Purchasing Process Improvement	STAGE	Concept

PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

Primary Contact	Brian O'Connor	**Email**	brian.oconnor@montana.edu
Title/Department	Purchasing Director	**Phone**	(406) 994-5016
Problem Statement	The OpenMSU Service Provider Survey indicates dissatisfaction with purchases that flow through the central office in 3 categories: paper-based systems; compliance-driven rather than value-add; personnel issues. A 100% turnover presents an opportunity to address both process and organizational issues.		
Proposed Solution	Hold a purchasing summit to collaborate on purchasing processes and organizational structure, including appropriate level of support staff. Implement electronic workflow processes to alleviate paper-based delays. Implement more collaborative shared purchasing contracts.		
Key Performance Indicators or Outcome Measures	Reduced time to approve a purchase Employee satisfaction with ease of use Increased savings from collaborative purchasing.		
General Time & Effort Required	SMALL-MEDIUM. Dependent on Doc Mgt and Workflow. Exact figures to be determined upon Concept clearance. Moderate implementation and training on new software. Limited communication and adoption management within the Purchasing Department and distributed purchasing on campus.		
Alternative Solutions	Hire an external consultant to evaluate processes and recommend solutions.		

ALIGNMENT

Data Support	☑ Surveys	☐ Focus Groups	☑ Professional Expertise					
Initiative Objectives	☑ Operational Efficiency	☑ Employee Satisfaction						
Departments Served	☑ Academic Depts	☑ Agencies	☑ Fin & Acct Central	☑ HR Central				
	☑ IT Central	☑ Purchasing Central	☑ Sponsored Programs	☑ University Comm				
Constituents Served	☑ Service Users	☑ <100	☐ 100-500	☐ >500				
	☑ Service Providers	☑ <100	☐ 100-500	☐ >500				
Problems Addressed	☑ Paper process	☑ Customer service	☑ Central/Dist model	☐ Lack of integration	☑ Comm/Coord			
	☑ Redundancy	☐ Staff expertise	☐ Staff capacity	☐ Allocation/prioritization	☐ Compensation			
Processes / Services Addressed	☐ HR Recruiting	☑ Purchasing	☐ IT Support	☐ Sponsored Programs	☐ Web Dev & Content			
	☐ BPAs	☐ Budget/Finance	☐ EPAFs/Payroll	☐ IT Governance	☐ Employee Relations			

COST-EFFECTIVENESS

DISCLAIMER: This solution requires minimal time and effort by staff, cost-benefit analysis was not conducted.

Upfront Real Cost	$ -	**Upfront T&E Cost**	$ -
Ongoing Annual Cost	$ -	**Ongoing Annual T&E Cost**	$ -
Benefits	☐ Cash Savings ☐ Incr. capacity	**Estimated New Net**	$ -

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Alignment Rating	0%	**Cost-Effectiveness Rating**	0%	**Probability of Success Rating**	0%

Purchasing Process Improvement				
REF	**CATEGORY**	**FACTOR**	**METRIC**	**VALUE**
ALIGNMENT				
A.1	Institutional:	Mission	Outcome aligns directly to support of MSU discovery, creativity, service mission.	0
A.2	Initiative:	Increased efficiency	Outcome results in optimized process, productivity, and throughput.	0
A.3	Initiative:	Improved satisfaction	Outcome results in improved employee job satisfaction.	0
A.4	Scope:	Horizontal problems	Outcome addresses all the identified horizontal problems of the organization	0
A.5	Scope:	Processes/services	Outcome addresses all the identified process or service problems	0
A.6	Scope:	Functional areas	Outcome addresses all of the functional area departments in the initiative scope	0
A.7	Constituents:	Constituent reach	Outcome directly addresses deepest identified constituent needs.	0
A.8	Constituents:	Constituent span	Outcome directly addresses needs of the widest number of constituents.	0
COST-EFFECTIVENESS				
C.1	Cost:	Ongoing	Ongoing cost is minimal or none.	0
C.2	Cost:	Upfront	Upfront cost is minimal or none.	0
C.3	Fiscal:	Cost Savings	Outcome reduces cash outflow.	0
C.4	Functional:	Time Savings	Outcome reduces time on process.	0
C.5	Opportunity:	Resource Availability	Necessary FTE and other resources are available and underutilized.	0
C.6	Opportunity:	Alternatives Availability	Time & effort cannot be better spent on any possible alternative.	0
PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS				
P.1	Institutional:	Critical Success Factors	CSFs are achievable with a high probability of occurring easily.	0
P.2	Institutional:	Funding Availability	Upfront and ongoing funding is sufficient for the life of the project.	0
P.3	Institutional:	Cultural willingness	The institutional culture is ready and willing to adopt this solution over alternatives.	0
P.4	Planning:	Training	Training needed is minimal and has been adequately planned for.	0
P.5	Planning:	Measurement	Outcome performance is measurable and will be reported.	0
P.6	Planning:	Stakeholders	Stakeholders are identified; expectations are reasonable and manageable.	0
P.7	Scope:	Complexity	Complexity is minimal; scope is defined and manageable.	0
P.8	Sustainability:	Ongoing Support	Ongoing support needed is minimal or readily available at low cost.	0

Purchasing Process Improvement
OpenMSU Proposal

OpenMSU Objectives Addressed

- **Reduce cycle times-** reduce time for purchasing processes.
- **Coordinate activities-** implement processes that improve coordination between central and distributed service providers.
- **Increase capacity-** implement processes that take less service provider time to create additional service provider capacity.
- **Improve service provider satisfaction-** meet campus demand for improved purchasing processes.
- **Improve service customer satisfaction-** meet campus demand for improved purchasing processes.

Supporting Data

- In response to the OpenMSU Service Provider Survey:
  - 7% of responses (32 comments) commented that purchasing processes were activities that took significantly longer than they should at MSU. This was the third most comments for any activity in response to this question.
  - 4% of responses (15 comments) commented that purchasing processes were the most critical processes to change and/or streamline at MSU. This was the fifth most comments for any process in response to this question.
- In response to the OpenMSU Service Customer Survey, 21 out of 80 process overall (take too long, too difficult, duplicate effort, paper/manual) themed comments were about the purchasing function.
- Purchasing at MSU is fragmented across about 11,400 vendors with spending of about $8,800 per vendor. According to UC Berkeley's Operational Excellence Diagnostic Report, an external benchmark for university purchasing functions is 6,000 vendors with spending of about $140,000 per vendor.

Detailed Problem Statement

According to the OpenMSU surveys, there is significant campus demand for improved purchasing processes.

There are two separate and distinct avenues for purchasing at MSU—those purchases that need to be approved by the central Purchasing Department and those that do not.

Concerns voiced by in the OpenMSU Service Provider Survey indicate dissatisfaction with purchases that flow through the central office in three main areas:

- Paper-based systems that lend themselves to version control issues, lost paperwork, lack of timeliness and inefficiency in general.
- The Purchasing Departments is perceived as only a compliance office instead of a value-added office because of state guidelines that do not always align with the goals that MSU is looking to achieve.
- Personnel and staffing issues, including difficulty interpreting varying levels of regulation (state law, policy, procedure, and preference).

100% turnover in Purchasing Department staff presents the opportunity for a fresh perspective.

Furthermore, the large number of vendors that MSU uses (as can be seen in the supporting data section) is due to the decentralized nature of purchasing at MSU and is beyond the control of the Purchasing Department. This large number of vendors leads to inefficiencies such as time spent by MSU employees shopping for commonly purchased goods from multiple vendors and missed opportunities for university-wide, best priced strategic vendor contracts.

Detailed Solution Statement

Assign a cross-functional project team to assess and design new purchasing processes, prior to investigating opportunities for more university-wide strategic purchasing.

- Hold a purchasing summit to better identify the concerns of campus and collaborate on new purchasing processes and organizational structure, including appropriate level of support staff.
- Implement electronic workflow processes to alleviate delays caused by paper-based processes.
- Investigate a purchasing workflow module or alternative software to support the process.
- As a secondary phase, investigate more university-wide strategic purchasing to decrease the number of vendors used for similar purchases through tactics such as making better use of purchasing cooperatives and master contracts.

Alternative solutions

- Implement an e-procurement solution such as SciQuest prior to process evaluation. Emory University has realized a 6-to-1 return on its investment in SciQuest's procurement automation software. It found that of the savings realized, approximately 45% was driven from process efficiencies and 55% from negotiated discounts and contract compliance.

- Other ideas for improving purchasing can be found on the UC Berkeley Operational Excellence site at: http://oe.berkeley.edu/dpreports/documents/P_BusCase_050211_v11.pdf

Cost-Benefit Analysis

A cost-benefit analysis was not conducted for the primary solution because the project is less defined and therefore not quantifiable. The primary solution involves minimal time and effort of purchasing staff both central and distributed.

A cost-benefit analysis was conducted for the secondary phase e-procurement solution.