yes – selected for demonstration; unanimous
 - iii. Focus School Software, LLC: - no – not selected; unanimous
 - iv. Highstreet IT Solutions, LLS: no – not selected; unanimous
 - v. Jenzabar, Inc: no – not selected; Richard Becker voted yes, all other members voted no.
 - vi. Oracle America, Inc.: yes – selected for demonstration; unanimous
 - vii. Student Cloud, LLC: no – not selected; unanimous
 - viii. Workday, Inc.: yes – selected for demonstration; unanimous
- d. Ginger Pedersen concluded the selection portion of the meeting
- e. Mr. Chojnacki read aloud the selected proposers invited to the demonstrations and indicated further instructions will be provided to the demonstration finalists by Monday, August 29, 2016.
- f. Mr. Chojnacki re-instated the cone of silence, reminding the committee that no further discussion or communications of any kind can take place.
- g. Mr. Chojnacki directed the members of the public to direct questions to the Procurement Director.

XI. Adjournment