Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Business Enhancement System Transformation (BEST) Project  
Community College Advisory Team (CCAT) Meeting  
April 29, 2016 – Time: 9:00 AM – 11:30 AM  
Location: EC-296

MINUTES

Attendees: See Attached.

INFORMATION

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Paul Landry, BEST Project Director, welcomed all CCAT members. Members introduced themselves.

II. BEST RFP #1563 (BEST WEBSITE)

Phillip Norris, BEST Project Administrative Analyst, previewed the BEST Project website, highlighting: RFP Documents; BEST Project communications; Community College Advisory Team (CCAT) information including member lists, and meeting materials and minutes; Business Process flowcharts for two pilot agencies; and how to subscribe to BEST Project updates.

III. CTO CONSORTIUM

Paul Landry announced the inaugural Chief Technology Officer (CTO) Consortium held on Friday, April 15, 2016, by LACOE CTO, Greg Lindner. 15 agencies were represented across both K-12 districts and community college districts. Mr. Landry urged CAT members to speak with their CTOs about attending future meetings.

IV. PROPOSALS TO RFP SCORING

Mark Kithcart, BEST Project Coordinator, highlighted key milestones achieved by the BEST Core Team over the preceding few months, including: RFP issuance on Monday, February 22, 2016; and the Vendors’ Pre-Proposal Conference held on Friday, March 11, 2016. Mr. Kithcart also covered the Proposals to RFP scoring timeline, focused on shortlisting vendors to the top two by June 20, 2016, and selecting a winner by Monday, October 3, 2016. He also identified other tasks to be completed subsequent to shortlisting and prior to vendor selection consisting of Vendor Software demonstrations and Vendor Reference Site Visits.
INPUT

V. DATA ANALYSIS - INITIAL ANALYSIS OF VENDOR MASTER FILE

Lisa-Ann Hinkson, BEST Project Implementation Expert – Financials, provided an initial analysis of the Master Vendor File of one BEST Project pilot district. She outlined three (3) top findings consisting of: duplicate vendors, inconsistent naming conventions and a lack of vendor record purging/archiving. Ms. Hinkson outlined why these issues were occurring and identified suggested industry best practices to correct these issues. The PowerPoint presentation is included below.

VI. SOFTWARE DEMOS – SUMMER 2016

Paul Landry announced that district staff will have the opportunity to participate in the Shortlisted Vendor Software Demonstrations this summer; district staff will be invited to view the software demonstrations in person or via live stream, and provide feedback via a survey that will be incorporated into the final vendor proposal score. Vendor demonstrations are projected to occur between August 1 and September 16, 2016. Once dates are finalized, notifications will be sent out via Informational Bulletin.

CCAT members were asked to provide the BEST Core Team with ideas of what they would like to see in the Vendor Demonstrations by Monday, May 16, 2016. These ideas will help form demonstration scripts developed by our ERP implementation experts that will be provided to the Vendors prior to their software demonstrations to LACOE.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP – PROCESS TO IDENTIFY WHICH AGENCIES PER WAVE

Paul Landry opened a discussion regarding the process to identify which agencies will implement the new system in which waves. Mr. Landry advised that BEST Project pilot agencies would be given priority as they have dedicated so much time and effort to the project.
VIII. LACOE/DISTRICT MOU FOR NEW ERP SYSTEM

Paul Landry advised that LACOE will need agencies to sign Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) in order to identify which districts are planning to use the new integrated ERP as their primary financial system, and which districts will interface to the new integrated ERP system for financials and use their own 3rd-party system. This MOU process must take place prior to LACOE entering contract negotiations with the chosen vendor so LACOE knows which agencies they need to license the software for.

IX. NEXT MEETING – July 28, 2016 – 1:00PM – 3:30PM – EC-202
ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Daniel Banh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>David Chiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>David Tarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Lisa-Ann Hinkson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Mark Kithcart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Paul Landry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Phillip R. Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>Ron Nakasone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Sangeeta Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Sean Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All
Welcome and Introductions

- Paul Landry
BEST RFP #1563 (BEST WEBSITE)

- Phillip Norris
- BEST WEBSITE
CTO Consortium

- Paul Landry
RFP to Proposals Scoring Status

- Mark Kithcart
Major Accomplishment:
Request for Proposal Issued 2/22/16

- Financial & HCM System - Implementation Services RFP #1563:
  - 3,200 Detailed Requirements and Sample Reports
  - Request for Project Plan and OCM Plan
  - Implementation Roadmap
  - Systems Architecture and Network Topology
  - Current PSFS and HRS Transaction Volumes
  - Cost Summary...”The Apple” for Apples-to-Apples Cost Comparison
Vendors’ Pre-Proposal Conference

- 3/11/2016 in LACOE Boardroom
- 24 Companies Represented
- Reviewed RFP and Key Appendices
- Answered Initial Vendor Questions
Vendors’ Pre-Proposal Conference

- 24 Companies Represented:
  - Oracle, Northrop Grumman, Precision Task Group (PTG), Graviton, SAP, PCGVS, Accenture, CGI, Infosys, Cherry Road, Digital Schools, Hitachi, Schafer Consulting, Infor, Cambria Solutions, SmarteTools, Vmware, Inc., Ciber, Epi-Use, Phoenix Consulting, Cognizant, Tech. Plarindra, Tyler Technologies, and PCG
RFP #1563 Next Steps

- **Integrated Financial & HCM System - Implementation Services**

**Request for Proposal (RFP) Key Dates:**

- ✓ RFP Issued on Schedule 02/22/2016
- ✓ Vendor’s Pre-Proposal Conference 03/11/2016
- ✓ Vendor’s Written Questions Due 03/22/2016
- ✓ LACOE’s Written Responses to Questions 04/08/2016
- ✗ Vendor Proposals Due to LACOE 04/29/2016
Scoring Team for BEST RFP #1563

- **BEST Core Project Team (40%)**
  - David Tarr, Rajiv Agrawal, Abir Chakraborty,
    Nkeiruka Benson, Jenny Zemeno, Michael Bullock,
    Peace Aneke

- **LACOE Representative(s) (25%)**

- **Districts Representatives (35%)**
  - **HR:** Marie Gandera, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources, Glendale USD
  - **Payroll:** Yumeka Seabrooks, Benefits & Payroll Manager, Lynwood USD
  - **Community College Representative(s):** David El Fattal, Vice President, Business Services, Cerritos College; Cynthia Moore, Director of Purchasing, Santa Monica College
WHEN:
Scoring Proposals Will Occur

- Vendor Proposals due: 04/29/2016
- Short-List to Top Two Vendors: 06/20/2016
- Select a Winner: 10/03/2016
BREAK - 10 minutes
Data Analysis - Initial Analysis of Vendor Master File

- Lisa-Ann Hinkson
# Implementation Roadmap

**Paul Landry**

<table>
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<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go Live Jan 1, 2018</td>
<td>Go Live Jan 1, 2019</td>
<td>Go Live Jan 1, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>Go Live July 1, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>FIN Wave 2</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>2019</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Go Live Jan 1, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go Live Jan 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Development, Business Intelligence (BI)**

**FIN Phase 1 – GL, AP, Purchasing, Inventory, AR, Billing, Cash Mgmt, Asset Mgmt, BI**

**FIN Phase 2 – Grants/Const. in Progress, Vendor Self-Service**

**HCM Phase 1 – Human Resources, Position Control, Payroll, Benefits, Time, Leave Mgmt, ESS/MSS, BI**

**HCM Phase 2 – On/off Boarding, Rec., Evaluations**
Software Demos - Summer 2016

- Paul Landry
LACOE/ District MOU for New ERP System

- Paul Landry
Next CCAT Meeting

July 28, 2016 - 1PM - 3:30PM
EC-202
BEST Project – Communication
Subscription to Project Updates

Receive Monthly BEST Project Updates on the 7th of each month and Periodic Informational Bulletins

www.lacoee.edu/best

Contact Information....Subscribe to BEST Project Updates
Vendor Data Analysis
Initial Pilot
Analysis of Vendor Master File
Pilot District

- Top 3 Findings
  1. Duplicate Vendors
  2. Naming Conventions (address)
  3. Vendor record purge/archive
How does it happen?

Duplicate vendors

- Vendor Name (different spelling)
- Entries including prohibited punctuation, misspellings, multiple ways of abbreviating common words, and inconsistent use of the address field.
- Existing data entry rules are not comprehensive or consistently enforced, resulting in duplicate records and inaccurate or inconsistent data
- Vendor Addresses (moves to new location)
- Buying and selling; mergers
- Relationship between Headquarters and Subsidiary
- No established practice to search for vendors before creating new records
Suggested Industry Best Practices

Duplicate vendors

1. Obtain a W-9 (request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification) from vendors prior to creating a master vendor record and making payments (regardless of 1099 Status)

2. Validate the Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) and vendor name using the free IRS TIN matching system
   - On-line Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) Matching Program Publication 2108A

3. Establish a written procedure manual to cover every aspect of master vendor file creation and maintenance

4. Restrict or limit the number of people with access to set up or change vendor records in the master vendor file
   - Initial District analyzed - 59 unique PSFS IDs for vendor creation/maintenance

5. Check or validate vendors against debarment and other government watch lists prior to vendor set-up
   - Federal – System for Award Management (SAM)
   - CA Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) DLSE Debarments – Public Works Contracts
How does it happen?
Address Naming Conventions

- How does it happen?
- No established written procedure manual
  - If there is, no real examples provided
- “Too Many Cooks in the Kitchen”
Suggested Industry Best Practices
Address Naming Conventions

1. Establish a written procedure manual to cover every aspect of master vendor file maintenance
   - Procedures for Address Naming Convention should incorporate USPS guidelines, as well as specific examples for domestic and international addresses for counties that the district does business with frequently

2. Ongoing training for staff involved in vendor maintenance

3. Training for supervisors responsible for approval of vendor records
How does it happen?
Vendor record purge/archive

- No process in place for regular vendor record purge
- Some vendors apply but never provide goods or services
- Some vendors cannot be identified because the vendor information and invoice information differ, resulting in creation of an additional record
Suggested Industry Best Practices
Vendor record purge/archive (continued)

1. Purge inactive vendors regularly. Purge or disable inactive vendor files annually using a prescribed frequency such as no activity for 15, 18, or 24 months.

2. Remove employees from the Master Vendor file and/or clean-up the Master Vendor File, to make sure that only active employees exist.
   - Initial Pilot District: The master vendor file includes 4,737 records (Active) coded as “Employee”. However, as of 03/07/16, there are only 3,213 Total Active Employees in HRS (includes FT, PT, Daily, and Hourly).
   - Removing employees from the master vendor file reduces the number of records in the master vendor file and reduces the risk of fraud.

Incomplete records and inaccuracies in the master vendor file increase the risk of duplicate, slowed, or erroneous payments to vendors; potential fines for improperly filing 1099s with the IRS.
What are your Best Practices?
Vendor Master File Maintenance
Take-Away Assignment
RFP Vendor Demos

What functionality would you like to see during the RFP Vendor Demos for the following business areas:
- Accounts Payable
- Procurement
- Contract Management