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## Procurement Services

Summary
Procurement Services seeks to move beyond a compliance function. The Update MSU Procurement Services working group has developed recommendations for enhancing communications, processes and the user experience. These enhancements will achieve efficiencies and financial savings without compromising vendor quality and service.
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## 1 Working Group Goal

Develop recommendations for enhancing MSU's procurement communications, processes and user experience to achieve efficiencies and financial savings without compromising vendor quality and service.

## 2 Working Group Membership

Joseph Atwood - Professor, Agricultural Economics<br>Charles Boyer - Vice President and Dean, College of Agriculture Christina Fournier - Financial Manager, University Business Services<br>Laura Humberger - Associate Vice President, Financial Services<br>Yves Idzerda - Department Head and Professor, Physics<br>Jerry Sheehan - Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Center<br>Leslie Taylor - Legal Counsel, President's Office<br>Advised by Terry Leist, Vice President for Administration and Finance<br>Staff Support- Brian O'Connor, Director of Procurement Services

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Initial Conversations

The working group members each solicited input from constituents, and brought their own varied background and perspectives to the team. The group began by airing any concerns expressed by their constituents. In clarifying the intent and goals of the group, three themes emerged: 1) that needs specific to research or academic purposes must continue to be met, 2) that communications regarding the availability of commodity goods and services as well as specific goods and services should be improved, and 3) that vendor quality and service must remain high, without adding additional layers of bureaucracy to internal processes.

### 3.2 Data Analysis

Staff provided a comprehensive summary of all University spend for one fiscal year (see Appendix A). An analysis of high-dollar spend categories was performed by funding source and expense type, to direct efforts toward the highest-impact areas. Additionally, an external review firm, Strategic Resource Management (SRM), had been engaged by the Procurement staff recently, and their preliminary
recommendations and findings were reviewed as well (see Appendix B). Preliminary recommendations were developed relating to office supplies, communications, print-related expenditures, and softwarerelated purchases.

### 3.3 Feedback

Preliminary recommendations were presented to constituents and a focus group, to determine the feasibility of recommendations. Response was positive and enthusiastic. Real dollar savings, as well as time and effort savings, are expected to be realized upon the implementation of recommendations.

### 3.4 ReCOMMENDATIONS

The collaborative process described above resulted in the following recommendations:

1. Design and implement a "How Do I Buy?" Webpage
2. Embark on Office Supply Savings Campaign
3. Complete A Print Management Study
4. Leverage software purchases

## 4 ReCOMmENDATIONS

### 4.1 Design and implementa "How Do I Buy?" Webpage

The Procurement Services office has focused on ensuring compliance with state procurement law, which only requires formal bid processes for purchases above $\$ 5,000$. Purchasers did not indicate a concern or lack of guidance for expenditures falling above the $\$ 5,000$ threshold, presumably due to the wellestablished, published procedures that must be followed to maintain compliance for purchases at that level. However, the working group and constituent purchasers reported a lack of available guidance with respect to procuring items under $\$ 5,000$. Because the Procurement office had not been charged with bringing low-dollar purchases under its purview, the working group identified this as a guidance gap. This lack of guidance has resulted in faculty and staff spending needless time searching for the most cost-effective solution, and perhaps missing out on pre-negotiated state contracts that often carry better shipping, insurance, price and other terms.

During the review of various spend categories (see Appendix A), it was noted that goods with large dollar spend (lab and office supplies, office equipment maintenance, computer equipment/software, travel) consist of a high volume of low-dollar purchases for which very little cohesive guidance is available to purchasers.

Procurement staff located a variety of university web pages that provide guidance to purchasers through an interactive website. User-friendly menus direct the purchaser to guidance for the most economical or responsive vendor (sometimes through pre-negotiated contracts), list approvals that may need to be garnered prior to purchase, and provide other helpful information regarding the purchase. The working group recommends developing the same sort of guidance for MSU purchasers to save time and money.

A focus group was solicited to provide input to the working group, and is currently in the process of suggesting prioritization for the first items to be listed on the "How Do I Buy?" website. A template was developed by University Communications in March 2015; page drafts have been supplied by the Procurement staff, in collaboration with the campus focus group. When complete, the "How Do I Buy?" website will provide much-needed guidance for frequently purchased items, provide information for purchasers to make informed decisions, and result in time and money savings for purchasers.

### 4.2 Embark on Office Supply Savings Campaign

SRM performed a comprehensive data analysis of office supply spend. Vendors offering a significant discount as compared with list price make up a significant portion of university spend. However, an approximately equal amount of spend is with vendors offering only half the discount. It is estimated that savings in all departments combined will amount to a minimum of $\$ 156,000$, and could double that, after a concerted education and training campaign is implemented. Along with an internal campaign, other vendors will be approached to negotiate a similar list price discount. The most cost-effective vendors will be highlighted on the "How Do I Buy?" website, to ensure that purchasers have more information to guide their purchases.

Driving spend to a cost-effective vendor, but one that is not able to provide the service, quality, or selection purchasers need, will not be successful. SRM and Procurement Services will kick off this campaign with a survey of identified office supply purchasers to gain an understanding of their choice of suppliers including their level of satisfaction with current suppliers, whether they are using discounted contracts, and any pain points or obstacles encountered. Feedback from the campus users will be critical during the campaign, and ensuring that the vendors maintain a high level of service, quality and selection will be a primary focus.

### 4.3 Complete A Print Management Study

Significant funds are expended on copiers, printers, and the related maintenance expenses-toners, maintenance agreements, and paper. SRM has recommended a print management study, which will inventory the printers, copiers, scanners on campus and assist in determining how much we are expending for all purchase, lease, operating and maintenance expenses. The Bozeman School District recently embarked on such a project, and is pleased with the results. The results of the study will assist in determining whether it would be beneficial to bid all print/copy and related maintenance services to one (or a handful of) vendors to achieve reduced costs and improved service levels.

### 4.4 LEVERAGE SOFTWARE PURCHASES

A significant number of software purchases are made each year-many by individual faculty and staff who lack information as to whether or not someone on campus already owns a license or whether there is the potential to use a group/site license. Communication regarding software needs and an inventory of the licenses currently in existence is recommended to improve communications and reduce costs. As information becomes available it will be included on the "How Do I Buy?" website. Strategies regarding preparation of a software inventory and collaboration techniques will be requested of the Information Technology center.

## 5 Assessment

To ensure that the desired goals are reached, assessment of processes and costs will be performed and compared with the current state. A timeline for each of the projects is estimated below:
$\checkmark$ Focus groups will be asked to give feedback regarding the success of the "How Do I Buy?" website, which will be functioning in pilot form during the month of May.
$\checkmark$ SRM has already measured office supply spend, and will be re-measuring success periodically. Those measurements will be provided to the working group.
$\checkmark$ Funds expended for printing/copying/scanning will be measured both before and after changes implemented as a result of the print management study. This is expected to be a longer-term process, targeted within the next 18 months.
$\checkmark$ Satisfaction with software information will be queried through focus groups.

## MSU Bozeman

Operating Expenses (Banner/SABHRS)
FY 2014

| Sum of Gasb report amount | Bozeman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bozeman Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4A <br> Current <br> Unrestricted - <br> MSU | 4B <br> Designated MSU | $4 \mathrm{C}$ <br> Restricted Spon Prog MSU | 4D <br> Auxiliary MSU | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 4E } \\ \text { Loan - MSU } \end{gathered}$ | 4 H Unexpended Plant - MSU | 4J Renewal/Repl acement - MSU | 4K <br> Retrmt of Indebtedness MSU | 4N Restricted - MSU |  |
| Operating expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compensation | 94,304,318 | 18,178,078 | 30,583,408 | 14,805,292 |  | 52,663 | $(1,217)$ |  | 2,723,667 | 160,646,208 |
| Benefits | 30,371,023 | 5,125,593 | 8,695,617 | 5,342,221 |  | 23,362 | 170 |  | 599,637 | 50,157,623 |
| Contracted Services | 2,776,438 | 6,923,132 | 20,282,642 | 4,044,441 | 19,935 | 1,958,004 | 2,664,947 | 626,297 | 475,143 | 39,770,978 |
| Communications | 1,119,987 | 1,206,783 | 317,430 | 281,152 |  | 118,908 | 48,761 |  | 105,120 | 3,198,141 |
| Travel | 1,632,667 | 4,124,199 | 3,092,936 | 160,287 |  | 11,361 | 493 |  | 509,404 | 9,531,348 |
| Rent | 3,395,122 | 2,660,825 | 481,467 | 354,505 |  | 2,286 | 1,317 |  | 40,843 | 6,936,364 |
| Maintenance | 5,117,758 | 1,521,660 | 312,821 | 2,860,751 |  | 2,677,774 | 13,280,161 |  | 58,087 | 25,829,014 |
| Scholarships and Fellowships | 19,642,621 | 3,024,458 | 2,852,121 | 2,700 |  |  |  |  | 21,586,862 | 47,108,762 |
| Supplies | 7,368,969 | 4,618,654 | 4,545,703 | 7,283,220 |  | 2,146,784 | 1,249,194 |  | 891,070 | 28,103,595 |
| Utilities | 3,409,651 | 7,922,744 | 77,982 | 2,808,008 |  |  | 269 |  | 7,203 | 14,225,858 |
| Other Expenses | 1,861,207 | 5,926,123 | 17,373,042 | 1,861,147 | 223,560 | 241,584 | 134,402 | 21,378 | 634,281 | 28,276,725 |
| Cost of Sales | 192 | 7,812,706 | 9,338 | 602,938 |  |  |  |  | 1,940 | 8,427,115 |
| Capital | 768,712 | 795,539 | 1,866,041 | 93,867 |  | 11,294,718 | 2,427,016 |  | 147,153 | 17,393,046 |
| Operating expenses Total | 171,768,665 | 69,840,494 | 90,490,550 | 40,500,530 | 243,495 | 18,527,444 | 19,805,514 | 647,675 | 27,780,411 | 439,604,778 |

Note-- included in fund types 4 H and 4 J are expenditures related to building construction and renovation. While all those costs should be coded to "Capital" they are often coded to maintenance, which is why the $\$ 13$ million of expenses in the maintanance category is high.

## MSU Bozeman Operating Expenses (Banner/SABHRS)

Maintenance Expense Detail
2014
( (blank)

| Sum of Gasb report amount | Bozeman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bozeman } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4A <br> Current <br> Unrestricted MSU | 4B Designated - MSU | 4C <br> Restricted Spon Prog MSU | 4D <br> Auxiliary - MSU | 4E Loan - MSU | 4H Unexpended Plant - MSU | 4J Renewal/Repl acement - MSU | 4K <br> Retrmt of Indebtedness MSU | 4N Restricted - MSU |  |
| Operating expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buildings \& Grounds '62701 | 4,743,222 | 701,791 | 20,831 | 2,526,662 |  | 2,511,944 | 13,267,325 |  | 29,271 | 23,801,047 |
| Office Equipment '62704 | 341,070 | 630,551 | 239,861 | 157,194 |  | 160,330 | 8,520 |  | 15,253 | 1,552,779 |
| Vehicles-Passenger '62706 | 25,600 | 129,655 | 29,520 | 47,178 |  |  | 3,751 |  | 8,134 | 243,839 |
| Repairs \& Maintenance-General '62799 | 1,382 | 2,087 |  | 64,543 |  |  | 565 |  |  | 68,577 |
| Snow Removal '62755 |  |  |  | 65,175 |  |  |  |  |  | 65,175 |
| Maintenance Contracts '62750 | 6,400 | 47,569 | (199) |  |  | 5,500 |  |  |  | 59,270 |
| Farm Equipment '627071 |  | 8,834 | 22,807 |  |  |  |  |  | 5,430 | 37,071 |
| Athletic \& Recreational Equipmeı '62748 |  | 964 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 964 |
| Fence Materials '62734 | 367 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 367 |
| Vehicles - Passenger Mntn Trader '62706T |  | 209 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 209 |
| Laboratory Equipment '62713 | (283) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (283) |
| Maintenance Total | 5,117,758 | 1,521,660 | 312,821 | 2,860,751 |  | 2,677,774 | 13,280,161 |  | 58,087 | 25,829,014 |

Note-- maintenance expense in Fund Types 4H and 4J include expenses related to building construction and renovation.
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## 1. EXPENDITURES

Montana State University (MSU) expenditure was established from the 2014 AP report provided by Brian O’Conner. The Office Supply Annualized expenditure is as follows:

| Supplier | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ Fiscal Year Expense |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Staples | $\$$ | $435,237.00$ |
| OfficeMax | $\$$ | $87,562.00$ |
| Simply Office Supplies | $\$$ | $110,343.00$ |
| 360 Office Supplies | $\$$ | $255,934.64$ |
| Victory | $\$$ | $43,594.61$ |
| All other maverick spend | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 6 6 , 9 1 6 . 7 5}$ |
| 25\% reduction due to miscoding | $\$$ | $(266,729.19)$ |
| Total Expense | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 3 2 , 8 5 8 . 8 1}$ |

## 2. CURRENT STRUCTURE

MSU utilizes the eMarket portal to access the WSCA-NASPO pricing from Staples and OfficeMax. The portal directs the user to the Staples and OfficeMax website where the appropriate discounts are applied to the order. Based on the accounts payable data provided, $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ of the office supply purchases are going through the eMarket portal and 27\% through Simply Office Supply, 360 Office Solutions and

Victory. The remaining $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ are being purchased from over 100 different suppliers. Currently, there is not a periodic reporting system to monitor spend that does not occur through the eMarket portal.

## 3. SRM PROCESS

In phase one, SRM will audit the WSCA-NASPO pricing to validate MSU's actual discounts received under these programs and to determine if the contract price is being applied to all Pcard purchases. In phase two, SRM will evaluate each WSCANASPO agreement to determine which office supply program provides maximum savings. In phase three, SRM will develop and implement the overall strategy to streamline purchases through the eMarket portal which will include purchasing program policies, end user program education and training. In phase four, SRM will track the savings on a monthly basis.

## 4. ASSUMPTIONS

Most locations are generally satisfied with Staples and OfficeMax's performance and product quality. MSU would support a consolidation office supply providers that would provide optimal cost savings potential while meeting MSU's quality and service standards.

## 5. SAVINGS ESTIMATE

Given the above criteria, SRM Benchmarks estimates annual savings as follow:


| Expenditure | Savings Range | Percent Savings Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1,732,858$ | $\$ 156,460-\$ 633,841$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}-52 \%$ |

## 6. SAVINGS MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGY

Savings will be calculated by measuring the compliance of the program. SRM will evaluate the Office Supplies Accounts Payable report each month to determine the percentage of office supplies expenditures that have transitioned to the WSCANASPO program.

## 7. ACTION PLAN - Major Steps

Upon approval of the adoption agreement, MSU and/or SRM will complete the following actions:

1. Develop strategy to decrease maverick spend in decentralized environment.
2. Contact Staples and/or Office Max to communicate strategy.
3. Direct supplier compliance training effort.
4. Guide the compliance campaign from central procurement.
5. Setup system to track compliance.
6. Track compliance.
7. Track savings for three (3) years.

## 8. SUPPLIER SENSITIVITIES

No supplier sensitivities have been disclosed to SRM.

