

A-1

**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD & RFP ADVISORY COMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING
MAY 29, 2009
MINUTES**

A meeting of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board and the RFP Advisory Committee was scheduled to be held at 1:00 p.m. in the Rio Salado Community College Tower at 2323 West 14th Street, Room 515, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

PRESENT

GOVERNING BOARD

Colleen Clark, President
Randolph Lumm, Secretary
Don Campbell, Member
Jerry Walker, Member
Debra Pearson, Member

RFP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Colleen Clark, Chair
Nancy Jordan
John Loreda
Diana Yazzie Devine
Charlie Vierhout
Dr. Phil Corkill – **absent**
Dr. Roy Herberger - **absent**

ADMINISTRATION

Pete Kushibab
Michael McIntier

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Colleen Clark called the Meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

A. Overview of RFP (Request for Proposal #2906-1) for Management Consulting Services for the Maricopa County Community College District

B. Quick Overview of RFP process from Director of Strategic Business Support – Mike McIntier

Mike McIntier, the Chief Procurement Officer for the District, is acting as the Buyer for this process. Mike explained how the RFP process works and that it is not normally an open process but will be as the Governing Board is involved. He stated that the audience (which includes all Board members with the exception of Colleen Clark) cannot participate. The Governing Board is considered the customer and they can only assist by helping define the scope of work, draft questions for the firms considered, etc.

There were 225 notices of this RFP sent out with only 9 firms responding. The Committee (of which our Governing Board President, Colleen Clark, is the Chair) reviewed and scored all nine proposals. The scoring system (number of points/categories) of the RFP was decided prior to receiving the proposals and none of the bidders had access to this information.

The Governing Board's role is to provide final approval of the recommendation of the RFP Committee. They cannot suggest an award to a different proposer.

C. Top Three Selections from Committee Members

At this time, Mike discussed the nine firms that responded to RFP #2906-1. The top three were: **Huron Consulting, MGT of America, and Alvarez & Marsal Public Sector Services**. Only one of the firms, **Alvarez & Marsal Public Sector Services**, has an office in Phoenix, Arizona but is based out of New York. **Huron Consulting** is based in Chicago, IL and **MGT of America** is based in Texas.

D. Comments from Board Members (and Advisory Committee)

Dr. Phil Corkill and Dr. Roy Herberger were unable to attend the meeting but sent their comments to the Buyer (attachment #1). Mr. McIntier read these comments to the other Committee and Governing Board members.

Comments from Board/Committee members:

- Agreed with comments of Drs. Corkill and Herberger
- Do firms have educational experience? (Some had listed educational clients as references)
- Are there projects that we can review?
- Charges not clearly defined in proposals.
- Since only one firm has an office in Phoenix – how will that affect charges?
- Some proposals listed 2 people involved in completing the project; others had up to 6-7 people – this would add to total cost.
 - o We need more definition of each person's involvement in this process
- Do they know how large MCCCCD is – how many employees?
- They need to see how MCCCCD functions as an organization
- How far down in the organizational structure do we want to go on outsourcing decisions? To include to the level of M & O and Groundskeepers?
- We want them to look at duplications of positions

Mr. McIntier handed out a Scope of Work from RFP Document (attachment #2) to all Governing Board and Committee members. He stated this document was taken verbatim from RFP #2906-1. After reviewing and discussing the five (5) assignments and/or categories that the RFP requests the contractor to perform it was decided to combine #1/3 and #4/5. There would now be three (3) new major categories which would help provide the proposers with a better idea of the number of people needed to conduct the project and the dollar amount.

- 1) Overall structure – including a review of outsourcing
- 2) Academic programs
- 3) Student services focus

← - - - Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Other questions/concerns of Governing Board members:

1. What options do they have for interviewing? Response: Mr. McIntier suggested a personal interview versus a telephonic one with the three finalists.
2. Would like to see more details on cost. Response: It was discussed that cost can be better defined by the proposers in response to a better defined scope of work, which will be provided in this second phase.
3. Can Board members review the proposals? Response: Mr. McIntier advised that the Governing Board is not able to review the proposals, only the RFP Committee.
4. Can we accept multiple awards (to more than one firm)? Response: It was suggested and agreed that accepting multiple bids would not be advisable in an organization as large as MCCCCD, in which each firm would need to learn all about MCCCCD in order to complete their assignment.
5. Can Governing Board and Committee discuss this via e-mail with Procurement Officer? Response: The Governing Board and the RFP committee are not able to discuss this via e-mail due to open meeting law issues.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

E. Next Steps – Colleen Clark

Mike will send out letters to the unsuccessful candidates. He will expand on the categories and also the scope of work (this will assure us that the contractors are meeting specific requirements). Once this is done and agreed upon he will request the proposers to answer each category in an interview and presentation to the RFP Committee. Each proposer will be allotted the same specified period of time to answer and interview so as not to provide one proposer the benefit over another.

Per General Counsel, Peter D. Kushibab, the Procurement Officer may send out notices/questions via e-mail but the Governing Board/RFP Advisory Committee may not respond or discuss over the e-mail system – this is a violation of the “Open Meeting Law”. A published Open Meeting would need to be held for any discussions/decisions.

The board meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.

Randolph Elias Lumm
Governing Board Secretary