STRATEGIC PROCUREMENT

Survey: Emerging Recommendations

ThinkMissionExcellence.maine.edu
Survey Background

- The survey on emerging recommendations was posted from February 1 until February 13, 2013.

- A total of 243 individuals responded to the survey.

- Details from the survey in the following analysis include charts showing how responses were divided.
Campus Affiliation

- USM: 87 (36%)
- UM: 102 (42%)
- UMF: 25 (10%)
- UMFK: 14 (6%)
- UMA: 2 (1%)
- SWS: 12 (5%)
- UMPI: 1 (0%)

n=243
Q2. Evaluation of Current Procurement Processes - please indicate your level of satisfaction with the service(s) provided by each of the following.

- **Purchases over $50,000 and greater: Formal Competitive Process (Strategic Sourcing)**
  - Rating Average = 2.37
- **Purchases between $10,000 and $50,000: 3+ Quotations**
  - Rating Average = 2.29
- **Purchases under $10,000: Purchase Order**
  - Rating Average = 2.29
- **Accounts Payable**
  - Rating Average = 2.21
- **MaineStreet Marketplace**
  - Rating Average = 2.09
- **Procurement Card**
  - Rating Average = 2.16
- **Travel and Expense**
  - Rating Average = 2.14

*n=201*

A rating average of 2 or higher indicates that the service is good.
Q3. Please indicate how each attribute contributes to your procurement decisions at work (the larger the # indicates the higher influence on your procurement decision process).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic impact to the State of Maine</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal obligation to demonstrate &quot;public, competitive procurement process&quot;</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly the good or service can be obtained</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency/ease of procurement</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value (ratio of the quality /cost)</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of ownership (over the life cycle of the product)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial cost to department work unit (or staying within budget)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=163

A rating average of 2.5 or higher indicates that an attribute is important.
Q4. Please indicate your level of support for each of the emerging recommendations for Travel and Expense Management

- **ESTABLISH UNIFIED TRAVEL ADMINISTRATION** as part of a comprehensive University system-wide procurement strategy to provide consistent policies and services for all locations with a dedicated support structure. Staff would be located at both campus and system offices with emphasis on ensuring effective campus-based presence.  
  
  **Rating Average = 2.73**

- **UPDATE TRAVEL AND EXPENSE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE LETTER (APL)** to better reflect traveler requirements with clear guidelines for areas such as tipping, per diem rates in high cost destinations, and exceptions for unique travel needs.  
  
  **Rating Average = 3.32**

- **CONTRACT WITH PREFERRED PROVIDERS** for favorable pricing and service guarantees for transportation, airfare, and lodging to the extent practicable in the context of the specific needs of University travelers.  
  
  **Rating Average = 2.87**

- **SECURE TRAVEL MANAGEMENT COMPANY(S) and ELECTRONIC TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT SYSTEM** through a competitive public process to provide unified on-line and agent assisted travel services that are integrated with a paperless travel reimbursement system.  
  
  **Rating Average = 2.75**

- **CONDUCT A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT** to document the travel service requirements for all traveler groups and locations.  
  
  **Rating Average = 2.87**

n=167

A rating average of 2.5 or higher indicates support for the recommendation.
Q7. Please indicate your level of support for each of the emerging recommendations for Pcard administration

ESTABLISH UNIFIED PCARD ADMINISTRATION as part of a comprehensive University system-wide procurement strategy to provide consistent policies and services for all locations with a dedicated support structure. Staff would be located at both campus and system offices with emphasis on ensuring effective campus-based presence.

Rating Average = 2.83

RE-BID PCARD SERVICES following a competitive public process to better meet Pcard user requirements and administration and include travel expense management.

Rating Average = 3.09

ESTABLISH BENCHMARKS AND STANDARDS for Pcard issuance and approvals to be administered consistently across the University system.

Rating Average = 3.04

DELIVER SYSTEM-WIDE PCARD SERVICE, SUPPORT, AND TRAINING for all locations as part a comprehensive support strategy for all procurement platforms (i.e. Pcard, MaineStreet Marketplace (MSM), Travel & Expense).

Rating Average = 3.14

n=164

A rating average of 2.5 or higher indicates support for the recommendation.
Q10. Please indicate your level of support for each of the emerging recommendations for Competitive Public Procurement Process (Strategic Sourcing)

EXPAND THE BREADTH OF PRODUCTS AVAILABLE WITH FAVORABLE PRICING AND CONTRACT TERMS by increasing MaineStreet marketplace (MSM) catalog suppliers by 30% from the current 20.

**Rating Average = 3.29**

CONDUCT COMPETITIVE PUBLIC BIDS for key products and services such as electricity, IT hardware (in coordination with IT administrative review), promotional materials, custodial paper goods, scientific equipment, commercial print, temporary employment, books and periodicals, maintenance services, and recruitment lists.

**Rating Average = 3.05**

IMPLEMENT CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM to better manage suppliers, ensure consistent contract terms across the University system, eliminate redundant agreements, and identify opportunities for competitive public bids / re-bids.

**Rating Average = 3.07**

DEVELOP SPEND ANALYTICS METHODOLOGY to better identify products and services where the University system would save money and add value from a competitive public bid process.

**Rating Average = 3.08**

ESTABLISH MULTI-CAMPUS ADVISORY GROUPS with expertise in products and services being considered for competitive public bid.

**Rating Average = 2.87**

\[ n=152 \]

A rating average of 2.5 or higher indicates support for the recommendation.
Q13. Please indicate your level of support for each of the emerging recommendations for Procurement Organization Structure

**IMPROVE MECHANISMS FOR EXCEPTION PROCESS AND FEEDBACK** that provide flexibility for unique requirements and create a better process for incorporating suggestions from shoppers about goods or services where they believe additional savings could be obtained.

*Rating Average = 3.31*

**ESTABLISH ASSESSMENT PROCESS** for each unit defining evaluation criteria and review process for achieving service, efficiency, and expense reduction goals.

*Rating Average = 2.94*

**CREATE A STRATEGIC SOURCING UNIT** within the unified strategic procurement organization to facilitate public competitive bids, analyze spend data, develop research and reporting methodologies, establish campus-based advisory groups, monitor supplier performance, and manage contract activity.

*Rating Average = 2.64*

**CREATE a PROCUREMENT SERVICES UNIT** within the unified strategic procurement organization to provide consistent, system-wide training and support, coordinate procurement activity for individual campuses, oversee quality assurance and compliance, and conduct special projects as required by legislative and regulatory mandates.

*Rating Average = 2.76*

\[n=149\]

A rating average of 2.5 or higher indicates support for the recommendation.
Q13. Please indicate your level of support for each of the emerging recommendations for Procurement Organization Structure

CREATE A PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS UNIT within the unified strategic procurement organization responsible for accounts payable, travel and Pcard administration, procurement systems administration, and management of procurement related data.

Rating Average = 2.61

TRANSITION TO A UNIFIED STRATEGIC PROCUREMENT ORGANIZATION operating as a shared system-wide service reporting to the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee and advised by the Shared Services Advisory Council and the President’s Council. The organization would consist of three functional units: Procurement Operations, Procurement Services, and Strategic Sourcing with staff located at both campus and system offices with emphasis on ensuring effective campus-based presence.

Rating Average = 2.52

n=149

A rating average of 2.5 or higher indicates support for the recommendation.