

Moore, Joseph

From: Rod Wright [rwright@unicomarc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2010 10:23 PM
To: Moore, Joseph
Subject: Re: Contract and Service Clarification

Joe,

I just got home from meeting and read your email. I apologize for not doing a very good job of communicating on a variety of issue. One of the reasons I wanted to meet with just you on my last trip was so we could go over all these details in person — I think it is much easier to discuss these things in person than by emails. Given how sick I was . . . you probably made a good decision not being in a small meeting room with me.

I still think we could benefit from that small meeting. It would give us a chance to be on the same page on the various issues raised in your email.

I thought I would take a shot at addressing some of your concerns tonight. Then perhaps I can write some more tomorrow. I'll also call tomorrow morning to see if we can move this discussion forward by phone.

1. The tracking survey. We will do the tracking survey at close to cost. But until we get the questionnaire written (meaning when we determine the number of questions), we won't know the exact cost. I'm guessing it will be \$12,000 or less. But, I had gotten the impression that the budget figures you wanted were of the "not to exceed" nature (similar to what we had in Elgin), so I padded the number a little. That, by the way, does not only apply to the tracking survey, but to a variety of other estimated costs. I estimate high to make sure the "real" costs will be less than projected so we can safely stay under a "not to exceed" figure.
2. Our fee. There are actually three documents where we proposed a professional fee. The first (dated January 4) assumed an engagement program that would run through April 2011. Our proposed fee was \$9,000 a month for 15 months or a total of \$135,000. The second document containing a fee was the "budget" figures I put together dated February 9 and which we (you, myself and others including Dr. Beuder) discussed during a meeting on campus. This budget was put together after discussions at COD led us to consider a program that would end by November 2010 rather than April 2011. In that document, we proposed a \$12,000 monthly fee for nine months (February through October) or \$108,000. In general, for our community engagement programs, the shorter the duration of the program the higher the monthly fee — much of the work is "constant" (brochures, mailers, etc.) even though the time period varies. During the meeting on campus, Dr. Breuder asked for our fee to be restructured separating the engagement work from the informational communications that would occur if a November referendum was an outcome of the engagement program. I addressed that request in our revised proposal dated March 21 — and though not asked to do so, lowered the fee to \$68,750 for the engagement work and a \$25,000 option for the informational work relating to the referendum. I assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that our March 21 proposal is what the Board of Trustees approved, so I put into the contract a payment schedule totaling \$68,750. I know that is long-winded — but in the three documents, we reduced our total fee (counting the September/October option in the March 21 document), from \$135,000 to \$108,00 to \$93,750 (\$68,750 plus the option for \$25,000). I'm not sure how I got this confused — but the fee proposal in the January 4 document became irrelevant when the calendar for the program was moved up to allow a November 2010 referendum.
3. You are right about the cancelation clauses. I retained the second clause because it allows UNICOM•ARC to cancel the contract — but it does conflict with the first mention as it relates to COD. I would suggest eliminating that clause. In my 25 years at UNICOM•ARC this has never been an issue, so I don't see what we can't eliminate the second clause. In fact in my 25 years at UNICOM•ARC, we've never had a contract "issue" with a client.
4. I will expand on this tomorrow — but the simple explanation is that, for our fee, we are taking responsibility for producing all the materials — writing, graphic design, production/printing. Our fee covers all of our professional

1 Dept. Letter

Final 000 w/

time for all of this — meetings, writing, supervision of production, etc. We have estimated out-of-pocket costs for printing, graphic design, website hosting and programming, postage and other items. Your role will be reviewing, suggesting changes and approval. We will treat the budget for out-of-pockets as not to exceed figures. Further, all of these out-of-pockets will require prior approval. You asked about "out-sourcing." We are anticipating using Tony Windler/Fables for the video work. On programs such as this, we contract with several graphic design firms who will design communication materials including the website. We will use an outside vendor for the web hosting and programming. For printed material, we will discuss with you whether materials can be printed on campus, or using one of your vendors, or bid it out to a local (to you) vendor. I guess the most important point is — whatever materials are needed — we will produce. If, during the course of the program, the Facilitating Team decides it wants another communications piece — this will not raise our fee. And, if that happens, we will work with you and the Facilitating Team to make sure this can be done within the constraints of a not to exceed budget for out-of-pocket program costs.

5. This is a complex question. We assumed, perhaps mistakenly, that (in a manner similar to Harper and Elgin), there was value in "inviting" all residents to participate in the engagement program. I think you've seen samples of those mailers. Without question, we want to be cost effective in our communications. Doing so must take into account some facts. First, our survey numbers are not particularly strong. Two, November turnout will exceed 50%. (Turnout in DuPage County in November 2006 was 50.91%. My guess is that with the economic mess in Illinois and a controversial Governor's race, it could increase to 60% or higher in November 2010.) While "rifle shot" communications are certainly appropriate for low turnout spring elections, November election turnout exceeding 60% (especially when you might find a voter in 70% of the households — not everyone in a household votes or doesn't vote) makes shot-gun communications comparatively more effective. In reality, November campaigns tend to have both types of approaches depending on targeting and survey data. And here is a complicating factor — some might think efforts by the college to communicate with some, but not others, is an illegal or inappropriate technique for attempting to influence voters for a bond referendum. We need to talk about all of this. Most definitely, if it is essential to hold down costs (certainly by utilizing existing College programs), we should think of more targeted methods of communications to make the program effective.

But here is the most important point. I think some of the program issues should benefit from the input of the Facilitating Team. The issues you raise are important issues and the type of which we always seem to get good answers when discussed by those who will be serving on the Facilitating Team. Our role is to organize and structure those meetings, prepare agenda, structure the conversation, and make sure decisions are within the limits of budgetary resources available. In a simple sense, the Facilitating Team helps solve problems. Certainly we have answers, and we have experience of what will work and not work in community engagement program — but time and time again we've seen how advice and consent from the Facilitating Team strengthens the overall program. We need to get this Team together, let them have ownership of the program and incorporate their input into the overall design of the program. Part of the strength of the Harper and Elgin programs was that we did not go into the Facilitating Team meetings with all of the answers — we helped the Team find its own answers. I know that is a little "indefinite" — but I think you will find, in the long run, it is the best approach to take.

Sorry for how long-winded this is. Let me know what might be a good time to call and we can go over this in more detail, and I can get a good sense of what else I need to produce.

Rod Wright

On 4/20/10 6:04 PM, "Moore, Joseph" <moorej7718@cod.edu> wrote:

Rod,

I did receive your contract last night. After careful review, the community engagement

leadership team has multiple concerns we would like you to address before we meet on Thursday:

- 1) You have added \$3,000 to the August survey for a total of \$15,000. This was originally stated \$12,000 in the March 21 document you sent us.
- 2) You originally proposed a \$9,000 a month fee in the document you sent us in January. This has been jumped to \$13,750 with an option for an additional \$12,500 a month for the election.
- 3) We would need to clarify contract cancelation clauses. The two paragraphs currently seem contradictory. They would need to clearly state that COD can end the agreement immediately.
- 4) It is unclear what “will produce content” means. This needs to be clarified in greater detail. Are you going to provide original, written text for this effort as part of the monthly fee or not? What exactly do we receive for our monthly fee to you?
- 5) If we are to sign with Unicom*Arc, we are searching for a “rifle shot” approach with our prospective voters, not a shotgun to 350,000 households. Given our time frame and that we are not going to pay nearly \$500,000 to a summer outreach program, which are the main tasks that we in your judgment cannot live without? As an example, we are already doing open houses, community dinners, etc.

Much of the language seems boilerplate at this point in terms of how specifically you would help COD successfully complete this engagement process. Assuming the above questions are addressed satisfactorily, we would agree to pay Unicom*Arc \$9,000 a month, as cited in the original draft sent to us Jan. 4, 2010, through the end of August. We would prorate the last week of April if we could have a satisfactory agreement signed by the end of this week and have you begin Monday of next week.

For that \$9,000 a month, we need a very clear plan that delineates what actual services will be provided by Unicom*Arc specifically, as opposed to an outsourced firm. Also, as opposed to a “do everything” approach, we would also like a degree of specificity concerning how your services will be customized to maximize those interventions that have proved to produce the greatest return.

We expect to hear back from you before Thursday.

Joe