

Informal Request for Proposal

UAF Procurement & Contract Services



UNIVERSITY
of ALASKA
Many Traditions One Alaska

IRFP # 15Q0027SAS

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES:
IT Governance Review/Business
Process Improvement

Issued by:

Scott A. Snedden

Significant Information:	
Issue Date	December 2, 2014
Teleconference	None
Submittal Deadline	January 7, 2014 at 3 P.M. A.T.

Table of Contents

Evaluation Criteria.....	4
Proposal Format.....	5
Cost Proposal	5
Appendix A: Terms and Conditions	6
Scope of Work (SOW):	7
Plan Description:.....	8
Process Benefits of Governance.....	8
Financial Benefits of Governance.....	9
Timeline:	9
Process and Methodology:.....	9
Key Deliverables:	9
Ownership:	9

INSTRUCTIONS TO Offerors

1. Offerors shall carefully review this solicitation without delay, for defects and questionable or objectionable matter. Questions, objections, or comments must be brought to the attention of purchasing agent. A protest filed based upon any omission, error, or the context of the solicitation will be disallowed if not brought to the attention of the purchasing agent prior to the scheduled IRFP submittal deadline. All verbal contact must be followed up with written notification.
2. The University reserves the right to accept or reject any and all IRFPs and to waive any informalities in the IRFP, and, unless otherwise specified by the offeror, to accept any or all item(s) in the IRFP.
3. The IRFP does not obligate the University to pay any costs incurred in the preparation or submission of such IRFPs, or to purchase or contract for material and/or services.
4. All IRFPs shall be offered F.O.B. Destination.
5. All equipment quoted shall be new and of the manufacturer's current model unless otherwise specified.
6. Use of a brand name is for the purpose of describing the standard of quality, performance, and characteristics desired and is not intended to limit or restrict competition.
7. Descriptive literature, brochures and/or data must accompany the quote when a substitute, but "equal" is offered. The University of Alaska will be the sole judge in determining "equals" in regard to price, quality, and performance.
8. Samples of items, when requested must be furnished free of expense to the University and if not destroyed by testing, will be returned at the offeror's request and expense immediately following award.
9. Time of proposed delivery must be stated in defined terms. If time varies for different items, the offeror shall so state.
10. In case of error in the extension of prices in the IRFP, the unit prices will govern. Written unit prices shall govern over a numeric unit price when both are present or called for by the quote schedule.
11. MULTIPLE, ALTERNATE, OR CONDITIONED OFFERS: Unless specifically allowed, multiple or alternate offers, or IRFPs conditioned upon receiving award of all or a portion of this and/or another contract shall be deemed nonresponsive and shall be rejected.
12. BASIS OF AWARD: Unless otherwise stated in the IRFP, award will be to the offeror with the highest ranked proposal whose proposal, conforming to all requirements of this IRFP, is/are determined to be the most advantageous to the University.
13. ANTICOMPETITIVE PRACTICES: Vendors certify by submittal of their IRFP that the prices submitted have been independently arrived at and without collusion.
14. ALASKA BIDDER PREFERENCE: IRFPs may be awarded to a firm that qualifies as an Alaska Bidder if their IRFP is no more than five (5) percent higher than the lowest non-resident's rate quoted.
15. STATE CERTIFIED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS PREFERENCE: A ten percent (10%) preference shall be applied to quotes received from any state certified employment program.
16. ALASKA PRODUCT PREFERENCE: In the evaluation of the quote, Class I Alaskan products will be given a three percent (3%) preference; Class II products a five percent (5%) preference; and Class III products a seven percent (7%) preference. Offerors claiming this preference shall submit with their quote certification from the State of Alaska to substantiate their claim. Failure to submit such certification will result in no preference being granted.
17. APPLICATION OF PREFERENCE: If both the Alaska bidder's preference or the employment program preference and the Alaska product's preference apply, the procurement officer shall apply either the bidder's preference or employment program preference first and the products preference second.
18. BUSINESS CLASSIFICATION: The University of Alaska offers an equitable opportunity to small businesses and small businesses owned and controlled by the socially and economically disadvantaged, and to women owned businesses. The correct classification shall be entered in the space provided on this document. In the case of tie offers, equal in all terms, these classifications will be used to determine the successful offeror in accordance with University.

Evaluation Criteria

The total number of points used to score proposals is 100. All proposals will be reviewed to determine if they are responsive. They will then be evaluated using the criteria set out below.

An evaluation may not be based on discrimination due to the race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, marital status, pregnancy, parenthood, disability, or political affiliation of the offeror.

Each proposal will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

A) Experience and Qualifications - 50 Points

- The proposal should include:
 - A timeline for work completion and a detailed list of all key personnel (i.e., project manager, programmers, software engineers, etc.) working on the project.
 - Responsibilities of each person, and their availability, applicable education and experience.
 - Highlight experience with higher education, including familiarity with Banner and other similar enterprise systems, IT Governance and Business process improvement.
 - Include examples of recent engagements and outcomes
 - Provide three (3) higher education references
 - Demonstrate an understanding of and experience with a statewide, public, multi-institutional university system

B) Completeness of proposal, including engagement options- 50 Points

- The proposal should include:
 - Complete description of engagement options.
 - Clear alignment to established IT Governance goals.
 - Complete description of process and methodology to be used.
 - Identification of key deliverables.
 - Clear alignment with statement of work

Cost

While cost will not be evaluated via a point system, the offeror must clearly outline all costs associated with the engagement, including itemized cost for all services, travel, expenses, administrative costs, etc. to be provided by the contractor to complete all work under the resultant contract.

The University will use a best-value determination to select a provider who meets all other criteria outlined in this IRFP.

Proposal Format

The University wishes to discourage unnecessarily lengthy and costly proposal preparation; however, all proposals must contain the following information in the following format.

Proposals should be limited to the requested information and shall consist of four parts –

Cover Letter, Description of Proposed Engagement, Identified Deliverables, Cost and Experience and Qualifications. The proposal must include proof of having met minimum requirements. Include a letter of transmittal containing the complete name; mailing address of the firm, email address and telephone number of the contact person for the proposal. Alaska Business License number (or a statement that the offeror will obtain an Alaska Business License prior to award of contract, a statement confirming that the proposal is valid for ninety (90) days from the closing date for receipt of proposals and a statement relating to any perceived or potential conflict of interest. Send the entire Adobe PDF package, in the order indicated, to sasnedden@alaska.edu in a timely manner.

Cost Proposal

- A. **Engagement method cost proposals should be clearly broken out into each engagement method(s) being proposed.**

For example, if offer proposes both a guided self-service and an on-site facilitated engagement, costs for each method should be clearly separated.

1. Self-service:
Cost breakdown
2. On site facilitation:
Cost breakdown
3. Hybrid engagement
Cost breakdown

- B. **Break down all other costs, for example travel and per diem costs.**

Reference University travel policy at <http://www.alaska.edu/travel/>

- C. **Any additional charges for proposed follow-on activities or services.**

Appendix A: Terms and Conditions

1. INDEMNIFICATION AND HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT

- (a) The Contractor shall indemnify, save harmless and defend the University of Alaska, its Board of Regents, officers, agents, and employees from all liability, including costs and expenses, for all actions or claims resulting from injuries or damages sustained by any person or property arising directly or indirectly as a result of any error, omission, or negligent or wrongful act of the Contractor, subcontractor, or anyone directly or indirectly employed by them in the performance of this contract.
- (b) All actions or claims including costs and expenses resulting from injuries or damages sustained by any person or property arising directly or indirectly from the Contractor's performance of this contract which are caused by the joint negligence of the Contracting Agency and the Contractor shall be apportioned on a comparative fault basis; however, any such joint negligence on the part of the Contracting Agency must be a direct result of active involvement by the Contracting Agency.

2. INSURANCE

- (a) The Contractor shall not commence work under this contract until satisfactory evidence has been provided to the Contracting Agency that the Contractor can cover the requirements set forth in this provision with regard to the Contractor and all subcontractors when engaged in any work performed under this contract. A Contractor who is a state institution of higher education or a state or local government entity may satisfy the requirements of subsections (b) (2) through (4) and (c) of this provision by submittal of a certification of self-insurance which attests it is self-insured for the required coverage limits in accordance with the laws of the state in which it is established.
- (b) Without limiting Contractor's indemnification, it is agreed that Contractor shall purchase at its own expense and maintain in force at all times during the performance of services under this agreement policies of insurance (or the Contractor shall maintain self-insurance if certified in strict accordance with subsection (a) of this provision) covering the following types and limits:
 - (1) Workers' Compensation Insurance: The Contractor shall provide and maintain, for all employees of the Contractor engaged in work under this contract, Workers' Compensation Insurance as required by the laws of the state where the work is to be performed. The Contractor shall be responsible for Workers' Compensation Insurance for any subcontractor who directly or indirectly provides services under this contract. This coverage

must include statutory coverage for states in which employees are engaging in work and employer's liability protection not less than \$100,000 per person, \$100,000 per occurrence. Where applicable, coverage for all federal acts (i.e., U.S.L. & H and Jones Act) must also be included.

- (2) Comprehensive (Commercial) General Liability Insurance: With coverage limits not less than \$1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence and annual aggregates where generally applicable and shall include premises-operations, independent contractors, products/completed operations, broad form property damage, blanket contractual, and personal injury endorsement.
- (3) Comprehensive Automobile Liability Insurance: Covering all owned, hired, and non-owned vehicles with coverage limit not less than \$500,000 combined single limit
- (4) Professional Liability Insurance: Covering all errors, omissions, or negligent or wrongful acts of the Contractor, subcontractor, or anyone directly or indirectly employed by them, made in the performance of this contract which result in financial loss to the Contracting Agency.

Limits required per the following schedule:

Contract Amount	Minimum Required limits
Under \$100,000	\$100,000 per occurrence/Annual Aggregate
\$100,000--\$499,999	\$250,000 per occurrence/Annual Aggregate
\$500,000--\$999,999	\$500,000 per occurrence/Annual Aggregate
\$1,000,000 or over	Negotiable--Refer to Contracting Agency, (Specific Limits are set forth as Alterations in General Provisions).

- (c) Coverage shall be maintained for the duration of this contract plus one year following the date of final payment. Failure to comply with this provision may preclude other contracts and agreements between the Contractor and the Contracting Agency. Where specific limits are shown, it is understood that they shall be the minimum acceptable limits. If the Contractor's policy contains higher limits, the Contracting Agency shall be entitled to coverage to the extent of such higher limits. Certificates of Insurance must be furnished to the Contract Administrator prior to beginning work and must provide for a 30-day prior notice to the Contracting Agency of cancellation, non-renewal, or material change. Failure to furnish satisfactory evidence of insurance or lapse of the polity is a material breach and grounds for termination of the Contractor's services.

Scope of Work (SOW): IT Governance Review and Improving the Speed of Administrative Business Process Solutions

This SOW outlines the scope and anticipated outcomes for consulting services to assist the University of Alaska in improving IT Governance and administrative business processes throughout the UA system. The successful vendor will identify specific activities needed to make these improvements.

Background:

The University of Alaska, (UA) is a public university system made up of three universities and a system-wide (SW) office.

The system-wide IT department reports to the President of the university system and is led by the system's Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO). The SW office is responsible for, among other things, system-wide Information Technology (IT) services such as wide area networking, ERP (Banner) services, coordinated software licensing, video conferencing, directory, data center and similar services for itself and other universities.

The three universities also have central IT staff and deliver specific local area network (LAN), metro area network (MAN), telecommunications, Learning Management Systems, specialized software support, desktop support and similar services for their respective campuses. The IT departments at each university are led by a Chief Information Officer responsible to the local users and their respective campus leadership.

Distributed IT exists outside of the central or core services. Half of the university's investment in technology occurs outside the system-wide or central IT departments.

There is general dissatisfaction with the pace at which the University specifies, implements, maintains and optimizes technology at UA for improved administrative processing. There are several examples of low and slow project completion history for system-wide collaboration efforts. UA needs to improve its business process management. The current governance structure is complex, not consistent, missing key components and needs to be modernized. There is a perceived inability to access, develop or change the enterprise systems in order to increase the number of projects in progress and improve the speed at which they are completed.

The UA administrative/IT governance basic framework can be referenced here:
<https://www.alaska.edu/pmo/governance/> It may not reflect current practice in all areas.

UA desires an examination of the current processes for IT governance and specific actionable recommendations to implement a process that improves the development and implementation of changes to administrative systems.

Plan Description:

UA is seeking a consultant to conduct an assessment of enterprise systems and governance to improve access and operations. This must include a specific focus on the speed at which business solutions are developed and implemented within the UA System.

1. Enterprise systems need to provide the best service possible to campus customers. A review of systems should include Ellucian/Banner, PeopleAdmin/Uakjobs, OnBase and may be expanded to examine other systems.
2. The university needs a governance model that supports both enterprise platforms and unique or specific campus business processes.
3. A review of the decision-making framework and processes which we use to implement solutions must ensure decisions are made at the appropriate level so that enterprise administrative/IT projects fit the mission and needs of the Universities and are completed in a timely manner. This should ensure a higher level of user satisfaction with products and processes as well as a greater number of projects brought to completion.
4. A future governance implementation plan should include activities currently performed by: the IT Executive Council (ITEC), Banner General Functions Council (GFC), Banner Coordinating Team (BCT), Portfolio Management Team (PMT), Project Management Office (PMO), Chief Information Officer (CIO) Management Team (CMT), OnBase Governance and Implementation Team (OGIT) and any other enterprise administrative or IT related governance group focused in Finance and/or Human Resources. The governance structure must consider which groups are strategic/decision-making, which should operate in an advisory capacity and how projects are managed. The structure must allow for small and large (campus-based or system) projects to be completed in a timely manner. Functional owners and groups must support the reformed governance structure consistent with the level of service need.

Following are benefits UA expects from the review process:

Process Benefits of Governance

1. Alignment with a standard or framework (e.g. COBIT, ITIL, ISO)
2. Alignment of administrative/IT priorities with institutional strategy
3. Enhanced stakeholder engagement and satisfaction
4. Improved accountability for the quality of administrative/IT services
5. Improved delivery of administrative/IT projects
6. Reduction of risk over time
7. Transparency into the administrative/IT decision making process
8. Timely decision-making to avoid unnecessary delays
9. Improved implementation and execution of new business solutions
10. The ability to access and affect meaningful change to systems/processes
11. Coordination with distributed IT solutions

Financial Benefits of Governance

1. Better utilization and alignment of limited administrative/IT resources on priority initiatives
2. Identification and reduction of redundant systems, hardware and services
3. Alignment of application portfolio and infrastructure with financial investment strategy
4. Establishment of policies to manage administrative/IT procurement and spend

Timeline:

Time is of the essence. It is expected that the first draft of any report would be available no later than **March 2015**.

Process and Methodology:

Respondents should clearly articulate their process approach to such and engagement to include:

1. Standards and framework(s) utilized
2. Type of Engagement: self-help tools, on-site, or blended approach to engagement in order for UA to choose the appropriate level of engagement
3. Timeframes anticipated for such work
4. Sample deliverables from previous work
5. References of clients for whom you have performed similar work

Key Deliverables:

Upon completion of the engagement, UA expects the following deliverables:

1. Current state assessment
2. Common IT Governance objectives and metrics for UA
3. Design of an appropriate IT Governance Framework for UA with Roles and Responsibilities
4. An Implementation and Communication Plan/Roadmap
5. Implementation of an IT Governance Decision-Making Process

Ownership:

All material produced in whole or in part under this contract shall remain the property of the University of Alaska during and after completion of the contract.

Questions regarding this IRFP should be addressed to:

Scott Snedden, Senior Contracting Officer
sasnedden@alaska.edu
Phone: 907.474.7787