# BI Community of Practice

## Minutes for 1/27/2016

Location

KPB 131A and Video Conference

### In attendance

* Jay Eckles (co-chair)
* Dennis Hengstler (co-chair)
* Denise Haley (Training & Support subcommittee chair)
* Ed Johnson (Tools subcommittee chair)
* Allen Dupont (Policy, Standards, and Definitions subcommittee chair)
* Mozhgan Shahidi (scribe)
* Denise Gardner
* Steven Robertson
* Kriss Gabourel
* Kristen Noblit
* Desiree McCullough
* Scott Gordy
* Shawn Bryan
* Mark Savage
* Susan Lazenby (substitute for Tom Hoover)

### Absent

* Tom Hoover (substitute present)
* Ron Loewen (Resources subcommittee chair)
* John Toman
* Lisa Ford
* Les Mathews
* Mike Ebbs
* Janice Hodge
* Cyndie Nichols

### Agenda

1. Update on SITC presentation
2. SAS vs. RFP discussion
3. Potential timeline and next steps
4. Data Stewardship and Access

### Minutes

Jay Eckles called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM eastern time.

### Update on SITC presentation

Dr. Eckles provided an update on SITC meeting and the follow up from that to the CoP. He said that everyone had questions and concerns. Based on Joel Reeves and Chris Cimino’s concerns, in particular, minor revisions were made to the Strategy document which he shared with the CoP. Dr. Eckles has sent the changes to Mr. Reeves and awaits his feedback.

### SAS vs. RFP discussion

TBR officially announced an intent to award to SAS. The boilerplate includes a clause that the University of Tennessee and other State Departments may take advantage of this deal and can have the same deal as TBR has. Dr. Eckles has neither the actual RFP response nor the information on what software is included in the SAS deal. Dr. Eckles posed the question, assuming that TBR comes to terms with SAS and the terms include the rights for UT to buy SAS, would UT rather to purchase SAS or pursue an RFP to buy something else? Dr. Eckles was instructed by the CoP to pose the following questions to purchasing:

1. Generally speaking, when we buy software under a TBR or other state agency’s contract, does UT establish its own terms and conditions with the vendor, or do we just enter as a party to the other agency’s contract and we’re bound by those terms?
2. If we only bought component A through the TBR contract, do our procurement policies/practices allow us at a later date to buy components B and C from other vendors, or may we only purchase B and C through the TBR contract?

Additionally, the CoP is interested in learning why certain vendors were disqualified in TBR’s RFP process.

Contingent upon a review of the contract and answers to the above questions, the CoP as a group leans towards taking advantage of TBR’s contract rather than pursuing an RFP.

### Potential timeline and Next steps

The CoP will delay publication of an RFP. Next Monday UT will receive from TBR a copy of the RFP response from SAS. Once a contract is developed between TBR and SAS, that contract will be reviewed by the CoP. Dr. Eckles will reach out to SAS with some technical questions and to purchasing with the contract questions.

Next SITC meeting is scheduled for April. Any recommendation to purchase SAS must be taken back to SITC, though we may ask for a special meeting before April if necessary. There is a desire to have tools implemented in time for the start of Fall 2016.

### Data Stewardship and Access

Denise Haley is taking the lead on re-engaging the CoP in the Data Stewardship and Access process document. Ed Johnson suggested starting by putting together the set of people responsible for granting access to each enterprise system. He agreed to take on that task. Dr. Eckles will send to Mr. Johnson a list of suggested names submitted by Dr. Hengstler in October.

Dr. Eckles concluded the meeting at approximately 11:15 AM.