Managed Print Services
Print Management Project Team

Print Management Team formed in August 2013
Ø Sponsors: Tom Glaser & Chuck Currier
Ø Members from: Purchasing
  IT (printers, faxes, scanners)
  Staff Services (production & MFDs)

Print Management Team Objectives:
Ø Reduce costs while meeting the needs of users by
  v Right-sizing print assets
  v Reducing volumes
  v Centralizing purchase of consumables
Ø Provide a central point of administration for all print
Ø Accommodate advanced technology needs (i.e. wireless)
Ø Tracking and charge-back ability at the user level
Why Consider New Options?

Ø Assessments in 2011 and 2013 indicated print assets significantly underutilized by industry standards.

Ø Information security concerns regarding prints waiting in trays for pick-up.

Ø Lack of ability to print to any asset on campus, and to print from mobile devices.

Ø A transition to digital vs. paper-based environment has progressed significantly, yet the College has experienced an increase in volumes on MFDs of 45%.

Ø Waste of paper and consumables when prints are not retrieved from print devices.

Ø Lack of functional accessibility, such as to color, multiple paper trays, larger paper sizes.

Ø Minimal on-campus technical support (MFD/Production).

Ø Need for increased cost controls and comprehensive print data.
What is Managed Print Services (MPS)?

MPS is the active management and optimization of document output devices and related business processes by a specialized vendor.

MPS focuses on reducing costs through:
Ø Asset right-sizing
Ø Printing on the most cost-effective asset to meet document requirements
Ø Reducing print volumes

Additional benefits:
Ø Hardware standardization
Ø Improved security
Ø Environmental Benefits
Ø Improved control and accountability
Managed Print Services RFP

RFP was initiated in January, 2014
Ø Print asset inventories
Ø Map of current state print assets
Ø Print volumes
Ø Evaluation criteria
Ø Three-phase approach requirement
  1) Assessment of assets/needs & baseline TCO and specific optimization plan
  2) Right-sizing of assets via total refresh and technology enhancements
  3) Continuous optimization and quarterly reporting of cost reductions

Legal notice published; 31 vendors solicited; 10 responses. Three respondents were disqualified due to non-compliance with RFP requirements.
# Managed Print Services RFP

## Evaluation Score Sheet

**Rating Scale 1 - 5**  
(1 lowest / 5 highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2.1 Conformance to RFP’s Preferred Conditions &amp; Requirements</th>
<th>Xerox</th>
<th>Canon</th>
<th>Gordon F</th>
<th>Whs Direct</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>Konica M</th>
<th>TBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Weighting 5 Perfect Score**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Score</th>
<th>Xerox</th>
<th>Canon</th>
<th>Gordon F</th>
<th>Whs Direct</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>Konica M</th>
<th>TBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>Xerox</th>
<th>Canon</th>
<th>Gordon F</th>
<th>Whs Direct</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>Konica M</th>
<th>TBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Xerox Original Proposal

Ø 21% reduction in Total Cost of Ownership over 5 years
Ø 20-hour per week on-site technician
Ø Reduce # of print assets from 655 to < 275
Ø Reduce # of device models from 178 to 6
Ø Improve user to device ratio from 2:1 to 9:1
Ø Secure print for all devices
Ø Mobile print capabilities
Ø Track and charge all prints/copies by individual user
Ø Two potential pricing models

$750,000 for FY15 and a five (5) year estimated expenditure of $3,000,000 approved by the Board of Trustees on July 17, 2014.
Managed Print Services Implementation Process

Ø Full inventory of print assets conducted
Ø Voice of the Customer
  § Focus Group Meetings (KDCs)(2)
  § All Employee Survey (1)
  § Faculty Survey (2)
Ø Survey of Peer Institutions
Ø Print Policy crafted and published
Ø Testing of recommended equipment
Ø Smart Print Team Site created
Ø Periodic Smart Print Newsletters distributed
Ø Pilot of total solution in IT/FSSC
Managed Print Services Implementation Process

Ø Design Drafts

§ Developed by Xerox

§ Reviewed by MPS Project Team
  • Modifications to comply with Print Policy

§ Administrator review and request for exceptions
  • Nine (9) departmental exception discussions with Implementation Team and department representatives
  • Classroom/lab print discussions with Team representatives and appropriate Administrators
MPS Project Team Modifications

Ø Upgrade from proposed printers (B/W & Color)
Ø Card readers for all printers
Ø Upgrade from color wax-based ink MFDs to dry ink models
Ø Addition of accessories to mirror current equipment by location
Ø Upgrade of proposed color production units
Ø Additional 17 units for classrooms/computer labs, faculty suites, and departments

Total estimated cost increase over proposal:
$60,000/year or $300,000/contract
Exceptions Requested by Administrators

Ø 25 adds for faculty suites
Ø 24 adds for printers at individual workstations
Ø 42 adds for departmental use
Ø 25 adds for classroom use
Ø 6 upgrades

Total estimated cost increase over proposal: $80,000/year or $400,000/contract
## Impact of Additional Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior State</th>
<th>Xerox Design</th>
<th>Xerox + Team Adj.</th>
<th>Xerox + Team Adj. + Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Print Assets</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Annual Cost</td>
<td>$816,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. 5-Year Cost</td>
<td>$4,078,570</td>
<td>$3,025,000</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Cost Reduction</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

That the Board of Trustees approve an increase to the five year contract for Managed Print Services with Xerox for an estimated expenditure of $3,700,000 as follows:

A) Increase of $300,000 over term of the contract for equipment upgrades and additional equipment as identified by the COD MPS Project Team
B) Additional increase of $400,000 over the term of the contract to accommodate additions and upgrades to the Xerox proposal as requested by College Administrators
Questions?