MUSC IT Review and Procurement Process

Purpose:
The IT Review process will assist in the identification, evaluation, selection, and purchase information systems and technology by state allocated funds. The Education Advisory Committee (EAC), the University Education Information Council (UEIC), or the Finance and Administration Information Council (FAIC) will review educational, administrative and financial proposals.

Rationale for the IT Review
Requests for computing hardware and software will be reviewed to insure that all financial, purchasing and institutional justifications of need are appropriately addressed. Such requests will be for hardware exceeding the capitalization limit of $5000, and major software systems. The review will also insure that hardware and software requests are consistent with the standards of the institution’s IT Infrastructure.

Goals:
• To assist the requestor in determining the most cost-effective approach to meeting a stated administrative or education support need; and
• Balancing that need with the impact on institutional infrastructure, standards, and guidelines.

Scope:
The following should be considered when determining whether the request will require approval through the established IT Governance process:

1. Cost:
   A. For IT purchases between $5,000 and $25,000, discuss with the OCIO Director of Academic and Research Computing to determine if broader information sharing/planning is appropriate or necessary.
   
   B. For IT purchases of $25,000, but less than $250,000, (the threshold requiring Board of Trustee approval), work with the OCIO Director of Academic and Research Computing to develop a brief proposal and 5-year financial analysis. (Appendix A)
   
   C. For IT purchases of $250,000 or more, work with the OCIO Director of Academic and Research to develop a detailed business plan, in preparation for full review by the Information Management Council. (Appendix A)

2. Non-cost factors
   A. Hardware and software upgrades and enhancements to existing systems generally will not require a review. IF the cost is $5,000 or over Purchasing cost thresholds a review will be required. Examples of items NOT requiring a review are:
      o Desktop computers, printers and other peripherals
      o New versions of software
      o Additional modules that expand existing system capabilities
B. Hardware and software requiring review regardless of cost:
   1. Requires support by the campus computer center
   2. Works with or uses data from existing or planned systems
   3. Introduces technology into the network or data center having the potential to damage other data or the institutional network.
   4. Systems provided by a vendor as an Applications Service Provider (ASP) to the university.

C. Systems or applications that have broad utilization across the university will be reviewed. Examples may include:
   - Evaluation Systems
   - Course/Learning Management Systems
   - Educational technologies
   - Research/laboratory management systems
   - Student Records
   - Scheduling
   - Testing/Grading systems
   - Statistical software
   - Bibliographic software

Process:

1. Basic Considerations. When evaluating IT purchases and their potential impact on the university, consider the following questions:
   - What is the purpose of the proposed hardware or software?
   - Is there similar technology on campus which can be used?
   - If there is, how does it meet your needs?
   - Is there commercial technology available that specifically meets your needs?
   - Will the commercial technology require customization?
   - Will the hardware be networked?
   - Will interfaces with other systems, either on campus or remote, be required?
   - Can your hardware/software be utilized in other areas of the university?
   - Will you require OCIO support?
     - If so, what kind:
       - Data center
       - Applications Development or programming
       - Maintenance and support
   - Will you need vendor maintenance contracts for upgrades and special support?
   - What is the quoted purchase price and yearly maintenance cost for the first 5 years?

2. For your discussion with the OCIO Director of Academic and Research Computing you will need information based on the questions above. The discussion will help determine how to proceed with the purchase and further review. If needed, you will be guided in the preparation of a business plan. The review will also indicate the appropriate Information Council for a review (UEIC, EAC, or the FAIC).
2. Proposal Development. A brief proposal or detailed business plan is required which will be presented to the appropriate Information Council and the IMC (Information Management Council).

Purchasing will require a Purchase Order for the requested equipment, software or system. The source and amount of the required funds must be included in the Purchase Order.

The business plan must list all costs (purchase/lease/maintenance/etc.) for a 5 year period. The 5 year projection is a state purchasing requirement and illustrates the total cost of ownership for the proposed purchase. (Appendix A, business plan outlines)

Systems costing $50,000 or more will need to be included in the South Carolina IT Plan. The OCIO will submit your system, specifications, and costs to the State Procurement Office.

Major purchases require individual Board of Trustees approval if the purchase was not a part of the original budget approved by the Board of Trustees.

The requesting department will develop the proposal, with assistance from the OCIO Director for Academic and Research Systems, the MUSC IT Procurement Officer and the Budget Office and technical experts from the OCIO as needed.

4. The individual/department proposing the purchase will present their business plan to the appropriate Information Council. The OCIO Director for Academic and Research Systems will determine the appropriate council and arrange the presentation. The OCIO Director will attend the presentation to support the project.

5. When approved by the council, the business plan will be presented to the MUSC Information Management Council (IMC). The OCIO Director for Academic and Research Systems will attend to support the project.

Special Considerations:

1. Expedited Review. Projects that are time-critical might require review and approval outside the IT governance process. In such cases, the OCIO Director of Academic and Research Computing should be notified as quickly as possible and request an expedited review. It will be the responsibility of the requestor to compile the appropriate information, consult with advisors, and outline the business case in preparation for an expedited review by the OCIO Director, the FAIC, UEIC or URC and the IMC as appropriate.

2. Project Tracking. The Office of the CIO will track projects that have gone through the review process. Tracking will provide information about implementation, successes, problems, actual expenditures versus projections, and other data.

3. Support and Consultation. Requestors should consult their department or college-based ITC (computer support staff) early in the process to identify technology needs. Requestors who do not have ITCs on staff, should contact the OCIO Director of Academic and Research Computing for a consultant.
The Implementation Process:

Once the project is approved and purchased, the appropriate OCIO Director will help charter an Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC). The IOC will be responsible for setting a time line for the project, set policy and procedure, and field decisions required by the Implementation Team.

The Implementation Team will be charged through the OCIO and contain applications specialists as well as users from the department(s) or college(s).

Vendor Management:

To insure that SAS70 requirement (currently called SSAE 16) will be integrated into contractual language, the OCIO-IS will ensure that:

A. Mission critical vendors provide SAS 70 (at a minimum, type I) reports annually;
B. SAS 70 reports provided by mission critical vendors are current and reviewed for any noted weaknesses;
C. The SAS 70 requirement is integrated into contractual language as appropriate for new and renewal contracts and agreements, and;
D. Follow-up action occurs with mission critical vendors on any identified weaknesses noted in SAS 70 reports.
Appendix A
Business Plan Templates

A. Business Plan – Standard Template

DETAILED BUSINESS PLAN OUTLINE
for
__________________ SYSTEM PROJECT / PROPOSAL

Date:  
Sponsors:

I. Executive Summary
   A. Supporting the MUSC Strategy  
   B. Project Summary  
   C. Financial Impact Summary  
   D. Rollout Summary

II. Market Analysis
   A. MUSC in the Current Market  
   B. Keeping MUSC at the TOP  
   C. Alternative Solutions

III. Project Management and Organization
   A. Project Overview  
   B. Project Roles and Skill Requirements  
   C. Project Governance  
   D. Organizational Framework  
   E. Project Responsibilities  
   F. Financial Plan  
   G. Determination of ROI  
   H. Expected Business Results

IV. Implementation Plan
   A. Assumptions  
   B. High level plan  
   C. Issues and Concerns  
   D. Risks  
   E. Training

V. Costs (see 5 year cost spreadsheet)
   A. Estimated Costs to Implement
      1. Software
      2. Hardware
      3. Training, installation costs
   B. Annual costs (maintenance, interfaces, etc) - overall Cost Schedule (by FY)
   C. Additional IT Personnel
D. Funding source

VI. Potential Savings
   A. Potential areas for Revenue Improvement/Cost Savings (per year)
   B. Estimated Payback period

B. Business Plan – Abbreviated Template:

Business Plan
Medical University of South Carolina
____________ (Title)____________

A document to assist in the business and strategic planning of ____________ and to establish the__________________________________________________________

Prepared by:
DATE

1. Executive Summary.

2. Needs and Demand Assessment.

3. Services Plan Component.

4. Internal and External Assessment.
   The following are Internal and External factors regarding the readiness of the institution to develop a ____________________________.
   A. Internal Factors.
      a. Organizational structure
      b. Governance
      c. Management
      d. “What is in place for the initiative to be successful?”
   B. External Factors / Internal Factors for successful implementation and use

5. Technical Plan.
   1. Applications Equipment
   2. Software
   3. Support

7. Management/Ownership

8. Financial Plan
   A. Cost Analysis and Initial costs of system
   B. Recurring Yearly Costs (Operating Costs)

10. Training and Testing

11. Operations Plan
Appendix B
The Request For Proposals (RFP)
Solicitation Outline

The following outline is for your information and guidance in the event that a Request For Proposals (RFP) is required.

I. Scope of Solicitation

It is the intent of the State of South Carolina, Medical University of South Carolina to solicit proposals for ________________________ in accordance with all requirements stated herein.

Introduction:

Background:

III. Scope of Work

The Scope of Work/Technical Specifications shall:

- Be quantified and/or structured in such a manner as to secure the best economic advantage;
- Be clearly stated;
- Be contractually sound;
- Be unbiased and non-prejudiced toward offerors;

It should be noted that the Scope of Work/Technical Specifications will eventually form the basic and governing language of the subsequent contract. Bear in mind that the actual contract document will consist solely of: The solicitation, including any amendments and/or attachments thereto, and the success offeror’s signed proposal.

The Scope of Work section must address (1) specific tasks, (2) sub-tasks, and/or (3) parameters and limitations restricting such tasks or sub-tasks which must be accomplished and/or considers by the contractor or included in the final product/report. Consequently each task should be numbered and organized in such a manner to identify it as an individual task among many.

Use the works “must” and “shall” to describe a command or mandatory condition. The writer should avoid the use of such phrases as “The contractor will”..... and “The report is to be completed by.....” to describe mandatory requirement. These, and other similar expressions, may be construed as an optional task rather than a mandatory requirement. The words “should” and “may” are to be used only to describe an advisory or permissible action accordingly. The words do not represent a mandatory condition for which contractor or offeror must comply.
IV. Information for Offerors to Submit

Indicate in this section specifically what should be included in the response. Do not ask for things you do not need or have no intention of evaluating. Be precise with your language to avoid misunderstanding. Be careful with the use of the word “must”. If a potentially good offeror fails to provide some minor item, such as a copy of licensures which could easily be provided at a later date, and the solicitation stated, “Offerors must provide a copy of their current licensures,” they could be deemed nonresponsive and therefore, not even eligible for further evaluation/award. Solicitation contents should be listed in order of importance and be reflected in the Award Criteria in the same order.

V. Qualifications

OFFEROR’S QUALIFICATION: Offeror must, upon request of the State, furnish satisfactory evidence of its ability to furnish products or services in accordance with the terms and conditions of this proposal. The Medical University of South Carolina Purchasing Office reserves the right to make the final determination as to the offeror’s ability to provide the services requested herein.

The offeror must demonstrate that he or she possesses the following qualifications:

In most instances when a Best Value Bid is chosen as the preferred method of procurement, the specialized and/or technical requirements of the service or product being procured imply a certain level of expertise, experience or skill on the part of the contractor. List the qualifications you feel are necessary to perform the Scope of Work under the part of the Best Value Bid. Will include special mandatory minimum qualifications and documentation of or information regarding qualifications to be used in evaluation. You can reference portions of Section IV Information for Offerors to Submit, to give them additional information.

VI. Cost Sheet/Award Criteria

Award will be made to the responsive and responsible bidder whose bid is determined to be the most advantageous to the Medical University of South Carolina, taking into consideration all evaluation factors set forth in this best value bid. The following criteria will be used in evaluation process.

A. Bid pricing based on items noted in Bid Response (60%)

The SCCPC mandates that the cost factor be 60% when utilizing the Best Value Bid methodology.
The other 40% will be divided among the remaining evaluation factors. Example: Technical competency of the proposed solution (20%); Reliability of delivery and implementation schedule (15%); References (5%).

The remaining evaluation factors should be developed based on each specific solicitation taking into consideration the most important factors to be weighed.