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Dear Ms. Merryman,

We are pleased to submit on behalf of Huron Consulting Services LLC (“Huron”), our response to the University of Kansas’ (“the University”) Request for Proposal for Organizational Consulting Services for Strategic Transformation of Administrative Services (RFP #87198).

We appreciate our prior opportunities to have served the University of Kansas with operational, technology and financial initiatives. We have thought seriously about Kansas’ current situation, its goals, and the challenges the University faces in achieving them, and we applaud this initiative to help the University improve its administrative effectiveness and efficiency to better support the mission activities of education, research, patient care and public service. We are excited about the potential opportunity to partner with you on an initiative that can bring so much return to the University!

As demonstrated in our proposal, we possess the full spectrum of attributes to support your efforts – including an extremely seasoned team with extensive experience in all aspects of the functions included in this assessment, a track record of developing collegial working relationships at all levels of your organization, and proven approaches to facilitating successful implementation. Our business is your business, and we are passionate about the opportunities to help universities succeed in transforming their organizations to achieve greater service levels, efficiencies and ability to invest in the education, research, clinical and public service missions.

As you evaluate Huron’s response, we have summarized the key attributes that make Huron uniquely qualified to partner with the University of Kansas on this important initiative.

- **Our experience in Higher Education**, including our work with more than 85 of the top 100 research universities in the United States, numerous academic medical centers, and previous projects with the University of Kansas including F&A cost rate assistance, PeopleSoft assistance, an IT assessment, and assistance with the implementation of SciQuest procurement software. We are proud of the successes our clients have achieved with our assistance and we encourage you to reach out to them.

- **The vast experience of our team**. The team of project leaders and senior staff that we will bring to this engagement have more than 150 years of collective experience dedicated to serving universities across all functional areas. Moreover, we can and will draw upon expertise of others both within and outside of our organization to provide the most comprehensive services available to meet your needs.

- **Our methodology and approach to ensure solutions can and will be implemented**. The initial focus of our approach is to identify fact-based opportunities to solve your most pressing issues, but our process prioritizes the development of sustainable solutions that are grounded in the realities of your operating environment. This approach to project delivery is what will make the Kansas-Huron partnership so successful.

- **Our many successful partnerships with you**. As a result of working with the University on a variety of engagements across various business functions, we understand how to work in your environment, the need to engage directly with your personnel, and the best means to achieve sustainable, meaningful change.

On behalf of Huron, we very much appreciate the opportunity to submit this response to RFP #87198.

Sincerely

Shandy Husmann
Managing Director
Transmittal Letter Requirements

All bidders shall respond to the following statements:

(a) Vendor is the prime contractor and identifying all subcontractors;

Huron is the prime contractor on this proposal. Marlon Lynch and Robert Hascall will be subcontractors.

(b) Vendor is a corporation or other legal entity;

Huron is a publically-traded corporation and organized as an LLC.

(c) No attempt has been made or will be made to induce any other person or firm to submit or not to submit a proposal;

No such attempts have been made.

(d) Vendor does not discriminate in employment practices with regard to race, color, religion, age (except as provided by law), sex, marital status, political affiliation, national origin or disability;

We comply with this statement.

(e) No cost or pricing information has been included in the transmittal letter or the Technical Proposal;

No cost or pricing information is in the transmittal letter or Technical Proposal.

(f) Vendor presently has no interest, direct or indirect, which would conflict with the performance of services under this contract and shall not employ, in the performance of this contract, any person having a conflict;

We have no such conflicts.

(g) Person signing the proposal is authorized to make decisions as to pricing quoted and has not participated, and will not participate, in any action contrary to the above-statements;

The person signing the proposal is authorized and complies with this requirement.

(h) Whether there is a reasonable probability that the vendor is or will be associated with any parent, affiliate or subsidiary organization, either formally or informally, in supplying any service or furnishing any supplies or equipment to the vendor which would relate to the performance of this contract. If the statement is in the affirmative, the vendor is required to submit with the proposal, written certification and authorization from the parent, affiliate or subsidiary organization granting the University and/or the federal government the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers and records involving such transactions related to the contract. Further, if at any time after a proposal is submitted, such an association arises, the vendor will obtain a similar certification and authorization and failure to do so will constitute grounds for termination of the contract at the option of the University;

Huron is not associated with a parent, affiliate or subsidiary that would relate to the performance of this contract.

(i) Vendor agrees that any lost or reduced federal matching money resulting from unacceptable performance in a contractor task or responsibility defined in the Request, contract or modification shall be accompanied by reductions in University payments to Contractor; and

We agree, but do not anticipate federal impact with this work.

(j) Vendor has not been retained, nor has it retained a person to solicit or secure a state contract on an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, except for retention of bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial selling agencies maintained by the vendor for the purpose of securing business. For breach of this provision, the Committee shall have the right to reject the proposal, terminate the contract and/or deduct from the contract price or otherwise recover the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee or other benefit.

We comply with this requirement.
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Summary of Responses to RFP Questions

The following table identifies the sections of this proposal that respond to specific elements posed in the RFP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP Element</th>
<th>Response Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a fixed cost total for Phase I.</td>
<td>Cost Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a fixed cost total for each opportunity identified as a potential initiative for Phase II. In addition to a fixed cost, describe any other cost basis you may want us to consider for conducting this work, and methods for ensuring accountability.</td>
<td>Cost Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a listing of staff that will be assigned to the work efforts in Phase I and II and include a description of the role each person/position will play in the performance of this project.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the senior staff that would be made available to work on this engagement. Include vitae of these individual(s) which summarizes their relative experience in performing similar scope of work efforts. Also briefly describe the type of staff support these individual will have access to within your organizational structure.</td>
<td>5.2, 5.3, 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a description of continuing services that could be provided subsequent to implementation recommendations in Phase III. Include a list of relevant resources supplied by the Contractor in provision of those services</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the role of the persons/positions and their hourly fees for the ongoing work that may occur in Phase III. Note that these fees must be inclusive of any administrative support provided to these individuals by your company, and must remain fixed for the initial three years of the Agreement.</td>
<td>5.5, Cost Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you would help minimize the travel required in the performance of your work.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your most recent successes in similar work efforts, including the scope of the engagement, and the key objectives achieved.</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe why your company is best suited to perform this work.</td>
<td>2 (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the methodology, including a draft work plan and timeline, you would employ to obtain successful results. Include details of what resources would be used and examples of how you would calculate the benefit derived from your recommended improvements.</td>
<td>3 (all) 4.1, 4.2, 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe what resources you would need from the University to make this engagement the most successful in terms of providing you with necessary information, guidance, decision making, and acceptance to perform the work efficiently and effectively.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you anticipate to be the greatest challenge(s) to the University in following through on recommendations, and how is your organization poised to assist in addressing these challenges?</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your firm’s methods for each of the following: (a) process of establishing a statement of work; (b) estimating the cost of work required for a project; (c) tracking costs while working on a project; (d) communicating a project’s technical progress and cost status during all phases of a project.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your firm’s efforts to improve efficiency within your organization and how the suggestions your firm has made to other organizations have been implemented within your firm.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information on how your firm demonstrates efficient practices within your organization.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a brief (less than one page) general history of your firm. Provide the last three (3) years of audited financial statements including a profit and loss statement and a Balance Sheet. The University will determine internally the financial stability of respondents to this RFP process.</td>
<td>1.2, 7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Executive Summary

This section provides an introduction to this proposal and reflects a summary of:

- Our Understanding of the Engagement Objectives
- Huron Consulting Group
- Project Overview
- Resources Required from KU and KUMC
- Most Significant Implementation Challenges

This executive summary is followed by several sections providing a detailed response to all the requirements identified in the RFP.

1.1. Our Understanding of the Engagement Objectives

The University of Kansas currently receives approximately one fourth of its annual revenue from the State. Appropriations have been flat over the last two years but potential reductions could come in FY 2012 as the ARRA funding is eliminated. We understand that the University would like to identify strategic cost reductions and service quality improvements across its administrative, financial, and operating units to sustain operations in the face of flat or declining appropriations.

Specifically, the University is interested in a substantial reorganization and streamlining of its infrastructure to achieve significant cost savings and revenue enhancements. The University is seeking a consultant to provide an independent assessment of potential opportunities. Objectives of the engagement include:

- Reduction of operating costs through more efficient use of the University's infrastructure;
- Identification of cost-reduction, revenue-enhancement and service-improvement opportunities to further the University’s missions;
- Evaluation of how effectively current administrative and business support services are delivered;
- Evaluation of funding models currently used for the University’s self-supporting units;
- Identification of opportunities to reorganize the University’s administrative infrastructure;
- Evaluation of cost saving ideas already identified by the University in light of industry best practices; and
- Creation of a roadmap to transform the University so that it operates effectively within the financial restraints that are expected over the next decade.

This engagement involves both the University of Kansas Lawrence campus, including the Edwards campus, and the Medical Center Campus in both Kansas City and Wichita. As explained in Section 5.1 (Proposed Staffing Model), Huron’s approach involves two dedicated teams which will focus on the University campuses and Medical Center campuses respectively, while working together to identify opportunities for collaboration between KU and KUMC.

1.2. About Huron Consulting Group

Huron Consulting Group is a leading provider of business consulting services to a wide variety of organizations including leading academic institutions, healthcare providers, Fortune 500 companies, medium-sized businesses, and the law firms that represent these various organizations. The firm is an independent provider of financial and operational consulting services that helps clients effectively address the complex challenges they face. Huron also helps clients deliver superior customer and market performance through integrated strategic, operational, and organizational change.

Since commencing operations in May 2002 and becoming a public company in 2004, we have conducted more than 7,000 engagements for over 3,000 higher education, public sector/government, and commercial clients. Huron has approximately 2,000 employees, which includes over 1,400 billable consultants. Huron’s service, dedication, and passion have long been appreciated by our clients and recently recognized in influential publications. Fortune magazine named Huron to its 2009 list of the 100 Fastest-Growing Companies.

The firm has conducted resource optimization and service transformation engagements for academic institutions since its inception. Huron has always been dedicated to continuous improvement efforts and we regularly identify and implement opportunities to advance the way we do business and serve our clients. We apply our philosophy of organizational improvement not only to our clients, but also to ourselves, having recently made significant changes to our organizational structure, increased the use of performance metrics, and developed and implemented processes for evaluating competing alternative requests for limited resources.
Huron is organized into three business segments: Health and Education Consulting, Legal Consulting, and Financial Consulting. For this engagement, Kansas would be partnering with our Health and Education Consulting segment. The Health and Education segment of Huron consists of the Higher Education Practice and Huron Healthcare practice. With more than 800 professionals devoted to these industries, this segment represents nearly two-thirds of the firm’s consulting staff. Below is a brief summary of each practice:

Higher Education Practice

Huron has the largest practice dedicated to serving the higher education industry. Our 200+ professionals have extensive industry knowledge and experience in a broad range of environments including Academic Health Centers, Research Universities, Colleges and Universities, Research Institutes, and International Organizations. Since our founding, we have worked with over 85 of the nation’s top 100 research institutions, various university systems, numerous academic healthcare organizations, and a variety of independent research foundations in virtually every core business function. Our professionals are nationally known for their ability to help implement practical solutions that can create immediate value in the university and academic health center environments.

Along with a thorough understanding of the operational, financial, and technical issues facing educational organizations, our team understands the culture and consensus-driven nature of the higher education environment. Our ability to integrate industry expertise with knowledge gained from a broad client base provides us with an important advantage: the ability to provide solutions that are practical and proven to be successful within the higher education environment.

As a firm, Huron has a deep commitment to higher education. Huron’s decision to maintain a dedicated Higher Education Consulting Practice assures our continued focus on working with leading institutions. Our industry focus allows us to give our client engagements our full attention and provide highly skilled and experienced resources to each project. Approximately 40 of Huron’s founding members were focused on the higher education industry and a large majority is still with the firm today, including Chief Executive Officer Jim Roth. From the top of the organization down, the employees of our Higher Education practice have a passion for serving our higher education clients.

Academic Medical Center Practice

Huron’s Academic Medical Center Practice offers an unmatched mix of expertise and experience and a reputation for delivering value. Our professionals’ experience stems from their prior roles at academic health centers and teaching hospitals. The AMC team has worked with many of the nation’s academic medical centers, assisted with the development of new medical schools in the U.S. and abroad, planned and managed building and recruitment projects, and worked in all aspects of hospital, physician practice, medical school finance, and budget management. We understand the implications research and scientific activities have on operations, we acknowledge that the provision of quality care in the conduct of research is a scholarly effort and we understand the infrastructure requirements necessary to do so.

Huron’s AMC teams helps academic medical centers and teaching hospitals plan and manage resources effectively, evaluate key performance measures and success criteria, and develop progressive organizational models that can be more responsive to the unique challenges inherent in their educational, research, and clinical service areas.

1.3. Project Overview

Section 3 of this document – Proposed Project Approach – provides a detailed explanation of Huron’s service transformation methodology. It is helpful, however, to summarize it here.

We first divide the project into three phases:

- Phase I, Assessment;
- Phase II, Business Case Development;
- Phase III, Additional Services and Implementation Support.

During the Assessment phase, the Huron team will gather information from across the KU and KUMC campuses: budgets and financial statements for all units; organizational charts and total numbers of personnel for each unit; policies governing costing and pricing, procurement, financial reporting, and the likely gaps in the requested data will be filled in with interviews. The information will then be compared to Huron’s extensive collection of benchmarking data from peer institutions in order to identify potential areas for transformation. Phase I essentially “funnels” the information into a set of promising opportunities. The following graphic provides a high-level overview:
Once promising opportunities are identified, they are prioritized and translated into actionable plans in Phase II: Business Case Development. In this phase Huron will “dig deep” into the most promising opportunities, selected in partnership with university representatives, to identify the challenges, risks, costs, and benefits to change. The table below depicts the tasks that will be performed while developing business cases:

### Business Case Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/ Business Assessments</th>
<th>Situational Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Further assess current operations including:</td>
<td>• Data collection facilitates a current state assessment through the incorporation of document requests and interviews with functional and administrative leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Acknowledged competencies</td>
<td>• Based on interviews, documents, and past experiences, opportunities are compiled and vetted to identify potential opportunities for revenue enhancement and cost reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Core operating functions</td>
<td>• Cases utilize four primary types of benchmarking to support recommendations (internal, historical, peer, and industry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Primary support functions</td>
<td>• Huron works with the University’s leadership team to facilitate peer benchmarking by selecting 4-6 peer institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and evaluate recent trends in the area operating environment</td>
<td>• A variety of tested approaches (e.g., organizational review, process mapping, cost-value mapping, financial modeling) are used to vet opportunities and determine the impact on university resources, service levels, and exposure to institutional risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review the sources and uses of resources with a focus on key drivers, including where appropriate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Revenue (price &amp; quantity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Cost (fixed &amp; variable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps &amp; Solutions</th>
<th>Situational Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Benchmarking information and data uncovered during Phase I are used to identify gaps and/or inefficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential opportunities to close the identified operational gaps are developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualitative assessments are made of each option to identify cultural and implementation considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendations are crafted to close the respective operating gaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost / Benefit Analysis</th>
<th>Situational Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting analytics are used to determine the financial impact of each recommendation, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Relevant up-front cost and one-time benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Affiliated cost reductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Incremental revenue enhancements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aside from the financial implications, assessments are made in terms of service levels and risk exposures to further justify implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Case Creation</th>
<th>Situational Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prior steps of analysis are synthesized into a complete business case providing a full description and a fact-based, data-driven rationale for change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business case deliverable components will include the current state assessment, strengths, benchmark data, recommendations for change, and benefits (financial, service quality, cultural, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the conclusion of Phase II the opportunities will be fully vetted, defined, and measured. Detailed implementation work plans may also be developed so that Kansas can begin immediately acting upon these opportunities.

Finally, Phase III, Additional Services & Implementation Support, is an open-ended set of services Huron can offer to Kansas and KUMC to expeditiously implement the cost reducing and revenue enhancing opportunities for long-term success consistent with your institutional culture and strategic priorities. These services are provided on an as-needed basis and include interim staffing, project management, and training. Huron will also help Kansas and KUMC design processes and systems to objectively measure performance to better quantify the results of University’s efforts.

1.4. Guiding Principles

The approach summarized above is formal and a necessary component of any disciplined assessment and prioritization of opportunities. But the knowledge and perspectives of the consulting team are equally important.

First, we understand that administration, finance, and operations exist to support education, patient care, and research, and that academic governance is deeply ingrained in universities. We have internalized that context so it deeply informs our work.

Second, key members of the team we propose below know universities and their academic medicine components from within through leadership positions that involve all of the areas in your project scope: we know how services can be duplicated across a campus when central offices lose touch with clients, or undergo budget reductions that weaken necessary services which then reappear in departments; we know how enterprise software development often stops short of its full workflow capabilities and thus induces multiple shadow systems; we know how organizational pyramids grow organically as promotions occur to deal with competitive compensation issues or as new titles and control layers are introduced in response to new regulations and risks. It is important to know how things got to where they are to understand the obstacles—mostly client service and trust issues—to intelligent redesign.

Third, both as leaders within and consultants working with universities, we have successfully rebalanced work among central, shared service, and departmental operations to achieve significant savings while improving services. Redesigned business processes, enhanced workflow from enterprise software, de-layered organizations and streamlined control procedures, enhanced data architecture to support management decisions; more strategic pricing through matching revenues with the costs required to produce them; service-level agreements and performance metrics to keep clients engaged—all these will feature in our work with you. But perhaps most important, our team will “walk in the shoes” of those affected by potential change to understand their work, gain their respect, and then to engage them in the development and ownership of more effective and efficient ways. In our view, implementation starts with the first interview.

And last but far from least, we know how much faculty members value the staff supporting them directly, and the kinds of concerns that will arise as administrative work is rebalanced along the local-shared service-central spectrum. We are familiar with working in this context during the change-management process.

Worthy of note as well in this overview are guiding principles affecting all phases of our work with you:

- Initiatives must be identified and prioritized in a manner that is sensitive to key aspects of the culture and mission of each campus and the University of Kansas.
- Potential reductions and reallocations will be judged on the basis of alignment with the University’s strategic priorities.
- All decision processes and criteria should be transparent, and all cost reduction decisions should be communicated clearly and systematically to all parties, including administration, faculty, staff, students, and other affected stakeholders.
- Reductions in costs in one area should not shift costs to another since this does not generate any net financial benefit to Kansas and risks creating a competitive, rather than collaborative, culture on campus.
- The revenue impact of cost reductions must be understood and estimated to the degree possible.
- Revenue generation options should be developed where feasible to mitigate potentially excessive expense reductions.
- Proposed initiatives should be supported by data driven comprehensive business cases.

1.5. Resources Required from KU and KUMC

We have found through our experience that the best way to approach change is to build consensus with the key stakeholders at the earliest stages. Our team will work with Kansas resources as a partnership in completing many of
the project tasks. With our collaborative approach, Kansas stakeholders will be the starting point to generating support, accountability, and ownership of the changes brought on by this project. Given the diverse and distributed nature of the Kansas campuses and KUMC, we have outlined several key roles that we would suggest to make this engagement successful:

- **Steering Committee**: Kansas and KUMC will each provide a Steering Committee which will consist of key administrators across campus, who will review project status, provide guidance, and validate opportunities presented. We would suggest that because many of the areas under review could have an impact on faculty, that they have representation on the Steering Committee. We envision meeting with the Steering Committee no less than once a month.

- **Project Sponsor**: The Steering Committee for each location will designate a senior administrator from amongst its membership to make or obtain all management decisions with respect to the engagement on a timely basis. Huron will be entitled to rely on the decisions of the Project Sponsor(s). Huron will be able to escalate issues that arise during the course of the engagement, e.g., lagging data collection efforts, to the Project Sponsor(s) for quick resolution.

- **Project Coordinator**: The University of Kansas will designate an employee on the KU and on the KUMC campus to work with the Project Sponsor and Huron team; this individual will be responsible for coordinating project administration, including scheduling meetings and interviews, identifying key meeting/interview participants, and assisting in the coordination of data gathering activities as needed.

Imperative to the success of an effort such as the one discussed herein is an early communication from University leadership outlining the scope of the project and its core objectives. This eases the trepidation that many across campus may feel at the prospect of meeting with “consultants.” In addition, we encourage high levels of engagement from the unit leaders and staff from the functions that will be included in the study. We work collaboratively with University personnel to optimize knowledge transfer, input, feedback and buy-in on business case for change.

1.6. Conclusion

Our experience has taught us that the initial commitment to significant change and the leadership and energy devoted to it over sustained periods of time, are the most important factors underlying institutional success. While some circumstances may warrant broad sweeping change, we have learned that lasting improvements at large research universities and their academic medicine enterprises are more likely to be achieved through a planned sequence of “digestible” and sustainable changes that sum to transformational change. In our experience, a commitment to continuous improvement, and an ongoing effort to evolve the support structure to ensure consistency with strategy and to increase effectiveness, efficiency, and flexibility are the dominant factors of organizational effectiveness. Huron has sincerely appreciated the opportunity to have partnered with the University on many strategic and operational initiatives and can assure you this engagement will receive our highest level of focus and commitment to success.
2. Huron’s Value Proposition

The following section of the proposal is intended to define the value Huron can provide to the University of Kansas and respond to the request posed in the RFP: “Describe why your company is best suited to perform this work.”

Universities are unique organizations, both in the aggregate and individually. The specter of shared governance, the heavy reliance on funding sources with significant restrictions, and the transient nature of universities’ core customers create considerable challenges that other entities do not face. When academic medicine is part of the university mix, the burden only increases. The growing shortfall of physicians and other healthcare providers, increasing demand for healthcare services as the nation’s population ages, shrinking support for medical education as Medicare funding faces further reductions, and uncertainties associated with the demands of healthcare reform contribute to a growing educational burden for these institutions. Couple those with the current plight of public universities, which include onerous state regulation and shrinking appropriations, and it is clear why many institutions are initiating significant broad-based reviews to help identify ways to promote increased effectiveness, efficiency, and flexibility.

We strongly believe that Huron is uniquely qualified to partner with Kansas to ensure this review is meaningful and successful for the following reasons:

2.1. Our Track Record in Higher Education and Academic Medicine

Huron’s experience and track record for success is unmatched in the industry. Counting more than 85 of the top 100 research institutions in the US and more than 70% of the nation’s 131 medical schools and their affiliated medical centers as satisfied clients positions us the best to meet your objectives. In addition to understanding your culture, challenges, and knowing how to partner with you, we can and will leverage the knowledge we have amassed over more than 1,000 engagements with many of your peers. Several of our leaders and advisors have served as executives at prestigious universities and medical schools across the country and our practice leaders have dealt with challenges similar to those facing the University. Through their industry and consulting experience, and the collective experiences of our 200-member strong team, we have honed a set of fundamental imperatives that we follow at each client. These include, for example, employing a data-driven approach to diagnose problems, developing a compelling underlying rationale for change, executing carefully-planned and orchestrated communications over time, and building and empowering a leadership team and core staff committed to sustaining change over the years. Without each of these elements, change efforts within the university environment can fall flat. This experience lets us more readily identify and prioritize the issues, craft meaningful and sustainable solutions, and generate the necessary engagement and buy-in across your broad base of constituencies.

Our experience enables us to more readily identify and prioritize the issues, craft meaningful and sustainable solutions, and generate the necessary level of engagement and buy-in across your broad range of constituencies. The inclusion of industry-renowned operational experts strengthens our understanding and analysis of specific issues and further enhances the value that we can provide. Moreover, our relationships with former and current clients provide us the unmatched ability to easily leverage best practices within the industry. Our satisfied clients include members of Boards of Trustees, Vice Presidents of Finance & Administration, Controllers, Vice Presidents of Research, Chief Procurement Officers, and Chief Information Technology Officers. We often find that the most meaningful information comes from an in-depth understanding of and discussions with institutions that have faced and overcome issues similar to yours. Our breadth of industry experience provides us with the ability to easily engage in those conversations for the benefit of Kansas.

Not only does Huron benefit from unparalleled experience in higher education and academic medicine, we also have deep experience in all functional areas of University operations including all the areas specifically identified in the RFP. As discussed in the methodology section of this proposal (3.1), Huron has worked extensively with university and academic health center clients in all areas identified by Kansas: Information Technology, Accounting and Finance, Procurement, Strategic Sourcing, Public Safety, Student Services, Human Resources, Academic and Non-Academic Business Services, Facilities, and Design and Construction. Additional non-academic functional areas that may be of interest to Kansas are also discussed.

2.2. Our Existing Knowledge of the University of Kansas

Huron has had a long history and successful track record in partnering with the University on a variety of technology, operational, and financial initiatives which have resulted in improving organizational efficiency and effectiveness. In the past 12 months, Huron has worked with the University of Kansas to provide strategic planning and cost efficiency analysis for KU’s Information technology services, partnered with the University to assess its Facilities and
Administrative (F&A) cost recovery rate and assisted the General Counsel with an investigation into a Financial Aid issue at KUMC.

Huron understands that KU and KUMC need resources to continue to invest in research and instruction. We appreciate that your goals for this initiative are not simply to free up financial resources, but, more importantly, to continue to proactively improve the way you do business to enable you to remain at the leading edge of education and research. We recognize that the difficulty lies in developing recommendations that resonate across the institution and, thus, are “implementable.” Huron has a successful track record of helping our clients identify and implement cost savings and revenue enhancements throughout their organizations. Our professionals understand firsthand the complexities of KU and KUMC’s operations.

2.3. Our Proven Approach & Sustainable Solutions

While we have a strong and time-tested methodology, Huron develops customized, sustainable solutions. We do not assume that we know all of the answers, but we do know that generic or anecdotal solutions will not be sustainable. We will study your operating environment and internalize your specific challenges before discussing possible solutions. While we will leverage best practices we have seen at other universities, and other clients outside of higher education, the identification of best practices alone will not support meaningful improvement.

Huron is unique in that our approach combines a deep understanding of the complex nature of university operations with an innovative and business-like approach to solving an institution’s gravest financial and operational challenges. This capability derives from the combination of our higher education experience and collective corporate and industry experience, which are further supplemented by our advisors and operational experts. This breadth of expertise has provided us with a keen sense of how to identify improvement opportunities and, more importantly, how to develop and deliver recommendations that are comprehensive, cognizant of your environment, and, accordingly, implementable. Our approach to project management, detailed in section 3.4, helps ensure that these recommendations are developed in an effective and efficient manner within the project budget and timeline.
3. Proposed Project Approach

Huron’s approach to service transformation projects has been successfully deployed at numerous institutions. In the initial phase opportunities are identified through intensive review of internal operations and benchmarking against peer institutions. These opportunities are prioritized and transformed into detailed business cases, including implementation plans, during the second phase. The third and final phase provides implementation support to help ensure successful change.

### Project Approach Diagram Showing All Three Phases of KU/KUMC Engagement

**Phase I: Assessment**

Huron utilizes a proven approach to service transformation engagements, described below, to provide the best results to our clients. We will employ this approach for the Phase I work at Kansas.

The Huron methodology will include a discovery and benchmarking approach that is designed to help Kansas and KUMC quickly identify the areas that hold the greatest promise, so that additional efforts can be focused on the “best” opportunities.

**Step 1: Launch**

We will begin this engagement with a kick-off meeting with the Kansas Steering Committee and Project Sponsor to confirm the project objectives, scope, approach and timelines. We will work collaboratively with the Project Sponsor to develop the project charter and plan and determine how to best align Kansas’ resources in areas critical to the review and analysis during this step of Phase I.

**Step 2: Discover**

The Discover step will be grounded in data and includes elements of team integration, data review, data interpretation and interviews, and benchmarking. Following the kick-off, we will submit to KU and KUMC a detailed data request seeking information related to every aspect of the areas in scope: from the University’s governance structure to its many policy and procedure documents; its organization charts, budgets, and personnel associated with in-scope units; its
current array of software applications; and additional relevant operating data.

This step will incorporate benchmarks as foundational indicators of operating performance. Huron will leverage our vast university and academic health center experience, including our repository of findings at previous clients, our knowledge of industry best practices honed through hundreds of engagements and participation in industry conferences, and a variety of public data sources and university/public sector association data sets to provide a data-rich and comprehensive assessment of your operations. This will not only serve as the baseline from which we will develop opportunities and provide recommendations, but it will also provide the basis from which we can measure the progress of implementation.

During this step, Huron will conduct interviews and conversations with University leaders, key administrators, functional directors, and managers across the identified functional areas. These interviews will serve to:

- Develop a deeper understanding of the operating environment – what is working well, what is not – within each function
- Identify the operational dependencies across functions—an initial sense of workflow
- Refine our approach to benchmarking
- Surface any additional data beyond the initial data request
- Begin to develop relationships with functional leadership and staff

Based on the results of our data and policy reviews, benchmarking efforts, and interviews, we will develop a list of potential opportunities for revenue enhancement and cost reduction that we will explore further through more intensive work within each of the areas in scope. We envision that the Discover step will last approximately seven weeks. This experience lets us more readily identify and prioritize the issues, craft meaningful and sustainable solutions, and generate the necessary engagement and buy-in across your broad base of constituencies.

**Step 3: Analyze**

The Analyze phase will establish the prioritization criteria for opportunities. Working with the Project Sponsor and Steering Committee, Huron will evaluate each potential opportunity along the following criteria: estimated financial impact; alignment with the University’s strategic plan; relation to efforts already underway; difficulty of implementation; and risk to the institution. The Analyze phase—which typically lasts approximately seven weeks—results in a long list of close to 100 cost reduction and revenue enhancement opportunities, organized within University functions. At the close of this phase, Huron will work with the University on the selection of opportunities for further data analysis, vetting, and verification.

Our efforts during the Analyze phase will be informed by our experience working within the industry and with Kansas’ peers, as well as direct Kansas experience in prior engagements across the respective areas identified in the RFP. The following provides examples of the types of analysis and benchmarking we will conduct during Phase I in the individual areas you have identified for review, and provides examples of our recent work in these functional areas.

**Information Technology**

Our approach to assessing Information Technology at a university is based on the entire IT organization. We determine the costs (including space), numbers and types of personnel services provided and clients served across the university in order to determine redundancies in service, service gaps, software license proliferation; and the like. We also measure personnel deployment and key expenditure levels with benchmarks from other universities and subscription sources such as EDUCAUSE.

**Accounting and Finance**

Huron will work with Kansas to understand the operations and scope of the University’s accounting and financial management teams. In an ideal world, financial management is a careful orchestration of corporate financial reporting and asset stewardship with school and departmental budget management in accord with policy and in support of education and research. Other characteristics of the ideal state are common usage of enterprise systems to record expenditures and report financial performance, a common data architecture and related business intelligence tools to provide decision support and scenario evaluations, all funds budget development, incentives aligned with financial performance goals, ability to link revenues with the costs that produce them to enable cost/benefit analysis, and the ability to link budget decisions to strategic plans.
Procurement

Huron’s proven approach to university procurement and strategic sourcing typically begins with “diagnostic” reviews of more than a dozen commodity areas such as office-related products, IT hardware, scientific supplies, and MRO supplies to understand the magnitude of discounts that the university is receiving and whether those discounts are appropriate for institution’s total expenditures on these items. In addition, business process design can play a vital role in ensuring usage of the university catalog and eliminating paper altogether (from the order to the invoice payment).

Public Safety

In the area of public safety, Huron’s approach to identifying potential cost savings and operational improvements starts with a core understanding of the importance of safety and security to each school’s image and the feeling of security felt by faculty, staff, and students. Beyond this, Huron endeavors to understand if public safety resources are deployed as efficiently as possible to meet the standards required by the school by conducting analysis around a few key areas.

Student Services

Huron’s analysis of student services focuses on identifying cost savings opportunities through both reasonable decreases in programming and staffing. Our approach acknowledges variations in scope of services and student needs that can arise when an academic medical campus is involved with its resulting graduate medical education component. Moreover, in past projects, Huron has often identified revenue enhancement opportunities in the areas of student services. While Student Services comprises different bundles of services across universities, Huron’s work often encompasses analysis across a large swath of student services.

Human Resources

Huron’s Human Resources cost reduction and revenue optimization strategies have focused on both the staffing and operations of human resources, as well as cost reduction opportunities available from changes in HR-controlled areas such as university-wide compensation, 403(b) plans, healthcare contracts and tuition remission programs. Our proven approach to identifying cost reduction, revenue enhancement, and also employee satisfaction opportunities within Human Resources will allow us to quickly identify HR-related opportunities that will be successful within the Kansas and KUMC environments.

Business Services

Huron recognizes that each of the Business Services functions has a role in creating a congenial and productive campus community within a strong fiscal environment. Our approach to resource optimization within these functions includes internal (e.g., organizational design, spans of control, business processes, etc.) and external organizational and process reviews (staffing levels, use of technology, operating service points and hours, services offered, etc.).

Facilities Operations

Huron’s analysis of facilities management starts with an understanding of your service needs and balances those needs with a desire for service improvements and cost reductions. We also consider the effect of efficiency initiatives such as retrofits, re-commissioning, scheduling, and programming changes, plus the consideration of outsourcing and co-sourcing of non-mission-critical services. Typically we rely on industry data sets and our internal intellectual property and industry experience to conduct the analysis of the Facilities Management function.

Design and Construction Services

Major research universities are serial builders and have significant leverage within local markets. Based on initial business case work completed in higher education we believe significant cost reduction opportunities exist if universities are willing to exert more influence over the procurement process for capital projects. Our approach to construction auditing can provide the initial first step to understanding the bigger opportunities that may exist with a different approach to construction strategic sourcing. Huron’s team of professionals are highly skilled in construction auditing and have a thorough understanding of the construction industry in general and the higher education industry in particular. We bring a unique combination of talents including people with multiple year backgrounds in construction auditing, contractor operations, imaging technology and higher education consulting.
Academic Medical Centers

Medical campuses of major research institutions often present their own unique administrative environments, with new layers of overhead, areas of service duplication and overlapping responsibilities. Huron has worked with health science centers and medical schools to assess, redefine and restructure their administrative services and infrastructure to achieve both cost savings and greater service efficiencies. Within the medical school and the related health professions schools on the medical campus, Huron would focus its analyses on the efficient use of institutional resources in support of its primary missions, considering the following categories to identify possibilities for greater efficiency and cost savings.

The RFP notes that “other non-academic programs” may also be considered as part of this project. Based on prior client experience Huron would suggest including several other potentially high-yield areas including, but not limited to:

Research Administration

Service transformation in the Research Administration area typically focuses on finding process efficiencies and developing flexible procedures to maintain or increase faculty productivity while ensuring the high levels of efficacy needed to comply with government and funder regulations. These improvements may include, for example, speeding up award set-up, increasing researchers’ access to their financial data, reducing the number of cost transfers, and closing a greater percentage of awards on time.

Auxiliaries

Auxiliaries, such as the bookstore, dining, and conference centers, are expected to be managed as “stand-alone,” revenue-generating or at least revenue-neutral entities for the university. As a result, we have typically found that auxiliary directors tend to be open to creative ideas and approaches for identifying and realizing resource optimization opportunities.

Energy Conservation

Our approach to identifying opportunities in energy conservation is both quantitative, within Facilities Operations as described earlier, and organizational across campus stakeholder groups. We have worked with universities to utilize energy management systems and associated technologies to pin-point the sources of excessive energy consumption in real time in order to better manage limited resources. Huron has also assisted universities and academic health centers to establish business case methodologies to ensure that energy conservation investment and infrastructure projects are based on a uniform approach to understanding the costs and benefits of each project.

Step 4: Identify

As each functional area is analyzed and potential recommendations are identified, Huron will consider how every opportunity (and ultimately their respective action plan) will impact the University of Kansas. A number of principles guide our reviews:

- Processes for initiative identification and prioritization must be sensitive to key aspects of the University’s culture; key stakeholders must play significant roles
- Reductions in costs in one area should not shift costs to another
- Reductions and potential reallocations should be judged on the basis of alignment with the University’s strategic plans just as new allocations should
- Whenever possible the financial scope of potential revenue enhancements and cost savings will be initially estimated through benchmarking, typically in a low/medium/high format, but opportunities on which initial dollar figures cannot be placed initially (e.g., service enhancements) will not be excluded from consideration.

Staying true to these principles will ensure that our recommendations do not undermine academic operations. Using the second principle, for example, we will assess how reductions in costs in a central service unit would affect academic departments by testing potential local impacts directly with departmental administrators. We will similarly engage academic departments in the evaluation of newly designed business processes (e.g., research administration or procurement) to be sure the efficiencies are not gained at the cost of a diminution of service.
We will use a “menu” approach in our delivery of recommendations to provide Kansas with the ability to weigh and consider recommendations. The menu illustrates the institutional risk, implementation difficulty and service level impact of each opportunity. A recommendation that has the potential to significantly impact Kansas’ academic or research enterprise, for example, would have a high level of institutional risk and be identified with no enhancement to institutional service levels.

Identifying a mix of short and long-term opportunities is critical to the success of redesign initiatives. Short-term options are needed for obvious reasons — to save money as revenues decline — but also to demonstrate leadership commitment to change and to reward those participants in the process who have become change champions. The most transformational changes typically have to “work their way through the system.” They may involve faculty and staff in an implementation project team, training in the ways of new processes, and software implementation. An example would be an initiative to transform the research administration process, with introductions of pre-award and effort certification software; generation of grants management reports that actually work for PIs and eliminate shadow systems; and of new processes that bring all this together. We note here that sustaining transformational change requires continuous monitoring and reinforcement—and continuous improvement. Otherwise, old ways may creep back, or the new ways can evolve in unintended and more costly directions.

As we identify and prioritize opportunities for savings and revenue generation, we will classify these into “quick-wins” and “big-bangs.” Quick-wins are initiatives that can often be implemented almost entirely through policy decisions, while big-bangs typically require consensus building and extensive implementation support.

**Anticipated Phase I Deliverables**

The purpose of the menu of opportunities is to support the University in its decision making process and to begin to transition the learning from Phase I into clearly defined and actionable recommendations for the second phase of work. The following outlines our primary deliverables by step within Phase I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Step</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Launch</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Project Charter</strong>: Establishes project scope, objectives, approaches, governance structures, and communication strategies and reporting norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Stakeholder Communication Plan</strong>: Introduces the project to the larger University community, indicates frequency of updates, and promotes external inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>High-level Communications Plan</strong>: Documents the baseline communication expectations of various campus and KUMC constituents, including trustees, faculty, staff, students, unions, and the State of Kansas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Project Plan</strong>: Outlines activities associated with Phase I, including areas in scope, timing of interviews, area champions, vetting process, etc. The project plan will also identify critical dependencies and key milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discover</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Data Request List</strong>: Identifies data required, customized for each area of focus, which typically includes information related to financial and operational performance, organizational structure, staffing, and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Interview List</strong>: Catalogs key KU and KUMC employees with whom the University and Huron confirm should be interviewed during this phase of the engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Benchmark Institution List</strong>: Confirms set of institutions and industry data that will provide the most meaningful comparisons for the University environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Benchmarking Analysis</strong>: Provides detail from quantitative and qualitative benchmarking for all functions and sub-functions evaluated. This deliverable will clarify where and how KU and KUMC are operating at or above benchmark levels and where the University is less efficient than benchmarks (using appropriately normalized data).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Process Step** | **Deliverables**
---|---
**Identify** | • **Opportunity Analyses for Core Functional Areas:** Identifies high-level opportunities in a menu format to enable the Steering Committee to compare opportunities within and across functional areas. The menu will estimate the savings or revenue potential, institutional risk, implementation difficulty, and service level impact of each opportunity. The final deliverable will be segmented into short-, intermediate-, and long-term opportunities, based on an understanding of several factors including readiness for change, implementation difficulty, and institutional risk. Developed with input from the university team, the Stratified Menu of Opportunities will facilitate a prioritization discussion with the Steering Committee to determine which opportunities to develop into business cases.

### 3.2. Phase II: Business Case Development

The second phase of the project focuses on transforming the identified opportunities into action plans that provide details on expected financial impact, implementation steps, and required resources. The approach described in the following section will apply to all business cases, though the total amount of work and the overall project timeline will be dependent on the number of business cases selected for development, as well as the complexity of those cases. By the conclusion of Phase II recommended enhancements will be fully vetted, defined, and prepared for implementation.

**Step 5: Develop**

During our fifth stage, we will translate the selected high-priority opportunities into diligently researched, justified, vetted, and actionable recommendations. These recommendations will be developed in the form of business cases. Each business case will contain several recommendations with a focus on the highest priority opportunities in a particular functional area within the scope of review. Each business case, and the recommendations that it includes, will contain discussions of potential challenges that may arise in implementation, including regulations/restrictions that could limit the effectiveness of a particular strategy. Huron’s business cases will be informed by what we learn about Kansas during the Discover and Analyze phases, by our understanding of organization, process, and technology from across the industry, and by the benchmarking activities we conduct with peer institutions.

Huron will then work closely with the University to evaluate the business cases, affirm cost-benefit analysis, and begin prioritizing initiatives that should be considered for implementation. During this step, we will develop work products including a high-level implementation roadmap and a document outlining anticipated savings for each recommendation to ensure the University is able to realize the anticipated efficiencies quantified in the business cases.

A critical component of the business case evaluation and prioritization is identifying the change management requirements of each opportunity. Huron will complete a stakeholder analysis to determine how key individuals (and segments of the University) will be affected by various recommendations and how they may respond to proposed changes—or may have anxieties about the prospect of change. We will have assembled data and impressions throughout the earlier phases of work that will contribute to this more formal assessment. A sound change-readiness assessment will identify obstacles and allow the University and Huron to develop strategies for overcoming them. Change readiness can be assessed along two tracks: (1) organizational resistance; or (2) barriers to implementation; either of which can delay or impede a successful effort.

The change-readiness assessment will culminate in a discussion between Huron and the Steering Committee to prioritize and sequence recommendations for implementation. Understanding the organizational resistance and barriers to change will be an important factor, along with the magnitude of efficiencies to be gained, enhancements to service, and risk, in understanding which items to tackle when. We will guide you through this process at the conclusion of the change readiness assessment.

**Step 6: Communicate**

Successful implementation of sustainable institutional changes requires truth and transparency; this is particularly true in regards to constituents who may be, or perceive themselves to be, the hardest hit by those changes. Following the change...
readiness assessment, Huron will develop a communications plan to inform core constituents about specific initiatives/recommendations. The plan will outline the information needs, communication goals, critical dependencies, and responsible individual(s) for each target audience. The communication plan will also outline the mode and frequency of communications. The Communications Plan will be a critical document to link with other implementation planning tools, such as initiative action plans, savings tracking reports, and initiative dash boards.

Step 7: Plan

In the final step of Phase II initiative-specific plans will be crafted to guide subsequent implementation efforts. Huron will work with the Steering Committee to identify the number of implementation plans to be developed and, for each plan, the level of detail required. For example, a project with relatively high risk and/or complexity may require a very detailed plan, while a more basic project may not require as much specificity. Projects prioritized for the near-term are better candidates for planning than medium- and long-term opportunities that may change prior to implementation or have dependencies on earlier projects. For any number of reasons the University may wish to develop implementation plans internally rather than include the work under Huron’s purview.

Effective implementation requires well-defined approaches and action plans, with clear assignments of responsibility, progress measures, and review milestones. During this step we will work with KU and KUMC to identify individuals and groups who will act as initiative “Champions” for each of the prioritized recommendations. (Typically champions will naturally emerge during the earlier phases of the project). Champions will be charged with communication and project management responsibilities including building support for the initiative and keeping it on track. As these individuals are identified, we will engage them in the stages of implementation plan development to both broaden participation and facilitate plan ownership.

Stories of successful implementations often underscore the importance of adjustments and adaptations over time, and that understanding organizational structure and process dependencies can enable development of a natural order of implementation steps. Once the prioritization of implementation efforts is established, we will support the Champions in engaging and educating their colleagues to develop a “localized” call to action. The Champions will be integral to implementation as community members will be most trusting of peers during major change initiatives.

Included in the development of initiative-specific action plans will be the development of initiative tracking documents and reports. These tools will be developed to align with and support the above-referenced communication plan. Together, the tracking documents and the communication plan will be used to ensure the appropriate level of transparency.

Anticipated Phase II Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Step</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop</strong></td>
<td><strong>Business Cases (8 – 12):</strong> Analyzes the costs, benefits, risks, and service enhancements associated with an opportunity, transitioning each prioritized opportunity into actionable recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Executive Report:</strong> Provides an executive summary of findings, a current state assessment of each functional area reviewed, a gap analysis, and detailed business cases for each opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Implementation Roadmap:</strong> Gives direction to the Steering Committee around implementation steps and needs (this roadmap will be replaced with a roll-up of the detailed action plans during the Plan step).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Savings Tracking Method:</strong> Documents expected savings associated with each recommendation to promote accountability of functional leaders and project champions and ensure that the University is able to capture the planned savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Communications Plan:</strong> Identifies key stakeholders impacted by recommended changes and defines communications strategies centered around stakeholder needs and project goals in order to help build a consensus for change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and provide necessary information to the University’s constituents.

Plan

- **Implementation Roadmap and Individual Task Lists**: Lists detailed activities in a work plan format with individual role assignments in order to track implementation status and ensure individual responsibilities are clearly defined and executed in accordance with the overall timeline.

- **Individual Opportunity Status Report**: Provides a template for project managers to report on the status of individual activities and tasks in a standardized format so that progress can be quickly communicated to KU and KUMC leadership and any implementation issues can be effectively identified.

- **Initiative Dashboard**: Consolidates status information from all individual initiatives to provide a summary overview of the service transformation effort to KU and KUMC leadership throughout the course of the implementation.

### 3.3. Phase III: Additional Services & Implementation Support

Huron can provide a series of implementation and post-implementation services designed to sustain change throughout the institution. Huron believes that successful engagements “begin with the end in mind” and our implementation / post-implementation plans would include working with the KU and KUMC staff to develop and deliver a continuous improvement plan encompassing training, communication, methodology, and performance measurement. Although the learning from Phases One and II will inform the specific tasks required to sustain change, we envision the following steps comprising Phase III.

**Step 8: Support**

Our implementation support roles often fall into one of the following three categories: project management, interim management or interim staffing. In each of these roles, we focus on helping to ensure that transparency and accountability are maintained throughout the process. We provide guidance and support to the implementation project leaders. We assist with development of mid-course corrections needed to keep implementation on course. We update and maintain project templates and reports for tracking project success, milestones and accountability, and we support activities identified within the implementation plan.

**Step 9: Train**

User education involves educating employees at all levels to achieve the objectives of engagement and culture change. Participation in training should be accessible and offer development opportunities for all University and KUMC staff. The following chart is illustrative of Huron’s approach to training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Training</td>
<td>• Prepares teams for responsibilities on the project; team members are trained on the methodology, tools and templates used to complete project deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Training</td>
<td>• Provides a basic understanding of continuous improvement goals and they align to strategy; used to engage all levels of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Transitions Education</td>
<td>• Supports change management related to process improvement projects; concentrates on defining workflows and tools for employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Training</td>
<td>• Provides advanced training modules on business case development and “train-the-trainer” (to facilitate future process improvement teams); these training sessions are targeted toward rising leaders in the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 10: Measure

The ability to track and demonstrate quantified results and improvement is essential to building a continuous improvement culture. We will determine high-level operational metrics tied to strategic objectives to reflect global performance. We will also develop consistent performance metrics requirements for process improvement projects. KU and KUMC personnel will be trained and experienced in using data and key performance indicators (KPIs) to establish baseline performance and track improvement.
4. Draft Work Plan & Timeline

The following section of the proposal is intended to define the value Huron can provide to the University of Kansas and respond to the request posed in the RFP: “Describe why your company is best suited to perform this work.”

Universities are unique organizations, both in the aggregate and individually. The specter of shared governance, the heavy reliance on funding sources with significant restrictions, and the transient nature of universities’ core customers create considerable challenges that other entities do not face. Couple those with the current plight of public universities, which include onerous state regulation and shrinking appropriations, and it is clear why many institutions are initiating significant broad-based reviews to help identify ways to promote increased effectiveness, efficiency, and flexibility. We strongly believe that Huron is uniquely qualified to partner with the University to ensure this review is meaningful and successful for the following reasons:

4.1. Integrated Timeline

The overall timeline proposed for this engagement is presented below. More detailed work plans for Phase I and Phase II are included in the subsequent sections of this document. The time required for Phase II is based on the assumption that KU and KUMC will decide to pursue ten business cases of the expected mix of complexity; if the University decides to pursue a fewer or greater number of business cases, or if the selected cases are more or less complex than anticipated, the timeline may require revision. Given the variable nature of Phase III, a timeline is not provided. Huron will work with KU and KUMC to develop a Phase III work plan and timeline based on the outcomes of the earlier phases.

**Anticipated Project Timeline**
4.2. Phase I Work Plan & Timeline

The following timeline identifies the expected start- and end-dates and the high-level work plan for each stage in Phase I.

**Anticipated Phase I Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I Timeline Steps</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Launch</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>• Steering committee planning</td>
<td>• Initial interviews</td>
<td>• Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discover</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>• In-depth interviews and follow-up interviews</td>
<td>• Hypothesis generation</td>
<td>• Benchmarking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyze</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>• Hypothesis testing</td>
<td>• Data analysis and presentation</td>
<td>• Vetting of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of Identified opportunities</td>
<td>• Selection of Business Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning for Phase II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Phase II Work Plan & Timeline

The following timeline identifies the expected start- and end-dates and the high-level work plan for each stage in Phase II. As noted previously, the time required for Phase II is based on the assumption that KU and KUMC will decide to pursue ten business cases of the expected mix of complexity; if the University decides to pursue a fewer or greater number of business cases, or if the selected cases are more or less complex than anticipated, the timeline may require revision. Phase II is currently expected to last eight weeks:

**Anticipated Phase II Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II Timeline Steps</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>Week 13</th>
<th>Week 14</th>
<th>Week 15</th>
<th>Week 16</th>
<th>Week 17</th>
<th>Week 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop</td>
<td>• In-depth functional interviews</td>
<td>• Additional data collection</td>
<td>• Synthesis of information into business cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vet results with affected stakeholders</td>
<td>• Identify key implementation enablers</td>
<td>• Analyze implementation requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partner with stakeholders to develop granular implementation plans</td>
<td>• Aggregate implementation costs and personnel resources required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Staffing Model & Staff Qualifications

5.1. Proposed Staffing Model

During Phase I, Huron will deploy selected members from Huron’s Higher Education practice and leadership team to provide project leadership, direction, and management. A Project Delivery Team comprising nine experienced consulting professionals will be assigned to work under the direction of the leadership team to conduct the data collection analysis (Phase I) and business case development (Phase II). In addition to the Project Leadership and Project Delivery Teams, we have established a panel of subject matter experts to provide advice and consultation on a number of functional areas. This panel of experts includes national leaders in the areas of academic medical centers, facilities, human resources, procurement, and public safety.

5.2. Project Leadership Biographies

**John R. Curry, Managing Director:** John brings a combination of experiences from senior financial and operational leadership positions at major research universities and Huron consulting engagements uniquely attuned to this project. He has over thirty years of experience in higher education administration. Prior to joining Huron, John was the Executive Vice President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Prior positions include Vice President for Business and Finance at the California Institute of Technology; Vice Chancellor for Administration and Chief Financial Officer at the University of California, Los Angeles; and Vice President for Budget and Planning at the University of Southern California. John has led our recent broad-scale redesign and transformation efforts at Seton Hall University, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the University of California San Francisco. His consulting work has involved developing and implementing incentive-based financial management structures in universities, developing organizational structures to align authority with responsibility with respect to financial and technology management, and developing approaches to evaluating and implementing ERP software application (SAP and Oracle). He has written extensively on incentive-based budgeting, enterprise systems implementation, and organizational change.

**Shandy Husmann, Managing Director:** Shandy has more than 20 years of experience assisting educational institutions, healthcare organizations, and non-profit research institutes in areas of research administration, cost...
accounting, finance, compliance issues related to federally funded programs, operational efficiency, strategic planning, financial modeling, and other administrative, organizational, and financial challenges. During his career, which includes five years in administrative leadership at Vanderbilt University, he has been involved in numerous consulting engagements for a variety of organizations.

**Mike Phillips, Director:** Michael is a Director in Huron Consulting Group’s Higher Education practice. He has over thirty years of experience assisting higher education and healthcare clients with establishing or improving their business operations and infrastructures. Michael focuses on matters of governance, and risk and controls; his primary areas of expertise are finance and technology. Michael has recently led similar cost reduction studies at both private and state-funded institutions. He also led the Organizational Assessment of IT at KU last summer and met over 150 key stakeholders on the Lawrence campus. Most recently, he led a review of Financial Aid at KUMC last fall and met a number of key stakeholders on that campus in the course of that project.

### 5.3. Subject Matter Expert Biographies

**Derek Smith, Managing Director (Procurement):** Derek is a Managing Director in Huron’s Higher Education consulting group. Derek has more than fifteen years of consulting and project management experience in eProcurement, strategic sourcing, process design and improvement, and systems implementation. Derek leads Huron’s delivery of procurement solutions for higher education clients. He has led multiple procurement transformation, eProcurement implementation, and strategic sourcing engagements. Derek’s most recent clients include Duke University, Purdue University, the University of Colorado System, Georgia Institute of Technology, the University of Florida, and the University of Pittsburgh. Derek has a bachelor’s degree in Finance from the University of Texas Austin, and an MBA from the University of Georgia.

**Judy Thorp, Managing Director (Human Resources):** Judy is a Managing Director in Huron’s Wellspring business. Judy brings more than 28 years of experience as an employee benefits and compensation advisor, with a focused concentration in the area of mergers and acquisitions. She assists healthcare clients with the design of Human Resource processes and the integration of benefit and compensation plans. Judy focuses on performance improvement initiatives for her clients which have resulted in multi-million dollar cost saving opportunities. Prior to joining Wellspring, Judy was the Executive Managing Director of the National Compensation and Benefits Practice and the Chicago office at SMART, a middle-market international accounting and consulting firm. Prior to SMART, Judy was the National Partner of KPMG’s Compensation and Benefits Practice. In her role, Judy has a bachelor’s degree from Loyola University and a Masters of Arts from the University of Colorado.

**Kathleen Shaw, Director (Academic Medical Centers):** Kathleen has more than fifteen years of experience leading complex engagements for academic health centers, medical schools and practice plans including Duke University Health System, the Arizona Cancer Center, Thomas Jefferson University and its affiliated University Hospital, the University of Connecticut Health Center, the University of Pennsylvania Health System, Mount Sinai Medical School and Medical Center, University of Minnesota Health Sciences, and Columbia University School of Medicine. Kathleen’s expertise encompasses a broad spectrum of critical issues facing academic medicine today, including strategic plan development and implementation, physician integration and alignment, financial planning and feasibility, operations/resource assessment and redesign for performance turnaround, and physician / academic medical center alignment. In addition, her consulting experience includes ambulatory and faculty practices as well as research planning and administration. Prior to joining Huron, Kathleen was a Director with PricewaterhouseCoopers’ Healthcare Advisory practice and a Principal at CSC Healthcare. Kathleen has a Master of Business Administration from University of Virginia.

### 5.4. Staff Availability for Phase III

Huron will guarantee that many of the same staff from Phases I and II will also be made available for Phase III. Our goal is to provide continuity in project leadership.
### 6. Appendices

#### 6.1. List of Huron Clients

Below is a partial listing of higher education institutions that are clients of Huron Consulting Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona State University</th>
<th>North Dakota State University</th>
<th>University of Maryland Baltimore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State University</td>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Colleges of Illinois</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Olin College</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College</td>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor College of Medicine</td>
<td>Pace University</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green University</td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education Corporation</td>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>University System of Georgia</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVry University</td>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>University of Texas System</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston Northwestern Healthcare</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Utah System of Higher Education</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Wheeling Jesuit University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollins University</td>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Woodbury University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minot State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olin College</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts System</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri System</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University System of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University System of North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah System of Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling Jesuit University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. Vendor Response Checklist

VENDOR RESPONSE CHECK-LIST

The following items are provided to assist bidders in ensuring all requirements are met and all required submissions are included with the bid. Vendors are instructed to utilize this list and include it with their bid submittal. In order to ensure fair and accurate evaluation, page numbers indicating the location of your response within your bid shall be included, where indicated.

Bidders must complete the page numbers required below:

- Response Page No. 72: Signature Sheet
- Response Page No. 78: Supplier Diversity Survey Form
- Response Page No. 8: Transmitted Letter
- Response Page No. 26: Timeline
- Response Page No. 14: Methodology
- Response Page No. 28: Experience
- Response Page No. 34: Qualifications
- Response Page No. 20: References
- Response Page No. 12: Informational materials, if applicable (RFP Response Section)
- Response Page No. 45: Exceptions to RFP noted, if applicable (RFP Instruction Section)

The following items have been submitted, as required:

- Literature submitted as required (RFP Response Section)
- Insurance/Bond information provided as required (RFP Terms & Conditions Section)
- Proposed number of copies submitted (RFP Response Section)
- Cost and Technical proposals separate (RFP Response Section)
- Confidential/Confidential information in separate packet (RFP Instructions Section)
- Samples included, if required (RFP Specifications Section)
- Media on separate CD

- Cost Sheet
- Tax Clearance
- Vendor Registration
- We
- Audited Financial Statement

Contact Person for Request Issuer: Shandy Humann

Company Name: Huron Consulting Group

Mail Address: 555 W. Van Buren Street

City & State: Chicago, IL

Zip Code: 60607

Telephone: 312-363-9797 Cell: 312-995-3201

Fax: 312-363-9797 E-Mail: shumann@huronconsultinggroup.com

RFP # 87198 Response
Proprietary and Confidential
6.3. Required Forms

The following section includes the forms completed per the RFP guidelines.

- Signature Sheet
- Acknowledgement of Addenda 1 & 2
- Supplier Diversity Survey Form
- Certification Regarding Immigration Reform and Control
- Vendor’s W-9
- Tax Clearance Certification Form

The required Cost Sheet is included in the accompanying cost proposal. Timeline for services performed is included in the technical proposal.
SIGNATURE SHEET

Item: Organizational Consulting Services for Strategic Transformation of Administrative Services

Department: Office of the Provost

Closing Date: January 25, 2011, 2:00 PM (CST)

By submission of a bid and the signatures affixed thereto, the bidder certifies all products and services proposed in the bid meet or exceed all requirements of this specification as set forth in the request and that all exceptions are clearly identified.

Huron Consulting Services LLC

550 W. Van Buren St. City & State Chicago, IL Zip 60607

Toll Free Telephone 866-229-8700 Local 312-583-8757 Cell: 312-479-3266 Fax 312-880-3201

Tax Number 01-0666114 E-Mail shusmann@huronconsultinggroup.com

Signature ___________________________ Date January 26, 2011

Typed Name Shandy Husmann Title Managing Director

In the event the CONTACT FOR THE BIDDING PROCESS is different from above, indicate contact information below.

Bidding Process Contact Name Same

Mailing Address ___________________________ City & State_________________________ Zip

Toll Free Telephone __________________ Local __________ Cell: __________ Fax __________

E-Mail __________________

If AWARDED A CONTRACT AND PURCHASE ORDERS are to be directed to an address other than above, indicate mailing address and telephone number below.

Mailing Address Same __________________ City & State __________________ Zip

Toll Free Telephone __________________ Local __________ Cell: __________ Fax __________

E-Mail __________________

University may use the Business Procurement Card for payment. Yes ___ No ✔

(Refusal will not be a determining factor in award of this contract.)
ADDENDUM 1

Date: 01/11/11
Addendum Number: 1
RFQ Number: 87198
PR Number: 2237
Closing Date: January 27, 2010 2:00 p.m. Local Time
Buyer: Deana Merryman
Telephone: 785-864-5971
E-Mail Address: merrymann@ku.edu
Web Address: www.purchasing.ku.edu
Item: Organizational Consulting Services for Strategic Transformation of Administrative Services
Agency: University of Kansas Office of the Provost
Location(s): Lawrence, Kansas
Conditions: The original question deadline date of January 17, 2011 has been extended to January 18, 2011 by close of business local time.

There are no other changes at this time.

A signed copy of this Addendum can be submitted with your bid. If your bid response has been returned, submit this addendum by the closing date indicated above.

I (We) have read and understand this addendum and agree it is a part of my (our) bid response.

NAME OF COMPANY OR FIRM: Huron Consulting Services LLC

SIGN BY:

TITLE: Managing Director                     DATE: January 27, 2011
ADDENDUM

Date: January 21, 2011

Addendum Number: 2

RFP Number: 87198

PR Number: 2237

New Closing Date: January 28, 2011 2:00 p.m. CST

Buyer: Deana Merryman
Telephone: 785-864-5971
E-Mail Address: merryma@ku.edu
Web Address: www.purchasing.ku.edu

Item: Organizational Consulting Services for Strategic Transformation of Administrative Services

Agency: University of Kansas Office of the Provost
Location(s): Lawrence, Kansas

Conditions: See Questions and Answers starting on Page 2
Close Date has been moved to January 28, 2011 2:00 p.m. CST

A signed copy of this Addendum must be submitted with your bid. If your bid response has been returned, submit this addendum by the closing date indicated above.

I (We) have read and understand this addendum and agree it is a part of my (our) bid response.

NAME OF COMPANY OR FIRM: Huron Consulting Services LLC

SIGN BY: ____________________________

TITLE: Managing Director

DATE: January 26, 2011
University of Kansas
Purchasing Services
Supplier Diversity Survey Form

Why is the KU Purchasing Services requesting this information?

Current statutes governing the activities of the Kansas Division of Purchases do not include preferences or set-asides for Small Business Enterprises (SBEs). The Division of Purchases is interested in determining to what extent purchase orders and contracts are awarded to SBEs under existing work efforts. Please Note: You must submit this form with each bid opportunity.

Persons or concerns wishing to receive a Purchase Order or Contract Award resulting from this bid opportunity must provide the information contained in this document before the award is made. To help expedite this procurement, it is requested that you submit this form with your bid.

COMPANY DATA

Legal Company Name Huron Consulting Services LLC
Doing Business As (if applicable), Huron Consulting Group
Federal Tax ID Number / FEIN 01-0666114
Diversity Program Contact Name Margaret Kosirog Title Director of Benefits
Phone Number 312-880-3360 Fax Number 312-880-3310
E-Mail Address Diversityinclusion@huronconsultinggroup.com Company Web www.huronconsultinggroup.com
Address 550 W. Van Buren St.
City Chicago State IL Zip Code 60607
Legal Structure: □ Corporation □ Partnership □ Non-Profit □ Sole Proprietorship □ LLC
Signature __________________________ Date: January 26, 2011

COMPANY DIVERSITY DATA

(A) Business Classification (See Appendix A for definitions):
Is your business a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) as defined by the SBA?
□ Yes ☑ No □ Don’t Know

Check all that Apply: □ Disabled (DS) □ SEA-Small Disadvantage Business (SDB)
□ Veteran-Owned (VBE) □ Women-Owned (WBE) □ Service-Disabled Veterans-Owned (DVBE)
□ African American □ Native American □ Minority-Owned Business Enterprise (MBE)
□ Hispanic American □ Asian Pacific American □ Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)
□ Asian Subcontinent American □ Other: ________________________________

(B) Has your Business Classification Status been certified by a state, municipal, federal or other certifying agency?
☑ Yes □ No Certifying Entity: ________________________________

Other State of Kansas Resources for Small Business Enterprises (SBE)
Kansas Department of Commerce
Office of Minority/Women Business Development
http://www.kansascmmerce.com/IndcxPages/Pgm01.aspx?scId=99600588532
CERTIFICATION REGARDING IMMIGRATION REFORM & CONTROL

All Contractors are expected to comply with the Immigration and Reform Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), as may be amended from time to time. This Act, with certain limitations, requires the verification of the employment status of all individuals who were hired on or after November 6, 1986, by the Contractor as well as any subcontractor or sub-subcontractor. The usual method of verification is through the Employment Verification (I-9) Form. With the submission of this bid, the Contractor hereby certifies without exception that Contractor has complied with all federal and state laws relating to immigration and reform. Any misrepresentation in this regard or any employment of persons not authorized to work in the United States constitutes a material breach and, at the State’s option, may subject the contract to termination and any applicable damages.

Contractor certifies that, should it be awarded a contract by the State, Contractor will comply with all applicable federal and state laws, standards, orders and regulations affecting a person’s participation and eligibility in any program or activity undertaken by the Contractor pursuant to this contract. Contractor further certifies that it will remain in compliance throughout the term of the contract.

At the State’s request, Contractor is expected to produce to the State any documentation or other such evidence to verify Contractor’s compliance with any provision, duty, certification, or the like under the contract.

Contractor agrees to include this Certification in contracts between itself and any subcontractors in connection with the services performed under this contract.

Signature, Title of Contractor

Date

January 26, 2011
Huron Consulting Services LLC
550 W Van Buren St
Chicago, IL 60607

RE: Tax Clearance Id: 628  Tax Clearance Request

Dear KDOR Customer:

The Department received a tax clearance request from Wayne E Lipski on behalf of Huron Consulting Services LLC.

According to our records, Huron Consulting Services LLC appears to be current on all tax types registered with Kansas Department of Revenue.

Therefore your request for a tax clearance is: **APPROVED**

The above information reflects the current status of the customer's account(s) as reflected in our master tax records. This information is subject to change(s), which may arise as a result of a state tax audit, federal revenue agent report or other lawful adjustment(s).

If you have any questions, please contact us at 785-296-3199 between 7:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Sincerely,

Kansas Department of Revenue
Compliance Enforcement - Discovery