Solano Community College District
Governing Board Meeting on March 31, 2010
Presented by A. Marie Young, Vice President of the Solano Community College District Governing Board
Questions, Comments & Concerns

Item 8. (b) SunGard Higher Education Contracts

<u>**Comments**</u>:

Since joining the Board in December 2006, I was led to believe that the District had set aside enough funds for the college to implement Banner. As I recall approximately $5 million dollars split between the Bond and General Fund was identified for this purpose.

Over the course of the last year or so we have continually been presented with requests for increase spending in this area from consultants (Don Mourton and others) and services by SunGard SCT. Further, at each juncture we were assured these were the solutions to getting the college on track and passing the ownership to the appropriate in-house IT staff and functional user. It concerns me greatly to see this item once again coming before the board for additional funding.

Below is a list of essential questions around this item.

1. According to the agenda item, the funding source is Bond revenue. It is my understanding that the voter approved funds for this line item were exhausted in 2008. **Please clarify what college project will not be done in order to pull these resources from the bond budget? And, why do you feel this expense is allowable? (SCC)**

2. Under the summary description of this item it states, "Fully implement the products we have purchased using best practices to move the latest version of the Banner product". **Please explain latest version of the Banner product.** Also, from my experience, system upgrades are normally handled by in-house IT staff. **Is this going to be a reoccurring expense? (SUN)**

3. Since my tenure on the board, there appears to be many risks with the implementation of Banner and continually brining in consultants to perform staff work. Risks include overextension of resources, lack of in-house trained personnel, scope creep, timely interfaces, underestimation of project completion and insufficient communication to constituents and the Board. **Please explain how contracting with SunGard SCT is going to pass ownership of implementation and project management to the staff? What is the detailed plan to include a timeline? What criteria are begin used to determine project success? If available, this should be shared with the Board. (Sun and SCC)**

4. **As a member of California Community College User Banner Group (3CBG), are there resources available that can assist the District and reduce the perceived needed services with SunGard SCT? What other Districts' has the IT staff and functional users worked with to resolve some of the challenges at no cost to the College? What would these services be and what would be the associated cost reduction? Would not the college realize a substantial savings for Banner, if we were to partner with the other 3CBG schools and thereby began to take a long awaited ownership of the system? (SUN &SCC)**

5. **Page 7 of the proposal:** The following items are of concern to me.
   a. Day-to-day management of all Banner & related systems through May 7, 2011. **Why are we proceeding without the assistance of a permanent Chief Technology Officer? How are we passing on ownership if in-house IT staff is not doing the work? (SCC)**

   b. Reliable systems maintenance & monitoring, Backup and recovery, Systems performance tuning. **Why is in-house IT staff not performing these functions? (SUN)**

   c. Under System and Technical Training-"Implementation of new Advancement solution for fundraising by the Foundation". The Foundation is a separate 501-C3 organization and therefore should not be funding such activities from their budget. If the Foundation is not funding such expense, this service should be removed as a part of this proposal, which in turn reduces the cost of this proposal. (SCC)

6. The contract states that the college will get one year and one month services at a cost of $1,036,570. **Please tell me the frequency of the staffing level support for this cost and what the staffing levels are for this cost? (SUN) Please clarify why the agenda introduction of this item states that the $1,036,570 is to be paid over a two year period yet the proposal states that the $1,036,570 is for one year and one month of service. (SCC: error. It should have said 13 months)**

7. The matter of paying for maintenance using bond funds came up a year ago and the Citizen Bond Oversight Committee and the Board were placed in a very vulnerable position. **Please clarify how the attorney feels the college can pay for the annual software maintenance agreement ($11,717) (The college will pay) using Bond revenue? Where will the funding come from in subsequent years? Where will the software cost of $80,769 come from in two years? Is there a parallel plan that identifies cost that will need to be absorbed by other budgets once this agreement ends? If so, what are the budgets and the amounts?** (Grants indirect and reallocation; reduction of consultants)

8. **Please provides more details regarding the Encompass Web Solution Service Agreement? How does it interface with Banner and who will maintain the program? (SUN) On page 5, there is a gift processing piece and I would like to know if the Foundation is paying for this expense? (SCC)**

Comment: It appears from all I have read that there is some customization of the Banner System taking place. **Do we currently have the appropriate staffing levels to manage these changes? If not, and given the current fiscal crisis at the state level how do we expect to take ownership of this system at this time? It scares me that SunGard will be managing the day to day operation of Banner and not SCC IT staff, who needs to be taking immediate ownership of Banner.**

I recommend we hire a permanent Chief Technology Officer who is a Banner expert and provide the Board with a detailed transition plan and lay out all future financial liabilities and sources to maintain a completely functional integrated Banner system. **(We will hire after the thirteen months if warranted).**

As an elected official, it is my fiduciary responsible to bring the aforementioned to your attention.

\w\Board Agenda Questions_SunGard_3-31-2010.doc

APPENDIX A – CONTINUED:

Solano Community College District

Governing Board Meeting on March 31, 2010

Presented by A. Marie Young, Vice President of the Solano Community College District Governing Board

Questions, Comments & Concerns Raised by the Board Members

Trustee Claffey: I don't think Banner has been a good success for us at all and I don't think it's prudent for us to give a no bid over a million dollar contract to a company that hasn't performed for us yet. This is a 3.5 million dollar contract that is now approaching 6 million dollars and I'm concerned about that; consultant after consultant after consultant. I like your ship metaphor, but you sound like the captain of a ship that said, "Well, I got half way across the reef, we're on the rocks right now with Banner." It's over-stretched out staff, damaged our accreditation with late reports to the state and things like that. So, I'm not in favor of this contract at all. I think it should go out to competitive bid.

Trustee Chapman: My questions would be to the management or the officials with SunGard. I came on board after Banner had been implemented. My question is if the program, let's say this was the beginning of the implementation today, ordinarily where should we be? Say, where should we have been at this stage in the game? Am I clear? Do you understand what I am asking? So let's talk about when you began the program, where should we have been by now? Honestly.

Jeff Pomponi: If I understood your question, the normal time frame for implementing the modules you're looking to implement, which are the four Banner products; Human Resources, Student, Financial Aide and Finance. The Luminous which is your Portal ODS, which is your reporting tool, is normally about a three year implementation time. That's predicated by having a fairly stable staff without having staff turnover, you've experienced some of that which clearly prolongs the implementation, but if you're asking about the general implementation time frame, I would say 36 months to 3 years for implementation.

Trustee Chapman: And it has taken us how long?

Jeff Pomponi: Well, you signed the contract back in 2006.

Trustee Chapman: 2006, so we're at our fourth year and we're looking at another 2 years. Ok. Of course the cost that has already been spent or that we've already put out and what is being asked. Are we getting assistance from SunGard based upon what we have incurred through the years to get to where we should have been? Has that been taken into consideration with this extension of a contract? As far as the additional monies that we are having to put out. Have you compromised with us anywhere along the way? Is there anything else you can do to assist us, knowing that we are over the time frame; we're beyond the time frame? And all of this is, and I don't know for sure, but I'm not thinking that all of this is because of a turn over at the college.

Jeff Pomponi: I think that the way we structure this contract, it's a fixed price contract to mitigate any cost overruns and I think it's important to go back to the previous presentations that I've given to the Board and reiterate the fact that SunGard was not the firm that was doing the heavy lifting; the consulting effort throughout this implementation process. We were doing some of the upfront training. You opted to have a third party vendor come in, to do some of that additional consulting. So to say that all of this was because of the SunGard's effort s that weren't there, I don't think it's a fair statement. So what we're trying to do with this contract and go forward perspective, is to put together a fixed price contract where we're responsible to ensure that the functionality that you're looking to implement, that you will implement it; that there's not going to be a cost overrun. There's provisions in that contract if we end up doing training that is not determined by the Solano Project team to be viable, that wasn't done in a professional manner that we'll have to that redo that over again, and we'll redo it over again on our dock, so there's not going to be the cost overrun and I think that we've worked diligently with the Solano team to put together this scope of services that clearly lays out what everyone's responsibility is. Hopefully I answered your questions.

Trustee Chapman: Yes you have and you brought up a point that might have been mentioned before, but I didn't pick up on and that was an additional firm, a third party that had a major role in this as well. Ok? Thank you.

Trustee Thurston: I'm sorry Jim; I didn't hear what you said. The other, are they modules that would go into the second—

Jeff Pomponi: Yes, they are degree works

Trustee Thurston: That has to do with our degrees, you're saying?

Jeff Pomponi: It has to do with students being able to where they are with respect to acquiring a degree or what it takes to acquire a certain degree.

Trustee Thurston: Ok.

Jeff Pomponi: It's also a valuable counseling tool. There's Banner document imaging, which is a document imaging system, will allow us to be more paperless. It will electronically record documents within the system and actually attach them to records. So when you bring up records the documents are accessible. And Work Flow is a module that allows you to automate processes that will take some of the manual effort off of the staff and be able to automatically send something from Financial Aide to Admissions & Records or to Finance and to have actions actually occur automatically when certain conditions are met.

Trustee Thurston: My question and I did ask it of Dr. Laguerre earlier is exactly what we're getting for this million dollars; over a million dollars. And as I understand it SunGard will provide a full-time project manager on campus?

Jeff Pomponi: No.

Trustee Thurston: No.

Jeff Pomponi: The project manager is not full time. The project manager will be spending a couple weeks a month on site, but it's not a full time manager.

Trustee Thurston: Ok, so I'm just trying to understand why the million dollars I guess. It sounds exorbitant especially in these trying times for us financially. I'm trying to understand what's really costing us a million plus.

Jeff Pomponi: Two major components to that is all of the functionality that has been implemented currently to date in your Banner 7 environment as well as the migration efforts to go to Banner 8, which is the new version of the Banner system. Along with, we're providing back office technical support to augment your tactical team. So the findings that we have, that we've presented to you that you have a good core group of people within the technical staff, but they were pulled in a multitude of different directions and really couldn't really spend enough time on any given particular task to get that done correctly and also to move forward with implementing new functionalities, so one of the pieces of our proposal is to provide a data base administration support, the system support, the back office support if you will, to ultimately free up your technical team to be interacting with the functional users throughout the campus and to be able to implement this new functionality.

Trustee Thurston: So they will have to be trained in that, is that correct?

Jeff Pomponi: Yes, on the new functionality, absolutely. So there's a lot of training that's going into this particular contract. Training not only for the technical team, but for the functional users; the people in your student services area, finance area, financial aid area, human resources area.

Trustee Thurston: As I was reading it appeared to me that there will be a lot of that you can call a number to get your questions answered. Is that correct? In other words say they have a problem, say HR has a problem or fiscal services has a problem. They're going to be calling on the phone to get help?

Unidentified Woman: Many of us will make calls often times to save the college money to work remotely with consultants and part of the reason we've had the challenges that we've had is because we've tried to things in a really piece-meal way to save money instead of doing them comprehensively which would have cost more. I wanted to add I've heard all kinds of criticism and compliments about the Banner project. When we very first began it, I was a classified employee and I was kind of watching my manager at the time, who was very involved in it and I was able to observe very closely a lot of the things that have taken place along the way. I don't blame people for having the criticism they have, many of us internally have the same criticisms, but now that I' m one of the people that's living and breathing this many, many hours a day, a week a month. As I said there's a small number of us here that are responsible for seeing this through and we desperately need the support to get it there. Switching to another system right now is unimaginable to those of us who have already put all of this work in to it. I kind have left your question for a moment, but just to reiterate, we do call them. We've actually worked with the rest of the team. We've all worked together to address ways to make it as cost effective as possible. Avoid actual costs that would be spent on having consultants come here and end up paying

travel expenses, hotel and all that. There are many times when we don't need to do that, where we can just work with them remotely and we've frequently done that and we intend to continue doing that. So the other thing I wanted to make sure that I highlighted is that when Banner first began the first year, a lot of things happened that probably shouldn't have for various reasons. There's lots of fingers that can be pointed in lots of directions, but those of us that are here now and are working on it are kind of the people that have come in to pick up the pieces and that speaks to why it's taken longer. I think that if you are more closely involved, all the time I want to say to the people who have very strong criticisms about Banner I wish they could come and spend a day with me because I could change their minds. It's not a terrible product at all, it's actually a really good product, but it's a very challenging product and so are all of them. We correspond with people at other schools frequently; other California Community Colleges, many, many, many also run Banner and they are happily on Banner. I say, "What did you do different?" and they did a lot different and it goes back to very early on. So it's a whole different group of people working on it now and we really are on a track to success, but we're desperate for this, to keep that momentum going.

Trustee Thurston: I just wanted to say I wasn't suggesting we go to another system. I don't think that's a very good investment of our dollars. I do appreciate the fact that you all are committed to doing this. I was just trying to get; again, you know a million dollars? It sounds like a lot of money and I just want to make sure that we're spending our money wisely.

Jim Ennis: I'd like to add on the services side, that the IT services that are being provided are going to be available to us 24/7, 365.

Trustee Thurston: I read that.

Jim Ennis: That's going to do a lot for us.

Trustee Thurston: Ok.

Jim Ennis: And we will be able to call the 24/7, 365 whenever I need them.

Trustee Thurston: When the campus goes down?

Jeff Pomponi: The majority of questions I think with the functional users there's going to be a functional consultant, trainer who's going to be out here to answer those questions. There also is what we call a customer support center and there's a hotline you can call with any issues when the consultant isn't here on site. So you have a variety of different ways you can get information back.

Trustee McCaffrey: Ok, I've got a few comments and I'm not one of those Banner fans. I've had to listen to the complaints, see the cost over-runs, the whole nine yards sitting here on this Board since the time it's been coming to us and I have nothing but the utmost respect for every single employee, for every single minute they've had to endure with this. The training, the hours that have gone into it and I know that training hours equals loss of man hours for the work that piles up when you're doing that training, I understand every bit of that. My problems are this: First off, where the money coming from this expenditure, I've seen several different figures. I've seen 1.8, 1.6 and now I'm seeing 1.36 million. I

respectfully disagree with taking it from the Measure G fund to pay for something that should have already been done and finished. When this project was presented to us, it was presented to us with a 3.5 million dollar price tag. I thought that was steep at the time and I voted "No". I now see the figure sitting close to 5.5. I understand SunGard reps saying that we decided to go with third party consultant; the third party consultant when presented to us was cheaper, we went with what was cost savings. But still we're looking at a 63% cost over-run from the original price tag and now we're going to pay for it out of the Measure G fund. This is not what was represented to the tax-payers number one; on the original Measure G Bond ballot this expenditure was nowhere on that. We have projects that are listed on that that aren't getting done, that will not be getting done, but yet we're going to take even more money out of that, which means more projects won't get done out of the Measure G project and I have a problem with that, that just means we'll have to pay more money if it comes to that point. I mean the way it seems to me is, "Hey! You got the old version, but hey here's the newer version. It's going to work better and fix all your problems, but hey here's the price tag for it!" and to me that's a no dice thing. We can get into a lot of the "he said, she said", representations of whatever's happened over the years, I just see the numbers, they speak for themselves. 3.5 was the original figure, we're at 5.5, that's a 63% over-run cost above the original figure. Now we're going to add another million to it and I'm not with it. To truly sit here and say, "Hey I know what we need and I know we need to fix this", but I don't think this is the right way and I especially don't think at that price; it's ridiculous. And we've had to lay people off and yet we're going to take 1.36 million and not finish projects and you know, do something that should have already been done. That's the way it was represented and that's what was sold to us and it's not happening folks. I'm not happy with it and I haven't been happy with it. When I see people working overtime or coming in on the weekend, you know people have families. There's no other way to put it, but it's BS to me and that's the way I stand on it.

President A. Marie Young: Since joining the Board in December 200, I was led to believe that the District had set aside enough funds for the college to implement Banner. As I recall approximately $5 million dollars split between the Bond and General Fund was identified for this purpose. Over the course of the last year or so we have continually been presented with requests for increase spending in this area from consultants (Don Morton and others) and services by SunGard SCT. Further, at each juncture we were assured these were the solutions to getting the college on track and passing the ownership to the appropriate in-house IT staff and functions user. It concerns me greatly to see this item once again coming before the Board for additional funding. According to the agenda item, the funding source is Bond revenue. It is my understanding that the voter approved funds for this line item were exhausted in 2008. Please clarify what college project will not be done in order to pull these resources from the Bond budget? And, why do you feel this expense is allowable?

Dr. Laguerre: We do consult with the Bond attorney to tell us wither or not that this project is allowable under the Bond. In terms of what project will not be done to pull these resources together the Board was presented with a list of projects (meeting at Vallejo) where there was re-prioritization of some of the projects and there is extra money left in the Bond after these projects are done and this is where the funding will come from. In addition we have added this to the potential expenditure for Measure G. No project that you have approved will suffer from this.

President A. Marie Young: Under the summary description of this item it states, "Fully implemented the products we have purchased using best practices to move the latest version of the Banner product". Please explain latest version of the Banner product. Also, from my experience, system upgrades are normally handled by in-house IT staff. Is this going to be a reoccurring expense?

Jeff Pomponi: As far as your statement about the upgrades being done by in-house IT staff, that is a correct statement, after the caveat that it's done after you've gone through the initial implementation. What we're trying to accomplish with this particular contract is to get you to the point where you are self-sufficient. Now, I want to address the issue with regards to upgrades. I can't make the statement that there won't be any further training expense with new upgrades that happen in the future. There could be things that change from the State, like PERS and STIRS processing, to the retirement program. There could be changes and there probably will be changes on Federal Financial Aide. So there's various things, various mandates from the federal government or for the state of California that we have to incorporate into the Banner system to make sure you're in compliance with that. Now will that require training? Some of it will, some of it won't, but I can't make the statement that there won't be any further training.

President A. Marie Young: So the question is, is this going to be a reoccurring expense and the bottom line is probably yes.

Jeff Pomponi: I could, but not to the extent that you're going through right now with regards to this migration effort because your technical team is going to be is going to have the proper knowledge transfer from us through that migration effort. There could still be some training on the functional aspects of those enhancements that are getting incorporated into the product. Did I answer your question?

Trustee Chapman: If we were where we want to be or should have been at this stage in the game; you shared with us the update number 8, if everything was in place and the implementation of that update was needed right now, how much would it cost us? Because when you get your 9, that's where we would be expected to pay again.

Jeff Pomponi: I don't have those numbers right off the top of my head.

Unidentified Woman: The people who have well trained staff at other California Community College's who've gone through similar upgrades might use us for remote back up, might use us for a little bit of training, but it's nowhere near the scale we're proposing tonight.

Trustee Chapman: Right, but what would that approximately cost us?

Unidentified Woman: Anywhere from a couple thousands to maybe 5 or 6 thousand or a little more if they need more training.

President A. Marie Young: Since my tenure on the Board, there appears to be many risks with the implementation of Banner and continually bringing in consultants to perform staff work. Risks include overextension of resources, lack of in-house trained personnel, scope creep, timely interfaces, underestimation of project completion and insufficient communication to constituents and the Board.

Please explain how contracting with SunGard SCT is going to pass ownership of implementation and project management to the staff? What is the detailed plan to include a timeline? What criteria are begin used to determine project success? If available, this should be shared with the Board.

Jeff Pomponi: What SunGard is going to be doing is provide the expertise to assist us with establishing the correct process and procedures. The best practices in regards to supporting and managing in the Banner environment. This is a task that really has eluded staff to limitations and limited resources created by many of the risks that you have, like employee turnover and workloads. There is a transition plan that will be developed for the entire project including timelines and we'll be happy to share them when we get them done, it's the first part of the project. The plan will contain milestones against which we can measure our success.

President A. Marie Young: As a member of the California Community College User Banner Group, are there resources available that can assist the District and reduce the perceived needed services with SunGard SCT? What other Districts' has the IT staff and functional users worked with to resolve some of the challenges at no cost to the College? What would these services be and what would be the associated cost reduction? Would not the college realize a substantial savings for Banner, is we were to partner with the other 4CBG schools and thereby began to take a long awaited ownership of the system?

Jeff Pomponi: Our experience in partnering with other schools is has resulted in limited success. Most schools do it differently than we do and; therefore, it's difficult to take advantage of something someone else has done. We have done it. We continue to do it, but being able to take advantage of that environment to do a project of this size, just is not possible. No other school is going to be able to give us that level of support. We did bring that up in one of our pretensions about utilizing the full depth and breadth of the California Community College client base. There is a lot of knowledge out there. To Jim's point, there are a lot of other school's out there that go through a detailed implementation. They use them to find out unique things they have done, it was at a California Community College client meeting where Kern Community College did a presentation on the MIS reporting that they did for the state; those types of things, but it's not meant to replace the whole implementation process and training process that you're going through now.

President A. Marie Young: Page 7 of the proposal" The following items are of concern to me. a. Day-to-day management of all Banner & related systems through May 7, 2011. Why are we proceeding without the assistance of a permanent Chief Technology Officer? How are we passing on ownership if in-house IT staff is not doing the work?

b. Reliable systems maintenance & monitoring, backup and recovery, systems performance tuning. Why is in-house IT staff not performing these functions?

c. Under System and Technical Training-"implementation of new Advancement solution for fundraising by the Foundation". The Foundation is a separate 501c3 organization and therefore should be funding such activities form their budget. If the Foundation is not funding such expense, this service should be removed as a part of this proposal, which in turn reduces the cost of this proposal.

Dr. Laguerre: I think we already explained that our in house IT staff will be trained by the SunGard people, so at the end of the project our folks will take over because they'll have the time to go through the training for SunGard. In terms of why we aren't doing this with a permanent Chief Technology Officer; I just want to share with the Board that you are aware that we do have severe financial difficulties. In order for this task to be done, I need to provide the support the staff needs to be trained. For example, I cannot expect the Admissions staff to every bit of work they need to do as well as be trained in the system. I need to find the funding necessary to provide back-up for the staff to be trained. Therefore I will bring to you a request to extend Jim Ennis as Interim CIS, until the project is done, so I can use the savings in the amount of $118,000 to provide back-up so they can be trained, so that as Trustee Claffey suggested to me, they can go to other Banner schools to see how Banner is being implemented. When they are having difficulties they can take a couple of days off to go to that and not worry about having to come back to work and having work piled up on them. That is the reason why we are not doing it with the permanent person, but we strongly believe that with Jim with us, he will have the knowledge of Banner and will help us with the CI. Jeff I'll give you the second one.

President A. Marie Young: So you're saying for A, it appears that we may not be able to take over ownership IT staff until the end of the 13 month period is over with, then we should be able to take over the ownership of SunGard when we see things going wrong in certain areas. Other than that at what stage should we be able to take over full ownership of this project? Without having to have someone on board from SunGard?

Jeff Pomponi: I'll respond to that. The idea that SunGard will be the only people involved in ownership and operation in the IT environment is not valid. We will be actively involved with everything that occurs. We will be consulting, we will be training all during the 13 months and then towards the end of the 13 months there will be a transition period where it will all come back to our staff. We do many of these things already, we don't do these things as well as we could and we're looking to SunGard to help us put in place the processes and procedures and automation tools that will help us to be able to deal with them and deal with them well at the end of the 13 months.

Dr. Laguerre: The question is why we are supporting the foundation. Although fundraising is a function of the foundation, the foundation does play a role in that at the college and I don't know of any institution that has not incorporated their advancement module into the regular operation. Furthermore, this module is going to help us with alumni, it's not just fundraising. It will also help us with grants, so it's not something that we are doing for the foundation, but rather it's a piece of software that we need to operate the college and get resources for the college. And the Board president it here in case you want to make any comments on that.

Board President of the Foundation: When the Board decided to move forward with the institutional advancement model, which is different than (unintelligible) dependent on the kindness of strangers and the kindness of volunteer coordinators for programs such as our Foundation, it said to me and the rest of us in the community that the college is serious about moving forward to get special endowments, alumni, gifts; dependent on grants that are available throughout the country with resources and such. With that said, we're serious about moving forward to do some work on behalf of the college. The

foundation itself is a membership organization, maybe not a membership, but it's made up of volunteers who augment; who support the college overall. (Unintelligible) So having access to tools is imperative to us as a volunteer organization, but our access to tools, our access to what the college has overall whatever the function or focus is supportive. We're supporting whatever the college is trying to get done we're trying to talk about institutional advancement and put a model in place. We can't get there without the proper tools, we can't get there without the proper access. To just be able to have the information, but I understand. I'm not a Banner expert (unintelligible recording) I've tried to stay out of this discussion about Banner. All I know is that I run around like a chicken with its head chopped off, with respect to Mr. Ennis, I ask him, "Can I get these files? Can I get access to these grants?" We just cannot function and the staff is in place, it's not just going to be for us, it's going to be for the staff. (Unintelligible recording)

Board President A. Marie Young: The contract states that the college will get one year and one month services at a cost of $1,036,570. Please tell me the frequency of the staffing level support for this cost and what the staffing levels are for this cost? Please clarify why the agenda introduction of this item states that the $1,036,570 is to be paid over a two year period yet the proposal states that the $1,036,570 is for one year and one month of service.

Jeff Pomponi: Yes, the staffing level of the people that are going to be coming in to do training, we call those our functional trainers. Those are the ones who actually come in and are subject matter experts that are going to be training you on the new functionality that you have not yet implemented. So, we actually have a project plan that we've put together that lays out when those people are going to be here to provide that particular training. Besides the project manager sitting in the back of the room, he's been interacting with the steering committee and project team. He's going to be providing the project management leadership throughout this implementation process and we'll also have the services that Josh provided a presentation to you which was on the back office technical support, the 24/7 technical support. There are a variety of people who are involved in that; DBAs, network people, who are actually providing remote services to Solano in a 24/7 time period. So there are a lot of different people with a lot of different responsibilities who will be interacting with people on this 13 month project.

Board President A. Marie Young: The matter of paying for maintenance using Bond funds came up a year ago and the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee and the Board were placed in a very vulnerable position. Please clarify how the attorney feels the college can pay for the annual software maintenance agreement? Where will the funding come from in subsequent years? Where will the software cost of $80,769 come from in two years? Is there a parallel plan that identifies cost that will need to be absorbed by other budgets once this agreement ends? If so, what are the budgets and the amounts?

Dr. Laguerre: Trustee Young, members of the Board, you are correct about the maintenance, that's something that the college needs to pay out of other funds and the Bond fund. In terms of how we're going to continue to do this, we are as you know, aggressive at getting grants. So we'll help with costs with those grants, as well as allocation in our budget and a reduction in consultant fees and strategies that I have to use in order to support that in the future.

Board President A. Marie Young: Please provide more details regarding the Encompass Web Solution Service Agreement. How does it interface with Banner and who will maintain the program? On page 5, there is a gift processing piece and I would like to know if the Foundation is paying for this expense. It appears from all I have read that there is some customization of the Banner System taking place. DO we currently have the appropriate staffing levels to manage these changes? If not, and given the current fiscal crisis at the state level, how do we expect to take ownership of this system at this time? It scares me that SunGard will be managing the day to day operation of Banner and not SCC IT staff, who needs to be taking immediate ownership of Banner. I recommend we hire a permanent Chief Technology Officer who is a Banner expert ad provide the Board with a detailed transition plan and lay out all future financial liabilities and sources to maintain a completely functional integrated Banner system.

Katherine Williams: The piece of that software is not purchased, you actually subscribe to it. The other beautiful thing about it is the software is a service, so it's maintained and implemented specifically for Solano, by this company of ours. It is a separate agreement, it's not on SunGard paper, but it is completely integrated with Banner. So, we showed it to some of your foundation folks, and it's the piece that will allow; it is very calm and very easy. It collects the data and sends it right back to Banner and all the financial pieces can fall into place.