University Medical Center of Southern Nevada
Governing Board Audit and Finance Committee
Special Meeting
June 3, 2015

UMC Conference Room I/J
Trauma Building, 5th Floor
800 Rose Street
Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada
Wednesday, June 3, 2015
4:30 p.m.

The University Medical Center Governing Board Audit and Finance Committee met in special session in Conference Room I/J, UMC Trauma Building, 5th Floor, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, on Wednesday, June 3, 2015, at the hour of 4:30 p.m. The meeting was called to order at the hour of 4:35 p.m. by Committee Chair Eileen Raney and the following members were present, which constituted a quorum of the members thereof.

CALL TO ORDER

Board Members:

Present:
Eileen Raney, Chair (by conference phone)
Robyn Caspersen (non-voting member) (by conference phone)
Harry Hagerty (by conference phone)
Donald Mackay

Absent:
Jeff Ellis (Joined by conference phone at 4:38)
Michael Saltman

Others Present:
Stephanie Merrill, Chief Financial Officer
Mason VanHouweling, Chief Executive Officer
Cindy Dwyer, Board Secretary

SECTION 1. OPENING CEREMONIES

ITEM NO. 1 PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Raney asked if there were any persons present in the audience wishing to be heard on any item on this agenda.

Speaker(s): None

ITEM NO. 2 Approval of Agenda *(For possible action)*

FINAL ACTION: A motion was made by Don Mackay that the agenda be approved as recommended. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SECTION 2. BUSINESS ITEMS

ITEM NO. 3 Review and discuss proposals for a Consultant to assist with the process of replacing the Electronic Health Record (EHR) clinicals products, and make a recommendation to the Governing Board for final selection; and take other action as deemed appropriate. ***(For possible action)***

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED:
- Consultant Selection Process; Presentation to UMC Audit & Finance Committee; June 3, 2015
- Cordea Consulting Proposal
- Dell Services Proposal
- The Rosenberg Group Proposal

DISCUSSION: CEO VanHouweling reminded the Committee that the purpose of today's meeting was to provide more detail and clarification regarding the process to select a consultant to serve as the oversight for the process of selecting and negotiating a vendor for EHR clinicals. Four vendors were invited to submit proposals, resulting in three proposals - from Cordea Consulting, Dell Services, and The Rosenberg Group (TRG).

CIO McKinley reviewed the criteria staff used to score the three proposals, and reviewed the scoring for each proposal. He summarized that all three respondents touched all areas of the proposed statement of work, and noted that based on the proposals submitted it appeared that all three respondents could complete the statement of work. The staff recommended engaging the services of the TRG.

The Committee discussed the three criteria where the vendors differed in scoring.

- "Ability to Support": Mr. McKinley explained that TRG was scored higher because they are a local vendor, and able to support at a moment's notice, while the other two vendors are located out of town and would be allowing for travel time during the regular work week

- "Methodology": Mr. McKinley explained that Dell scored higher than the other two vendors because in their proposal, Dell's response to methodology was more detailed than the other two proposals.

- The prices were: $1.45 million for Dell, $1,000,050 for Cordea, and $669,000 for TRG.

There was discussion about utilizing a smaller company verses a larger company with more resources. It was noted that one individual would provide continuity, whereas a larger group utilizing several individuals may lose some continuity in the project. It was also noted that a larger group would have more depth to cover over a long period of time. CIO McKinley reminded the Committee that the consultant would not be overseeing the implementation of the EHR, only the selection and negotiation of a vendor, as well as oversight of change management. The implementation phase will have a separate consulting group.

The Committee was unable to reach a consensus to select a vendor, and concluded that due to the magnitude and expense of the overall project they needed additional time to review the proposals in detail and be more involved in the selection process. They gave staff direction to invite the three vendors to meet with the Committee next week during a publicly posted meeting to discuss their proposals. CIO McKinley will request that each of vendors send the actual individuals that would be staffing the project. A list of approximately ten questions will be established with input from the Committee members, to ensure that each vendor is asked the same questions. CIO McKinley was asked to include questions related to those areas considered most important in the project, specifically those areas in which the hospital didn't succeed in the previous engagement.

<u>FINAL ACTION</u>: No action.

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC:

At this time, Chair Raney asked if there were any persons present in the audience wishing to be heard on any items not listed on the posted agenda.

SPEAKERS(S): None

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, at the hour of 5:26 p.m., Chair Raney adjourned the meeting.

MINUTES APPROVED: ____________________