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Background Information

An Owens Community College team attended the AQIP strategy forum in November, 2006. One of the original action projects identified addressed the budget process. During the strategy forum, it became clear to the team that an underlying issue needed to be addressed before any activity dealing with the budget process could be successfully implemented. This underlying issue was the College’s Information Support System.

Owens’ Information Support System enables users to monitor performance of operational and continuous improvement activities and supports decision making across the College. Any weakness in this system adversely impacts the ability to conduct business and monitor performance. Therefore, the team decided that an action project improving the College’s Information Support System was needed.
Project Statement

To improve the College’s current information support system by assessing organizational structure, stability, efficiency, including future capabilities and needs by setting the parameters for an independent audit, designed with the intention of utilizing an auditor’s expertise to provide a meaningful vision of the College’s future.
Assessments of Owens Needs
- Academics
- Student needs
  - List of what we can do and what is being done
- Efficiency
- Decrease paperwork of faculty to increase time with students.
- Increase student impact

Assessment of Owens Resources
- Current Resources
- Need
- Have
- Missing

Key elements involved in Assessment of Banner

Desired Outcome:
- Help students learn
- Clear
- Few “should have”
- Measureable
- ROI
- (avoid) blaming
- Not changing, just to change
- Not micromanaging
- State Reporting
- Kind, but blunt assessment

People
- S
- Top, Middle, Front line
- Faculty
- Union
- Trust
- Collaboration

Training
- End user
- Re-training
- Train-the-Trainer

Right
- Capacity
- People
- Data Driven
- Outside

1-4
2-3
4-1
3-2
5-0
### Force Field

**Desired Change:** ITS Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVING FORCES</th>
<th>RESTRAINING FORCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AQIP</td>
<td>1. Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consensus</td>
<td>2. People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Financial Resources</td>
<td>3. Size of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presidential Buy In</td>
<td>4. Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team with right people and mind set</td>
<td>5. Backlash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scope &quot;not fair&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of understanding of length of commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions:**
1. Communicate, communicate, communicate.
2. RFP must be written with due diligence.
Highlights of Request for Proposal

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The consultant will assist Owens Community College in the execution of a Current State Assessment, Needs Analysis and Preliminary Gap Analysis. The scope of work is to provide an assessment of the current state of the IT environment, including current capability, capacity, and resources, identify the gaps where the current IT environment is insufficient to meet the academic, student, and administrative computing needs of this institution and highlight the opportunities and constraints imposed on the IT planning process by the culture and environment at Owens.

The completed work product will include a shared understanding of the "current state", a summary and evaluation of current state gaps, an assessment of our most critical needs and recommended next steps.

BACKGROUND

This section includes the history of Owens Community College, a detailed description of the College’s Information Technology environment, background on how the need for an audit developed and web sites where the College’s IT Strategic plan is located.

SELECTION AND AWARD PROCESS

Consultants are instructed how to respond. All interested parties must attend a pre-proposal teleconference. Submittals must include a proposed work plan with a description of their approach, timelines and explicit details of deliverables. The consultant’s experience performing audits similar in size and scope to Owens must be provided along with the biographies and resumes of all individuals working on the audit. The strategic planning process and tools used, project cost planning and staffing and rates must be provided.

Selection criteria were established. Factors which determine the selection include but are not limited to: quality of consultant's approach and work plan, quality and experience of staff proposed to be used on this project, relevance of prior and related experience, understanding of Owens' environment and culture, compatibility of timeline and commitments with Owens’ needs and total project cost.

GENERAL INFORMATION

With minor changes, this section is common to all Owens RFP’s. Rights that the College reserves are explained as well as the right to investigate and reject, the invoicing process, indemnity from incurred expenses, inclusions in the award of the contract and responsibility to review, complete and sign the Declaration Regarding Material Assistance/Nonassistance to a Terrorist Organization form prior to award.
TERMS AND CONDITIONS

This section is common to all Owens Community College RFP’s and work orders. It includes all legal statements and conditions required by the Ohio Attorney General’s Office.
Costs

COSTS OF IMPROVEMENT

Consultant fees for audit - $100,000 - $150,000
Potential wage and fringe costs if additional IT staff is recommended

TIME COSTS

Lost productivity as IT staff works with consultant to analyze system

TIME SAVINGS

Expected savings are that processes such as admissions, recruitment, faculty reporting, and other stakeholder’s needs and processes will be expedited.

COST SAVINGS

None

ANTICIPATED POSITIVE RESULTS

Improved use of Owens Community College’s information support systems.

By reviewing, identifying needs and implementing change in our information technology services, equipment, software, hardware, skills and training, all of the college “community” will benefit from the results.

In addition to saving time, this completed project will increase job satisfaction, assist in decision making, decrease workloads, improve morale, and boost and support student success.

This project will support the college’s Institutional Technology operations and maintain a solid infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Issue RFP</td>
<td>1 day?</td>
<td>Fri 9/14/07</td>
<td>Fri 9/14/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pre-Proposal Conference</td>
<td>1 day?</td>
<td>Fri 9/28/07</td>
<td>Fri 9/28/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vendors Submit RFP Responses</td>
<td>1 day?</td>
<td>Mon 10/1/07</td>
<td>Mon 10/1/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Award of Contract</td>
<td>1 day?</td>
<td>Tue 10/3/07</td>
<td>Tue 10/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consultants Begin Work</td>
<td>1 day?</td>
<td>Thu 11/1/07</td>
<td>Thu 11/1/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gantt Chart
## Relationship to AQIP Quality Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQIP Quality Criteria</th>
<th>Project Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand students’ and other stakeholders’ needs</td>
<td>The project will lead to an assessment of current and future needs for the information technology provided by Owens Community College to its students, employees, and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Continuous Improvements</td>
<td>The project will pursue recommendations for short and long-term planning of the College’s information technology systems based on a clear understanding of:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                           | 1. the current state of these systems  
|                                                           | 2. current and future needs  
|                                                           | 3. current and future resources  
|                                                           | 4. the College’s strategic plan  
|                                                           | 5. The College’s mission and core values                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Measuring Effectiveness                                   | The employment of an independent agency to perform an audit of the College’s IT systems will minimize the opportunity for bias. The audit will make it possible to objectively measure and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of these systems. |
Recommendations

• The Request for Proposal (RFP) is either approved or not approved as a whole (i.e. with no changes).
• The consultant selection process consists of a recommendation from the team; presented to the AQIP Steering Committee and President’s Cabinet for approval.
• Once the consultant is approved, a new team is formed for the audit. This team consists of some members from the current team and additional representatives from the College (i.e. IT Department, faculty members, Department Chair, etc) for a total no more than nine members.
Special Thanks

Special thanks are extended to:

- The Information Systems Independent Audit Team Co-Champions, Pat Jezak and Brent Wickam for their support and efforts.
- The Steering Committee.
- William “Randy” Wharton, AQIP Advocate
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Steering Committee Feedback

Team name: Information Systems Independent Audit Team
Date: July 19, 2007        Sponsors: Pat Jezak and Brent Wickham

Ideas for Improvement  Support

1. The Request for Proposal (RFP) is either approved or not approved as a whole (i.e. with no changes).

   __________

2. The consultant selection process consists of a recommendation from the team; presented to the AQIP Steering Committee and President’s Cabinet for approval.

   __________

3. Once the consultant is approved, a new team is formed for the audit. This team consists of some members from the current team and additional representatives from the College (i.e. IT Department, faculty members, Department Chair, etc) for a total of no more than nine members.

   __________
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1.0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION

1.1 PURPOSE

Sealed proposals will be received by Owens Community College for an Information Technology System Audit from eligible vendors until 12:00 noon on October 15, 2007, when said proposals will be publicly opened and read aloud. All proposals should be clearly marked "ITS Audit Proposal" and addressed to Ms. Laurie Sabin, Director of Finance, Owens Community College, P.O. Box 10000, Toledo, Ohio 43699-1947. Specifications and any questions can be directed to Laurie Sabin at the above address or by calling 567-661-7282. Owens Community College reserves the right to waive any irregularities, and to reject any or all proposals and to determine the lowest and best bid.

1.2 SCOPE

The project will lead to an assessment of current and future needs for the information technology provided by Owens Community College to its students, employees and the community.

1.2.1 The scope of Respondent's involvement will be:

- To provide an assessment of the current state of the IT environment, including current capability, capacity, and resources.
- To identify the gaps where the current IT environment is insufficient to meet the academic, student, community and administrative computing needs of this institution.
- To highlight the opportunities and constraints imposed on the IT planning process by the culture and environment at Owens.
- To provide insight into the future direction of IT in higher education.

1.2.2 The products of this effort will be:

- A shared understanding of the "current state;"
- A summary and evaluation of current state gaps;
- An assessment of our most critical needs.
- Recommended next steps.

1.2.3 Potential Future Scope(s): After an assessment of the success (acceptance and usefulness) of the above activities, additional planning activities in the following areas may be authorized without an additional competitive bidding process. Owens Community College may enter into negotiations for this work with the consultant selected for this initial phase.
• Develop recommendations:
  • For development and implementation of a continuous audit and improvement structure for Information Technology at Owens Community College.
  • For alternative funding models for Information Technology at the College.

• Develop recommendations for an ongoing long-range planning and communications process to meet the IT needs of the academic, student and administrative functions of the College.

1.3 TIMETABLE

The following timetable is provided to assist bidders:

September 14, 2007 Issue RFP
September 28, 2007 Pre-Proposal Conference
October 15, 2007 12:00 p.m Submit RFP Response
On or about October 30 Award of Contract
On or about November 1 Consultant Work Begins

2.0 BACKGROUND

Owens Community College began as a technical institute under the jurisdiction of the Ohio Department of Education. The first classes were offered in Toledo on September 13, 1965 with fewer than 200 students. Two years later, in 1967, the College was chartered by the Ohio Board of Regents as a technical college. In 1983, Owens Community College opened its Findlay-area campus in Hancock County.

In 1994, the College was chartered as a comprehensive state community college with a district encompassing Lucas, Wood and Hancock counties, and parts of Ottawa and Sandusky counties.

Since 1994, Owens Community College has more than doubled its student enrollment on the Toledo-area and Findlay-area campuses and is the fastest growing higher educational institution in Northwest Ohio. Owens' Toledo-area and Findlay-area campuses continually serve more than 45,000 credit and non-credit students annually.

2.1 Owens Community College Information Technology Environment
See Exhibit B

2.2 Background – Information Technology System Audit
An Owens Community College team attended the AQIP strategy forum in November, 2006. One of the original action projects was to address the budget process. During the strategy forum, it became clear to the team that an underlying issue needed to be addressed before any activity dealing with the budget process could be successfully implemented. This underlying issue was the College’s Information Support System.

Owens’ Information Support System enables users to monitor performance of operational and continuous improvement activities and supports decision making across the College. Any weakness in this system adversely impacts the ability to conduct business and monitor performance. Therefore, the team decided that an action project improving the College’s Information Support System was needed.

2.3 Additional Background Materials and Web Sites

Web sites of existing planning activities and IT information

This project is and must remain directly tied to the Owens Community College Strategic Plan, its initiatives and objectives. Specifically this project's objective focuses on, Student success, Organizational vitality, and Institutional advancement

https://www.owens.edu/strategic/index.html

The IT Strategic Plan

https://www.owens.edu/direct/technology_strategy.pdf
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3.0 SELECTION AND AWARD PROCESS

3.1 Pre-Proposal Teleconference

An RFP Response will be accepted only from those Consultants who attend the pre-proposal teleconference. At the teleconference, Consultants will be provided an opportunity to ask questions and request additional background information. Meeting minutes and responses to questions will be sent only to attendees. The teleconference will be held on September 28, 2007 at 2:00 PM EST The dial-in number is 866-267-3857 and the Conference Code is 5676617398.

3.2 Submittals
3.2.1 Proposed Work Plan, Approach and Timelines

- Describe how your firm will approach the audit of the organization, including the use of any association or affiliate member firm personnel and the areas that will receive primary emphasis.
- Summary of the proposed work.
- Provide explicit details of deliverables.
- Provide a detailed description of the Work Plan, Approach and Timeline that you would propose using to meet the objectives described in sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above, including phasing and staffing.
- Specify the level of involvement and specific tasks you will require of Owens Community College for each objective.

3.2.2 Statement of Experience

- Detail your firm’s experience in providing auditing services to organizations in higher education, as well as colleges of a comparable size to Owens Community College.
- Provide information on any relationships with service providers in the IT service area.
- Discuss the firm’s independence with respect to Owens Community College.
- Identify five colleges for whom you have provided IT audits and provide at least one executive level and one mid-management reference for each.
- Describe how and why your firm is different from other firms being considered, and why our selection of your firm as our independent auditor is the best decision we could make.
- Please provide a description of experience for each type of planning effort identified in section 1.2, with specific reference to research and educational institutions.

3.2.3 IT Expertise

- Identify the partner, manager, and in-charge auditor who will be assigned to our account if you are successful in your bid, and provide biographies and resumes.
- Identify the employees who will be assigned to our account if you are successful in your bid, and provide biographies and resumes.
- Describe the intellectual resources that would be utilized in this engagement, including Best Practices, Case Studies or empirical works authored by your firm.
- Describe the IT Planning Tools commonly used by your firm in this type of engagement.

3.2.4 Examples of Strategic Planning Process and Tools

- Please describe planning process, models and tools used to develop the Proposed Work Plan, Approach and Timelines in 3.2.1 above and how they were modified for use at Owens Community College.
- Please identify to what extent the process, models and/or tools are proprietary products of your firm.
• Provide examples of the processes and models generally used by your firm in guiding client-staffed planning and/or consensus building initiatives, particularly in an academic environment.
• Describe the staffing and time frames typically involved in performing a general needs assessment and gap analysis for IT resources.
• Describe the methods and strategies typically used or recommended to communicate strategic planning goals, objectives and activities to/within the client's organization.

3.2.5 Project Cost Planning

• Please provide a total project cost for the work plan and timeline referenced in 3.2.1 above. For each primary element or milestone of the work plan, detail the staff required, their hourly rate/range, and estimated hours.
• Please identify the key cost drivers that you expect to influence the costs of this project and your ability to contain them.
• In addition, for each of the academic, student, community and administrative areas, please provide an order of magnitude cost or cost range for providing:

  Benchmarking and/or Best Practice analysis;

  Providing staff support to an internal planning process.

3.2.6 Staffing and Rates

Set forth your fee proposal for the audit. Furnish standard billing rates for classes of professional personnel.

• Please provide in your RFP submittal your Standard Billing Rate Sheet.
• Provide your rates and policies concerning Reimbursable Expenses.
• Provide an organization chart and typical project-staffing model (if not covered in a response to items above).
• If the firm has multiple offices, describe which office(s) will staff this project.
• If this is a joint venture, describe your affiliation structure.

3.3 Selection Criteria

The Respondent who’s Proposal, in the sole opinion of the College, represents the best overall value to the College will be selected. Factors which determine the selection include but are not limited to:

• Quality of consultant's approach and work plan;
• Quality and experience of staff proposed to be used on this project;
• Relevance of prior and related experience;
• Understanding of Owens' environment and culture;
• Compatibility of timeline and commitments with Owens’ needs;
• Total project cost.

4.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

4.1 Rights Reserved

Owens Community College, at its sole discretion and upon its determination that such actions would be in its best interest, reserves the right to:

• Accept or reject any or all Proposals, or any part thereof, or to withhold the award and to waive, or decline to waive, irregularities, informalities, and technicalities in any Proposal when determined that it is in its best interest to do so;
• Hold all Proposals for a period of up to ninety (90) days after the Due Date/Time and to accept a Proposal not withdrawn before the scheduled Due Date/Time;
• Proposals may not be modified, withdrawn or canceled by the Respondent for a 90-day period following the Due Date/Time, or 90-days following College receipt of Respondent’s best and final offer, whichever is later.
• Request clarification or a “best and final offer” from any Respondent on any or all aspects of its Proposal;
• Cancel and/or reissue this RFP at any time;
• Invite some, all, or none of the Respondents for interviews, demonstrations, presentations, and further discussion;
• Choose to not evaluate, may deem non-responsive, and/or may disqualify from further consideration any Proposals that do not follow the RFP directives, are difficult to understand, are difficult to read, or are missing any requested information;
• Reserve to award by items, groups of items or as a whole or to multiple contractors, - which ever is deemed most advantageous to the College.

4.2 Right to Investigate and Reject

The College may make such investigations as deemed necessary to determine the ability of the Respondent to provide the supplies and/or perform the services specified. The College reserves the right to reject any Proposal if the evidence submitted by, or through investigation of, the Respondent fails to satisfy the College that the Respondent is properly qualified. Additional information or oral presentation may be requested during RFP evaluation process. This includes the College’s ability to reject the Proposal based on negative references.
4.3 Invoicing

Invoices may be submitted for twenty-five percent (25%) of the total cost of the contract at initial startup, at fifty percent (50%) completion and at seventy-five percent (75%) completion. The College will retain twenty-five percent (25%) of the total cost of the contract until the project is satisfactorily completed.

4.4 Incurred Expenses

The Respondent, by submitting a Proposal, agrees that any cost incurred by responding to this RFP, or in support of activities associated with this RFP, will be born by the Respondent and may not be billed to the College. The College will incur no obligation or liability whatsoever to anyone resulting from issuance of, or activities pertaining to this RFP, including samples. Respondents submit Proposals at their own risk and expense.

4.5 Resulting Contract

This RFP, the Respondent’s Proposal, any addenda or EXHIBITS, best and final offer, and any clarification question responses may be included in any resulting Award.

4.6 Declaration Regarding Material Assistance/Nonassistance to a Terrorist Organization (D.M.A.)

Respondent will be responsible to review, complete and sign the D.M.A. form prior to award. Information regarding this form is available at:
http://www.homelandsecurity.ohio.gov/DMA_forms.asp.

5.0 TERMS AND CONDITIONS

5.1 Indemnification

Consultant agrees to indemnify the College, its governing board, officers, employees, agents, students and the State of Ohio from and against any and all costs, losses, damages, liabilities, expenses, demands, and judgments, including court costs, and attorney’s fees, which may arise out of Consultant’s performance of this Agreement, except to the extent such are caused by the sole fault or negligence of the College.
5.2 Governing Law

All questions relating to the validity, interpretation, performance or enforcement of this Agreement, and any claims arising from or related to this Agreement, will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Ohio, without regard to the principle of conflict of laws. Any litigation arising from or related to this Agreement may be brought only in the federal or state courts of Ohio with appropriate jurisdiction and the parties irrevocably consent to the jurisdiction and venue of such courts.

5.3 Contingent upon Appropriation

It is understood that any and all expenditures of State funds are contingent on the availability of lawful appropriations by the Ohio General Assembly. If the General Assembly fails at any time to continue funding for the payments and/or other obligations that may be due hereunder, then the State of Ohio’s obligations under this Contract are terminated as of the date that the funding expires without further obligation of the State.

5.4 Unresolved Findings

Consultant warrants that it is not subject to an “unresolved” finding for recovery under O.R.C. 9.24. If the warranty is deemed to be false, the Agreement is void and the Consultant must immediately repay to the State any funds paid under this Agreement.

5.5 Suspension or Debarment

Consultant certifies that it is not suspended or debarred by the Federal Government or State of Ohio from participating in Federal or State funded projects.

5.6 Absence of Sanctions

Consultant represents that neither it nor any of its owners, officers or employees have been sanctioned by or excluded from participation in any federal or state health care program, including Medicare and Medicaid. Consultant agrees that if it or any such individual associated with it should become the subject of an investigation relating to health care fraud, abuse or misconduct, or should be sanctioned by or excluded from participating in any federal or state health care program, including Medicare and Medicaid, it will immediately notify the College contact of such event and the College contact will have the right to immediately terminate this Agreement without penalty or cost.

5.7 Compliance with Law and Policies

Consultant hereby covenants and agrees that in the course of Consultant’s performance of its duties hereunder, Consultant will comply with all applicable federal, state and local government statutes, ordinances and regulations, and College policies and procedures.
If professional licensing or certification constitutes a qualification for Consultant’s performance under this Agreement, Consultant will make immediately available, at the College’s request, a copy of said certification or licensure.

The Consultant warrants that it has complied with all federal, state and local laws regarding business permits and licenses of any kind, including but not limited to:

- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Gramm-Leach-Bliley (GLB) Act
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability (HIPAA) Act of 1996
- Privacy Act of 1974
- OSHA Compliance

The Consultant agrees to comply with all applicable state and federal laws regarding drug-free workplace and ensure that all its employees, while working on state property, will not purchase, transfer, use or possess illegal drugs or alcohol or abuse prescription drugs in any way. Consultant agrees to adhere to Prevailing Wage laws, if applicable, as pursuant to ORC Chapter 4115.

5.8 Non-Discrimination

Nondiscrimination. Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code (“O.R.C.”) Section 125.111, the Consultant agrees that the Consultant, any subcontractor, and any person acting on behalf of the Consultant or subcontractor, will not discriminate, by reason of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, national origin, or ancestry against any citizen of this state in the hiring of any person qualified and available to perform the work under this contract. The Consultant further agrees that the consultant, any subcontractor, and any person acting on behalf of the consultant or subcontractor shall not, in any manner, discriminate against, intimidate, or retaliate against any employee hired for the performance of work under this contract on account of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, national origin, or ancestry.

5.9 Campaign Contributions.

Consultant hereby certifies that all applicable parties listed in Division (I)(3) or (J)(3) of O.R.C. Section 3517.13 are in full compliance with Divisions (I)(1) and (J)(1) of O.R.C. Section 3517.13.

5.10 Ethics Compliance.

Consultant represents, warrants, and certifies that it and its employees engaged in the administration or performance of this contract are knowledgeable of and understand the Ohio Ethics and Conflicts of Interest laws and Ohio Executive Order No. 2007-01S. Consultant further represents, warrants, and certifies that neither the Consultant nor any of its employees will do any act that is inconsistent with such laws and Executive Order.
5.11 Insurance Requirement

The Consultant shall defend, indemnify, and hold the College, its officers, employees, and agents harmless from and against any and all liability, loss, expense (including reasonable attorneys' fees), or claims for injury or damages that are caused by or result from the negligent or intentional acts or omissions of the Consultant, its officers, agents, or employees.

The Consultant, at its sole cost and expense, shall insure its activities in connection with the work under this Agreement and obtain, keep in force, and maintain insurance as follows:

a. Comprehensive or Commercial Form General Liability Insurance (contractual liability included) with limits as follows:
   1. Each Occurrence — $300,000
   2. Products/Completed Operations — $1,000,000 Aggregate
   3. Personal and Advertising Injury — $1,000,000
   4. General Aggregate — $1,000,000

   If the above insurance is written on a claims-made form, it shall continue for three years following termination of this Agreement. The insurance shall have a retroactive date of placement prior to or coinciding with the effective date of this Agreement.

b. Business Automobile Liability Insurance for owned, scheduled, non-owned, or hired automobiles with a combined single limit not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence. (Required only if the Consultant drives on College premises in the course of performing work for the College.)

c. Professional Liability Insurance with a limit of $1,000,000 per occurrence.

   If this insurance is written on a claims-made form, it shall continue for three years following termination of this Agreement. The insurance shall have a retroactive date of placement prior to or coinciding with the effective date of this Agreement.

d. Workers' Compensation as required by Ohio State law.

   It is understood that the coverage and limits referred to under a., b., and c. above shall not in any way limit the liability of the Consultant. The Consultant shall furnish the College with certificates of insurance evidencing compliance with all requirements prior to commencing work under this Agreement. Such certificates shall:

   1. Provide for thirty (30)-days advance written notice to the College of any modification, change, or cancellation of any of the above insurance coverage.
2. Indicate that The Trustees of Owens Community College have been endorsed as an additional insured under the coverage referred to under a. and b.
3. Include a provision that the coverage will be primary and will not participate with nor be excess over any valid and collectible insurance or program of self-insurance carried or maintained by the College.

It should be further understood that the provisions under 2. and 3. above shall only apply in proportion to and to the extent of the negligent acts or omissions of the Consultant, its officers, agents, or employees.

5.12 Suspension and Termination Provisions

The College reserves the right to terminate this Agreement for any reason and at any time upon 30 days written notice to Consultant. In the event of termination prior to completion of all Services described within RFP, the amount of the total fee to be paid the Consultant will be determined by the College on the basis of the portion of the total Services actually completed up to the time of such termination.

If either party fails to perform any of the requirements of this Agreement, or is in violation of a specific provision of this Agreement, then the non-breaching party may suspend or terminate this Agreement if the breaching party fails to cure such non-performance or violation within ten (10) business days following delivery of written notice of the breach.

5.13 Meetings

The Consultant is required to meet with the College to resolve technical or contractual problems that may occur during the term of the contract or to discuss the progress made by the Consultant and the College in the performance of their respective obligations, at no additional cost to the College.

5.14 Conflict of Interest

Consultant acknowledges that no conflict of interest exists between the Consultant and the College, or Consultant and its employees, or any members of their families in relation to any College policies or guidelines or state laws. Any person who acquires a conflicting personal interest as of the date the services begin must immediately disclose such interest to the College in writing. Consultant will not participate in any action affecting the services of this Agreement unless the College has determined that such participation would not be contrary to the public interest.
5.15 Public Records

Consultant understands that any records kept or maintained by the College, including any quotes or pricing of Consultant, may require disclosure under Ohio’s Public Records Act, R.C. § 149.43 and Ohio law and Consultant consents to such disclosure.

5.16 Advertising

No Consultant providing products or services to the College will appropriate or make use of the Owens Community College name or other identifying marks or property in its advertising.

5.17 Entire Agreement

This agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes any previous oral or written agreements between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof. This Agreement may not be modified, waived, or changed except in writing, and signed by both parties.

5.18 Waiver of Breach

A waiver by either party of any term or condition of this agreement in any instance shall not be deemed as a waiver of such term or condition for the future or of any subsequent breach thereof. All remedies, rights, undertakings, obligations or agreements contained in this Agreement shall be cumulative and none of them shall be in limitation of any other remedy, right, obligation, or agreement of either party.

5.19 Severability

If any provision of this Agreement or any portion of a provision hereof applicable to any particular situation or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Agreement or the remainder of such provision (as the case may be), and the application, shall not be affected thereby.

5.20 Time of the Essence

Time is of the essence under this Agreement, as to each provision in which time of performance is a factor.

5.21 Applicable Law

Applicable Law. This Agreement is made under and will be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Ohio.
5.22 Attorney Fees

In the event litigation is commenced by either party hereto against the other in connection with the enforcement of any provisions of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be paid by the losing party all court costs and/or other expenses of such litigation, including attorneys’ fees in a reasonable amount to be determined by the Court.

5.23 Respondent Statement

Herewith is not made in the interest of any undisclosed person, business group, or organization; that proposal is genuine and not collusive or sham; that bidder has not induced or solicited any proposal; that bidder has not sought by mutual Bidder verifies that the proposal filed agreement with anyone to fix the prices or to fix any overhead, profit, or cost element of such price or that of any other bidder, or to secure any other advantage against Owens Community College.
CERTIFICATION OF FUNDS

This signature certifies the amount required to meet the obligation in which this Agreement is made, has been lawfully appropriated for such purpose, and is in Customer’s treasury or in process of collection to the credit of an appropriate fund free from any previous encumbrances.

By: _____________________________
Title: ____________________________

Date: ___________________________
EXHIBIT A

OWENS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SIGNATURE AFFIRMATION BY RESPONDENT

The Respondent hereby acknowledges the following:

1. Respondent has read and understands RFP and attachments and agrees to comply with all requirements.

2. Respondent has no outstanding questions regarding the interpretation or clarification of the RFP or attachments.

3. Respondent understands that fulfillment of Award may require sequential, coordinated and interrelated operations, which may involve interference, disruption, hindrance or delay in the progress of Contractor’s work.

4. Respondent agrees that Award price shall cover all amounts due from the College or State for Completion of work, as specified within RFP.

Company

Date

Signature (Required)

Printed Name

Title
Exhibit B

Owens Community College Critical Information Technology Status

July 3, 2007

Communications Facilities:

Local Wiring:
Both the Toledo and Findlay campuses use fiber optic technology heavily. The backbone networks are a composite of single and multi mode predominately 12 pair multi-mode and 6 pair single-mode. Twisted pair Category 5 twisted pair or above is used between work areas and Intermediate Distribution Frame (IDF). The local network includes the entire Findlay Campus and the Toledo Campus except the Fire Science and Law Enforcement Building and the Workforce and Community Service Building.

Metropolitan Networking:
The College leases communications facilities that connect the Toledo campus to properties not on the exiting network. Facilities are provided by Buckeye Telesystems (BTS) unless otherwise indicated.

Toledo Data and Voice:
Fire Science and Law Enforcement Building: (LE) 10 Mb BTS
Workforce and Community Service Building (WCS): 10 Mb BTS
Center for Emergency Preparedness (CEP) Video Only 100 Mb
Source proposed 10 Mb

Voice local and long distance to BTS
Toledo Campus 10PRI
Findlay Campus 3 PRI
Toledo Campus Backup 1 T1
Findlay Campus Backup 1 T1

Data LAN
Backbone 1 Gb
Desktop 100 Mb
WIDE AREA NETWORKING

Toledo/Findlay Connection: 1 Gb
Internet from Toledo Campus 40 Mb Internet, 5 Mb IntraOhio

WIRELESS

All wireless is VPN direct to Internet
Estimate of campus coverage 60% Toledo, 100% Findlay

VIDEO

Both campuses have Cable TV capabilities to all buildings; Toledo supplied by Toledo Buckeye Cable, Findlay using Time Warner. Video over IP is available between to the two campuses with video conferencing available on both campuses. Video over IP is also frequently over the Internet.

COMMUNICATIONS CONTRACTUAL STATUS

Buckeye Telesystems is the current conductivity provider. Telephone and data T1, PRI, and Ethernet capacity is covered on a 5-year agreement that began in 2004. BTS is also the provider for last mile connectivity for OSCNet. Connectivity to OSCNet until 2016 is covered by an Ohio Board of Regents Grant.

TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The current telephone system is a Siemens 4500 and was purchased in 2004. Two PBX systems are utilized, one on each campus. Each building has a remote shelf. On the Toledo Campus the remote shelves in the Library and WCS will provide independent dial tone. Voice over IP technology is used to connect buildings and campuses. Digital telephones are normally utilized.

DATA COMMUNICATIONS

Cisco is the primary data communications equipment provider.

COMPUTER HARDWARE

There are approximately 2,400 desktop computers in use at the College. This consists of 1,200 for administrative and faculty use and 1,200 for student use. The desktops associate with approximately 120 servers of various capacities. Four HP storage area networks provide storage for the larger applications and student generated data. Over the last two years the SUSE Linux has been the operating system of choice. ITS has been migrating applications off proprietary UNIX versions to Linux and commodity hardware. Microsoft Servers Windows 200X is used only when the application requires it and there are not any other alternative solutions.
The main reasoning for this direction is that our enterprise applications all are UNIX/Linux based. By limiting the number of operating systems and server types the number of systems administrators can be kept to a minimum.

**IDM**

In 2005 as part of our Novell upgrade the College embraced the concept of Identity Management (IDM). The main goal of this project was to automate much of the manual labor for several College departments when a new student is enrolled or a new employee begins working. For example when a students application is processed, IDM generates an email address and establishes an ID account. When a student enrolls for classes IDM populates the student into the proper Blackboard classes.

**EMAIL (GROUPWISE)**

Two years ago the College move from using two email systems Pegasus for faculty and staff and Pipeline for students to Novell’s GroupWise for all email users. Currently there are about 80,000 email accounts on the College system. About 30,000 are active, the remainder have limited or no activity.

All full time employees have access to both a client server and web-based email client. Students and adjunct faculty only utilize the web-based email client. Currently GroupWise 7.0.2 is utilized.

**DATA BASE (ORACLE)**

Banner uses Oracle as its database. The College has made an effort to standardize on Oracle for all database applications. This has allowed the College to minimize the technical effort required to support a number of different database systems.

Currently besides Banner: TouchNet, Blackboard Commerce Suite, Appworx, Clean Address, and OnBase all use Oracle. The College has purchased a site license for Oracle; this will allow us to curb cost increases as the size and number of databases grow.

**INTERNET/INTRANET**

The College uses an Internet/Intranet to deliver Web content. The Internet contains general information that is directed to current and prospective students, contributors and the general public. The Intranet is a secured environment that is reserved for current students, faculty, staff and alumni. The Intranet functions are framed by a portal (Ozone), which is based on Novell’s exteNd platform.
Ozone, and the Intranet in general, is role based; after successful authentication the user is presented with information that meets assigned roles. For example, employees can view pay stub information and students can view grade history. Ozone is divided into five sections. My Ozone provides: news, announcements, events, weather etc. Administrative Services provides links to Banner self service which provides role based service as described above. Intranet provides services for employees and contains a directory, policy and procedure manuals, forms, union contracts etc. Ozone also provides links to Blackboard’s course management system and GroupWise WebMail.

**STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (BANNER)**

The student information system (SIS) is SunGard HE Banner. This system has been in operation since 1999. All of the basic Banner modules are in use: Finance, Financial Aid, Human Resources, Student, and Alumni. Banner was installed within an 18-month period because of Y2K issues. Because of the short installation period all modules were installed to perform the basic functions to of the College.

Banner is a good SIS because upgrades come at regular periods. Several adjunct systems have been interfaced with Banner to complement the services provided by Banner. These systems are:

- TouchNet – Credit Card Authorization
- Budget Text – Bookstore Point of Sale
- Appworx – Job Scheduling and Application Automation
- Clean Address – Address checking utility
- OnBase – Imaging System

**COURSE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (BLACKBOARD)**

ITS provides technical support for the Blackboard course management system. All For-Credit sections taught at the College have a Blackboard presence generated. During an average semester 12,000 students are enrolled in courses that utilize Blackboard. Approximately 7,000 students are enrolled in only E-Owens courses. Students are populated into the proper classes through an IDM function: Blackboard’s Enterprise System. During the summer of 2007 the Blackboard server configuration was upgraded to a four node cluster that should provide a very reliable environment for students and faculty.
APPENDIX B

Meeting Minutes
ITS Audit Team

April 20, 2007
9:00 a.m.

Attendees:

Laurie Sabin       Brent Wickham       Dr. Stan Jensen, Facilitator
Bill Schmoekel    Pat Jezak           Theresa Jensen, Facilitator
Max Baumgartner   Tom Perin
Kris Holland

Absent:

Darla Johannsen

Responsibilities established:

Team Champions:  Pat Jezak and Brent Wickham
Team Leader:     Laurie Sabin
Team Scribe:     Kris Holland

Five-Acre Field has been identified by B. Busby as “Establish a comprehensive data collection system that is reliable” for academic services.

The team will begin focusing on the current method of data collection (Banner) and how to better utilize, improve or replace outdated/non-productive processes. This narrows the scope down to one, possibly two, potential Banner modules affected.

- Need GAP analysis to determine current usage vs. desired results
- Need to determine measurables to ensure data collection can and will be utilized to benefit the students and the employees using it.

Actions

Understanding of Banner as it exists today: B Schmoekel has offered to meet with the team to discuss current system practices and potential areas of concern. He will be bringing his staff of computer analysts to the next meeting in order to help the team to understand the role, and potential roles, of the Banner system.
Meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, May 3, 2007, at 9:00 a.m. CH 120

Dean Karen Reed, a team resource, suggested we contact:

Rob Stuart  
Cuyahoga Community College  
Institutional Planning & Evaluation  
Director  
(216) 987-4757  
Rob.Stuart@tri-c.edu

Rob has completed a full Banner gap analysis at Cuyahoga CC. K Holland to contact and invite him to meet with the team and share his experience on Friday, May 4, 2007 after our morning session with Dr. Jensen.

If anyone needs to contact Dr. Jensen, his email address is stan@drstanjensen.com.

Next team meeting May 3, 2007 9:00 a.m. CH120  
Second Session with Dr. Jensen May 4, 2007 9:00 a.m. LE 145-147  
Meeting with Mr. Stuart Hold May 4 1:00 p.m for tentative mtg
This special meeting of the ITS team was scheduled to introduce the team to the computer analysts responsible for maintaining the systems involved in (Banner) data collection. Individuals were invited to present the system from their perspective on how the different modules are inter-related.

Pat Jezak, Team Champion, thanked the attendees for being there and explained the team’s “Five Acre Field”, as it relates to why we were there.

Jerry Beck explained to the team how Financial Aid is affected by the information maintained in Banner. Items such as Title IV Federal, State and Institution Financial Aid, student filing of aid applications and required documentation, and real-time financial aid status depend on Banner to facilitate data retrieval. (see his attached material)

Jerry also detailed a few of the areas that Banner has limitations for. Banner is an extremely large, complex system, therefore it is increasingly difficult to stay current with updates and changes. It also doesn’t have the ability to run or maintain state regulation programs on its own, requiring redundant work. Our OnBase system is not currently meeting the needs of the students and needs expansion. Banner system is not interactive for our students and needs to be. The enhancements expected in the summer 2008 upgrade, with Oracle, to Banner 8 are expected to address some functionality issues, but not all, will also give Owens’ IT the ability to manage security of authorization.

One future enhancement planned is the OnBase Imaging system. A SIP system which can be integrated with Banner so it appears as one system and reduces paper and redundant work.
Another planned improvement is to allow each student the ability to customize their web page to be based on their academic goal.

The major issue facing Banner and Owens Community College is resource allocation; there are more projects planned than manpower and money allow for.

Brent Wickham, Team Champion, asked Jerry and the other computer analysts what part of the Banner system have they seen that they would like our system to be able to do. Bill Schmoekel responded that every employee that attends such events as the SunGardHE Summit annual conference goes with a “laundry list” of items requested from their respective departments and returns with a trip report on what can be done (usually resource dependent), that is shared within the department for growth potential. Max Baumgartner requested that the analysts each get the team a wish list so that we can see if we can help any of them become a reality. The said they would check with their departments to see if there were items they would like to see implemented and get that list to Kris Holland, for review of the team and inclusion in the minutes.

Tom Perin asked if Banner training was an issue. Jerry responded that there is a great deal of difference in the way each department uses Banner and therefore, training is usually done by departmental personnel and therefore subjective to the trainer and the trainee. Often the trainee is not fully aware of the capabilities of the system because, due to several factors, training is done on-the-job and when time permits, usually only as needed for specific tasks. New hire training cannot take place until the employee is “officially” an employee in HR system. Banner 7 has three on-line training modules; Student, procurement and navigation. They are basic training, not task or department specific.

Matt Lewis, supporting the Business Affairs office, Finance and Accounts Receivable, presented how several areas of the College affect Finance. These included Alumni Affairs, the Bursar’s office, Financial Aid, Procurement as well as the Bookstore and ID cards. This area also must maintain student records with real-time information, such as account balances, grades and schedules. He is currently working with the users in his area to define individual processes and develop work instructions that are task specific.

Limitations identified were the time required to learn new modules or upgrades, improving user efficiencies/capabilities due to individual preference and the on-line training modules are not Owens specific.

Max Bauerschmidt asked Matt if the computer analysts were stretched too thin to concentrate on training users & increase usage. The overwhelming answer was yes.

Greg Brown, supporting Institutional Research, HEI Reporting and, with Sweta Thakker, the Student Systems. System builds class schedules, controls course verification, maintains course descriptions, verification of pre-requisites and course transfers, as well as generating letters to students. Other applications are CAS, XML transcript standard (OCC is a pilot school for this), and Academic/Degree History.
Some areas for improvement are; Records, in order to send a specific letter the fields/search must be entered and changed each time. Selective admissions, such as in medical fields, which evaluate student readiness and generate letters of request for information, need to be standardized. There is no “standard”, health fields need to define minimums and adhere to one standard.

The Academic History/Degree Summary module is very useful, providing a detail of summary of hours, a Curriculum Advising Program which can show a student where in the course of a program they are and receive commencement information quickly and accurately. The CAP is extremely labor intensive.

**Actions:**

IT to provide team with today’s meeting preparation notes

IT to provide team with the results of the last SunGardHE conference attendees’ trip reports for our research.

IT to provide team with a “wish list” or planned projects for Banner that the team may be able to facilitate; include project, goal and any road blocks to completion.

Team Meeting/Session with Dr. Jensen      May 17, 2007    9:00 a.m.    AVCC125/128
ITS Audit Team

May 4, 2007
8:00 a.m.

Team Attendees:
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader Tom Perin
Kris Holland, Scribe Pat Jezak, Team Champion
Bill Schmoekel Dr. Stan Jensen, Facilitator
Max Baumgartner Theresa Jensen, Facilitator

Absent:
Darla Johannsen
Brent Wickham, Team Champion

Key elements involved in Assessment of Banner:
(see attachment diagram)

(1) Assessment of Owens’ needs:
   • Academics
   • Student needs
     o What can be done
     o what is being done
   • Efficiency
   • Decrease paperwork for faculty to increase time with students
   • Increase student impact

(2) Assessment of Owens’ current resources
   • Current Resources
   • Need
   • Have
   • Missing

(3) Desired outcome
   • Help students learn
   • Clear
   • Few “should have…”
   • Measurable
   • ROI
   • (avoid) Blaming
   • Not changing just to change
   • Not micromanaging
   • State reporting
(4) Training
- End User
- Re-training
- Train-the-trainer

(5) Right
- Capacity
- People
- Data driven
- Outside

(6) People
- $ 
- Top, middle, front line buy-in
- Faculty
- Union
- Trust
- Collaboration

Using the statement “If we improve (n) will that improve (x) or vice versa, or is there no relationship?” we were able to determine that:

Improving the Assessment of Owens’ needs we will be able to affect the Assessment of Owens Resources (2), Training (4), Right (5), and People (6) effectiveness. There is a symbiotic relationship between assessing the needs (1) of Owens Community College and assessing the resources (2), while the effect of providing a clear and accurate Desired Outcome (3) will improve the Assessment of Owens’ Needs (1).

Using the Cause/Effect evaluation to identify areas where “…improving (1) will improve (2, 4, 5 & 6)”, we have a ratio of 4:1, four improved-one no change.

Looking at the other five areas the ratios are:

(2) Assessment of Owens’ resources 3:2
(3) Desired Outcome 5:0
(4) Training 2:3
(5) Right 1:4
(6) People 2:3

The results of this evaluation have directed the team to focus on the two areas where the most benefit can be seen: (1) Assessment of Owens’ Needs and (3) Desired Outcome, for the next meeting.
Clarification of Statement of Work vs. Request for Proposal vs. Request for Qualifications: Team agreed that we need to complete the appropriate recommendation based on Banner knowledge, best, qualified (broad), focus on outcome, neutral, higher education experienced, for a determined period of time and working without personal or professional agenda (i.e. no change just to change something).

Identified possible data sources:
- Other colleges
- Team of consultants
- Individual consultants (1 or more)

**Actions**

Team to work on preliminary list of items that need study to determine course of action. Plan to meet on Thursday, May 10, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. in the BAO Conference Room to review these lists. If you are unable to attend, please submit them to Laurie at laurie_sabin@owens.edu prior to then.

Tentative meeting scheduled for Monday, May 14 at 8:00 a.m. to meet with Mr. Stuart Kris Holland will finalize plans.

Team will need a clear statement of desired outcome to give to prospective consultant.

Champions to present to the Steering Committee our perspective of the project, through the mission, stating what the project consists of within the scope of the big picture (IT) at the next Steering Committee meeting.

If anyone needs to contact Dr. Jensen, his email address is stan@drstanjensen.com.

Next team meeting May 16, 2007 2:00 p.m. AVCC 125/128
Meeting with Mr. Stuart Hold May 14 8:00 a.m. for tentative mtg
Attendees:  
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader  
Bill Schmoekel  
Darla Johannsen  
Max Baumgartner  
Tom Perin  

Absent:  
Kris Holland  
Brent Wickham  
Pat Jezak  

Minutes of May 4, 2007 were accepted as prepared.  

The Team’s Project Statement was finalized as:  

To improve the College’s process of assessing current and future Banner Academic support system capabilities by setting the parameters for an independent audit, designed to identify current and future needs and make recommendations for efficiency and resources.  

The following definitions were agreed upon:  

Independent Audit: A audit performed by an individual or group not directly associated with Owens CC. i.e. employee, board member or firm associated with an employee or board member.  


With Desired Outcomes and Assessment of Needs complete, the team needs to begin writing the RFP, document the process and create a template for the College for future IT projects. For discussion at the next meeting, several examples of RPF’s were handed out along with a write up of RFP standards.  

Submitted by Laurie Sabin, Team Leader
ITS Audit Team Minutes  
May 17, 2007  
9:00 a.m.

Attendees:  
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader  
Dr. Stan Jensen, Facilitator  
Bill Schmoekel  
Theresa Jensen, Facilitator  
Brent Wickham (Ext. 3565)  
Darla Johannsen  
Max Baumgartner  
Pat Jezak  
Tom Perin

Absent:  
Kris Holland

Dr. Jensen explained the importance of defining the current process: to agree on aim, size, and scope and then gather data on each quality measure.

Several control charts were reviewed. The run chart plots data over time. Stratification subdivides the data into categories for better analysis and understanding. The Pareto chart ranks causes from most significant to least significant. The 80—20 rule is then used where 80% of the problems are caused by 20% of the categories. This is also known as “the vital few”.

Dr. Jensen showed the ease and versatility of QI Macros for Excel software and provided a copy to the team.

The report out is to the Steering Committee is due on July 19, 2007. It is anticipated that the RPF will be complete and the team will have a timeline of when it will be advertised and mailed out, when the auditor would be selected and when the auditor’s report would be complete.

The successful auditor must have Higher education experience, be knowledgeable about Banner and be independent. It is anticipated that 60% of their time would be spent on the Banner Academic support modules and 40% would be broad scope (i.e. hardware, security, network, wi-fi, authentication, etc.).

Areas where the Faculty is looking for improvement are grades, evaluations, registration, faculty load, green sheets (new classes) and blue sheets (changes to existing classes such as time, days, etc.)

In preparation for a meeting with Dr. Unger, Dr. Adams, Dr. Busby, Dawn Wetmore and Faculty Union leadership to clarify the scope of the RFP, the Team mapped out a chart of the current Information Support Systems.

Action Items:
Max: create Visio version of the current Information Support Systems.
Laurie: create card version of the current Information Support Systems. Meet with Kris to compile wish lists from Computer Analysts.
Tom: schedule meeting with Dr. Unger, Dr. Adams, Dr. Busby, Dawn Wetmore and Faculty Union leadership to clarify the scope of the RFP.

Submitted by Laurie Sabin, Team Leader
ITS Audit Team

May 23, 2007
10:00 a.m.

Attendees:

Laurie Sabin  Bill Schmoekel  Pat Jezak
Max Baumgartner  Tom Perin

Absent:

Darla Johannsen, Brent Wickham, Kris Holland

The team held a working meeting to finalize the presentation scheduled for May 29, 2007, 11 a.m., with the AQIP leaders. Purpose of the May 29 meeting is to achieve consensus on the scope of the independent audit and the team’s project statement, which is currently:

“To improve the College’s process of assessing current and future Banner Academic support system capabilities by setting the parameters for an independent audit, designed to identify current and future needs and make recommendations for efficiency.”

The team reviewed the ITS relational diagram. The next working session to prepare for the presentation is Friday, May 25 at 8 a.m.

Submitted by

Pat Jezak
Co-Champion, ITS Audit Team

C: Team members and Randy Wharton

05-23-07 pj

Action Items:
Pat: Prepare agenda for 5/29/07 meeting
Max: Make changes to viseo diagram
Laurie: Pull together project improvement requests (formerly known as wish lists)
Bill: Schedule classroom for 5/25/07 and 5/29/07
Laurie: Notify team of classroom number for 5/25/07 and everyone of room change for meeting on 5/29/07
ITS Audit Team Minutes  
May 29, 2007  
11:00 a.m.

Attendees:  
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader  
Bill Schmoekel  
Max Baumgartner  
Pat Jezak  
Tom Perin  
Kris Holland

Guests: Paul Unger, Brian Paskvan, Bruce Busby, Dawn Wetmore, Deb Rathke, Randy Wharton

Tom Perin opened the meeting by reviewing the history of the team project statement and our understanding of the task. It was noted that the team had determined that the audit would focus on Banner system improvements, not replacements.

Bill Schmoekel presented a flow chart created by Max Baumgartner and the current status of support technology at Owens. He was also able to provide a brief history the Banner implementation process.

Laurie Sabin then presented the information gathered from the Computer Analysts (CA’s) related to system improvements and project requests. This information was compiled from the lists submitted by the seven CA’s at Owens and represents items that could enable process, efficiency or reporting improvements if completed. It was noted that 47% of the project request list encompasses the Academics, Enrollment, Records, Bursar and Procurement functions. By implementing these projects, we could dramatically improve the systems for our students and faculty.

Tom Perin closed the presentation by asking the panel for input and direction to clarify the focus of the Request For Proposal (RFP) to identify the areas that are important at this stage of developing a dynamic system. The suggestion was offered that we ask three questions: Where are we? Where could we be? And, Where should we be?

PANEL DISCUSSION

Dr. Unger discussed the use of the term “report card”. It was suggested that we do not use that term, in order to clearly state that we are not only looking for the “where we are/how we are doing”, but that we want to know if we are properly planning for the future.

Dr. Unger also stated that we should use the RFP to establish the baseline “Here is where we are.” along with request to answer “How can we most effectively and efficiently respond to
development/implementation and maintenance of a progressive, state-of-the-art information support system.

Another approach suggested was to request the auditor look at how we are organized to maintain the modules currently used and then offer Owens, through experience, what he has seen work and how close Owens Community College is to meeting that.

Randy Wharton stressed that it is important to ensure the system is configured properly to maintain an active, healthy system; critical that we have the framework in place including some redundancy and security to enable users to have a reliable system to work from.

Dr. Unger reiterated that the RFP be designed to evaluate the configured system; manpower, resource dollars, training necessary, etc.

Deb Rathke discussed the diagram and the relationship between the Campus Network and the components of the Owens Intranet, Ozone and Blackboard. Looking at a reliable configuration, those components would become higher priority and therefore may need to be included in the parameters of the audit.

Brian Paskvan suggested the diagram be updated to reflect these components in order to ensure certain elements of the system will be secure, reliable and state-of-the-art.

Dr. Unger discussed the RFP and the amount budgeted for AQIP, specifically Action Project Idea #3. Mr. Paskvan included the IT budgeted amounts and where those are allocated.

Dawn Wetmore suggested that the audit parameters include evaluating future needs and therefore must be designed to enable future growth and progressive thinking.

Max Baumgartner stressed the importance of the audit results in ensuring system stability of core functions, efficiency and the forward planning of the organizational structure.

The team thanked the guests for their participation and support.

ACTION ITEMS:

Project Statement has been revised to reflect the direction outlined from today’s meeting:

To improve the College’s current information support system by assessing organizational structure, stability, efficiency, including future capabilities and needs by setting the parameters for an independent audit, designed with the intention of utilizing an auditor’s expertise to provide a meaningful vision of the College’s future.
ITS Audit Team Minutes
June 4, 2007
11:00 a.m.

Attendees:
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader
Bill Schmoekel
Max Baumgartner

Absent: Kris Holland, Darla Johannsen, Tom Perin, Pat Jezak, Brent Wickham

The suggested content for RFP’s was reviewed. Introduction and general, criteria for evaluation, general contract terms and conditions, and request for references are generic to all Owens/State of Ohio RFPs. The contractor personnel requirements, reporting requirements and procedures, criteria for evaluation and cost proposal can also be modified from other RFPs, Owens or otherwise. The scope of work is our biggest challenge. Constraints on the contractor, college responsibilities, evaluation of contractor performance and special conditions do not apply to this project.

We will be using the “include everything that may or may not be appropriate and gut it later as a team” approach to writing the RFP. No idea is a bad idea and the more we can use from previous work, the better.

Action Items:
Laurie: draft boilerplate sections of RFP.
Bill: draft overview of existing system for appendix.
Max: use what we learned at our 5/28/07 meeting to start drafting our scope of work.
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Attendees:
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader
Dr. Stan Jensen, Facilitator
Bill Schmoekel
Darla Johannsen
Tom Perin

Absent:
Max Baumgartner, Kris Holland, Pat Jezak, Brent Wickham

Dr. Jensen reminded the team that our report out is due to the Steering Committee on either July 18 or 19. In addition to our report, this includes a 45-minute to one-hour presentation.

The Improvement Theory Check Sheet was reviewed. This will be our guide to the seven points to cover in our report. While we will not use every bullet and tool, most reports include 6 –8 tools. We will be including our relations diagram in ours. The Develop Improvement Theory & Implementation Plan section is the most part of the report. A requirement is to include a page where we clearly and briefly state our improvement theory. A Gantt chart of our “Plan “A” is also required.

Dr. Jensen walked the team through Systematic Diagrams, where you start with the end result and “think backwards” through key elements and “who will do it” and through Force Field Analysis, where the forces that will aid or hinder an organization in reaching an objective are analyzed. In our case, the desired change is the IT audit, the driving forces are AQIP, consensus, monetary resources, Presidential buy-in and a strong team made up of the right people with the right mind set and the restraining forces are monetary resources, people, the size of the scope, fear, backlash, the opinion that the focus is “not fair,” lack of commitment to fulfill the recommended changes and the lack of understanding of the length of the necessary commitment to fulfill the recommended changes.

The minimum we should deliver on July 18 or 19 is an overview summary of the RFP. We should state that most of the RFP is boilerplate and the requirements and components are defined by the State of Ohio. We should also point out that the challenges Owens faces in auditing and improving its IT system are not unique, but common to both higher education and business in general. At the August 1 outcome assessment, we expect approval of the RFP in total, with no modifications to the body of work. Our Gantt chart will include a calendar laying out our anticipated timeline for the completion of the RFP, who it was sent to, the pre-bid conference and the required timeframe in which to respond.

Tom shared that Lorain Community College, Cincinnati State Community College, the University of Cincinnati and Columbus State Community College have all undergone ITS audits.
In addition to getting copies of their RFPs, he is networking to get their opinions of what they would do differently.

Action Items:

Tom: RFP’s and opinions of various entities that have undergone ITS audits.
Laurie: develop systematic diagram and get volunteers for /assign who will do what for report and draft boilerplate sections of RFP.
Bill: draft overview of existing system for appendix.
Darla: prepare title page with names of team/project, and pages with team members’ names, title, roles, background information and project statement.
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Attendees:
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader  Dr. Stan Jensen, Facilitator
Bill Schmoeckel
Darla Johannsen
Kris Holland
Pat Jezak, Champion

Absent:
Tom Perin, Brent Wickham

The 7 Step Continuous Improvement Process and the Improvement Theory Check Sheet were reviewed.

Section 4. Develop Improvement Theory and Implementation Plan. As we prepare our report, it’s important to include costs of improvement, time costs, cost savings and time savings, even though they are estimates. We should also include a Gantt Chart and explain how the improvements are aligned with AQIP.

A plan details who, what, when, where, how, why and how much. A Gantt Chart is used to display and control planned work and finished work in relation to time. More simply, it shows who, what and when.

Section 5. How Will You Study Results? One way of doing this is to show where time deadlines were met and/or document attendance at meetings. We will need to report back to the Steering Committee at least twice: an update on results (completed) and a Final Report of results (July 18 or 19).

Section 6. How Will Team Engraft Improvements into System? In other words, how will we hand this off to the next group or team and end this team?

Section 7. Ideas for Other Team Projects. Also known as areas for improvement. Remember to thank the Steering Committee. Must include the Steering Committee Feedback form on page 9.3.

Dr. Jensen reminded the team that our report out is due to the Steering Committee on either July 18 or 19. We will need 40 copies of the report. In addition to our report, a 45-minute presentation is required.

Action Items:

Laurie: Finish draft of RFP and get volunteers for /assign who will do what for report.
Bill: draft overview of existing system for RFP.
Max: work on relationship of project to AQIP Quality Criteria.
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Bill Schmoekel  
Theresa Jensen, Facilitator  
Darla Johannsen  
Tom Perin  
Max Baumgartner  

Absent:
Kris Holland, Pat Jezak, Brent Wickham  

Dr. Jensen reminded the team that our report out is due to the Steering Committee at 9:00 a.m. on July 19. We will need 40 copies of the report. In addition to our report, a 45-minute presentation is required.

Visual Control Systems, techniques used for organization and the creation of visual controls to ensure adherence to standards were reviewed. In the Visual Workplace Vision, paperwork is simplified and minimized, procedures to follow are prominently displayed and easy to follow and when something is wrong, it’s visually easy to tell. The benefits: the “8 Zeroes,” are zero waste, zero injuries, zero downtime losses, zero waste in changeovers, zero delays, zero customer dissatisfaction and zero red ink. The five S’s of workplace organization are: First sort (organization), Second stabilize (orderliness), Third shine (cleanliness), Fourth standardize (adherence) and Fifth sustain (self-discipline).

Bill brought a laptop and projector and a draft of the RFP was reviewed and modified by the team. Except for a few additions for the existing system and web addresses for obtaining additional information, the RFP is complete. Next step, pulling together the project book.

Action Items:

Laurie: get volunteers for /assign who will do what for report.
Bill: complete draft overview of existing system for RFP and provide web addresses for existing and revised draft versions of IT strategic plan.
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Attendees:
Laurie Sabin, Team Leader
Bill Schmoekel
Max Baumgartner
Tom Perin
Kris Holland
Darla Johannsen

Absent: Pat Jezak, Brent Wickham

The team reviewed the final draft version of the RFP and made minor corrections.

The special thanks, recommendation and cost pages were discussed.

The report out was planned. Tom will present the background information and Bill and Laurie will explain/present the RFP. Darla and Kris will provide emotional support.

Action Items:

Tom: Provide anticipated positive results from original action project plan.
Laurie: Complete recommendation, cost and special thanks pages and pull everything into project book document.
Bill: Get IT organizational chart from HR for RFP. Send final version of RFP to Roberta Montrie who will send it to the team, Dr. Stan Jensen and the AQIP Steering Committee prior to the report out on July 19, 2007.
Darla and Kris: Proof project book document and “pretty up” as they see fit.
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