

**COUNCIL OF BUYERS
MEETING MINUTES
January 8, 2015**

Members/Attendees	In Attendance	Phone	Absent
Arnold, Jonathan – COSCC	√		
Barker, Elaine – TSU	√		
Buchanan, Melanie – TCAT Nashville		√	
Carrier, Heather – WSCC	√		
Clark, Debbie – PSCC		√	
Clark, John – PSCC	√		
Crisp, Kathy – MTSU		√	
Curtis, Elaine –COSCC			√
DeLoche, Cathy –TBR	√		
Desrochers, Suzanne – APSU		√	
Dunn, Connie – CLSCC		√	
Ferreira, Marta – TSU	√		
Flynn, Angela Gregory – TBR	√		
Fox, Alisha – CLSCC	√		
Greenwood, Valerie – TTU		√	
Hall, Deanna – TBR	√		
Hull, Judy - TTU	√		
Hamer, Lynn – WSCC	√		
Harris, Lana – SWCC		√	
Hemrick, Robert – JSCC		√	
Hodges, Mark - TBR	√		
Hyland, Robert – NESCC	√		
Jones, Randall – NESCC	√		
Lowe, Doris – ETSU		√	
Martin, Ron – CHSCC		√	
McGovern, Terry – VLCC	√		
Mount, Diane – RSCC	√		
Nabors, Jim – UOM		√	
Owenby, Wilma – CLSCC		√	
Presley, Dana – RSCC	√		
Pritchett, Will – MTSU		√	
Pugh, Wayne – TBR	√		
Ridgeway, John – TCAT McKenzie			√
Robbins, Canty – UOM		√	
Robinson, Jacqueline – SWCC		√	
Rouse, Lynn – JSCC		√	
Sims, Dale – TBR	√		
Sims, Joel – TSU		√	
Smith, Jo – NASCC			√
Stafford, Camilla – MSCC		√	
Staples, Mary Jane – MTSU		√	
Turpin, Danice – TCAT Harriman		√	
Wallis, Donna – TTU		√	
Walls, Leigh – MTSU		√	
Watts, Amy – DSCC	√		
Young, Stacy - TBR	√		

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.

Attendance taken by Angela.

Personnel Updates

Angela informed the Council that Michelle Newman was no longer with Southwest Tennessee Community College. Michelle took a position at the UT Health Sciences Center Procurement Office. Additionally, Angela informed the Council that Carol King was no longer at the TBR System Office. The TBR Purchasing and Contracts Admin Position is now posted and the Purchasing and Contracts Office hopes to have someone in place in the next four (4) to six (6) weeks. Stacy Young, from Kelly Services, will be assisting in the interim. Angela requested information regarding any other changes at any of the campuses. No responses were given.

Inbound Freight Cost Reduction Program

Angela informed members of the Council of a potential initiative regarding inbound freight cost reduction which institutions around the country have been implementing. This initiative appears to present an opportunity to save money by cutting freight shipment costs.

Angela introduced Eric McGlade, a partner with Vantage Point Logistics (VPL), and Bobby Bledsoe, Federal Express (Fedex) Account Manager who provided a presentation to the Council on the inbound freight cost reduction program.

Mr. Bledsoe began the presentation with a brief personal introduction. Mr. Bledsoe stated that FedEx began having conversations two to three years ago with several universities to discuss ways in which to save money. Through these discussions, the idea of inbound solutions came up and, as such, the concept is still relatively new. The initial partnering of FedEx with VPL began with Mr. Bledsoe's association with Emory University and their negotiations regarding inbound freight distribution. Emory has been utilizing the FedEx/VPL alliance for a year and a half, and has saved well into the six-figure range.

At this point, Mr. Bledsoe introduced Mr. McGlade to present the nuts and bolts of the concept. Mr. McGlade provided a brief history by stating that VPL initially provided the inbound shipping process to approximately 1400 to 1500 hospital/healthcare systems. Mr. McGlade told Council members that almost all hospitals across the country are currently utilizing this inbound freight concept. The inclusion of higher education institutions seemed a logical extension and, at that point, VPL connected with FedEx and FedEx's national counterparts. VPL has a publicly bid contract with E&I, which TBR is eligible to use, and VPL is working with the University of California System, Ohio State, Emory, the ten schools and hospitals at the University of Texas and others. Institutions were provided an article from Educational Procurement Journal specific to Emory University's experience.

Mr. McGlade explained that, although the concept was relatively new within higher education, it was not new overall, and has been proven through time. Mr. McGlade used a slide show to illustrate who VPL was and what VPL could do for TBR. The overall idea is to have vendors remove shipping/freight costs from the cost of the good, as these costs are typically a standard inflated cost instead of the actual cost to have that item shipped.

Mr. McGlade suggested that if this program was to be implemented that a school should collectively meet with FedEx and VPL to discuss next steps. VPL would manage the process, and do most of the work. Mr. McGlade indicated that VPL would approach vendors in advance, informing the vendors that a particular school had come on board with the FedEx/VPL program so that once the system was in place TBR personnel would continue to conduct business with vendors in the normal manner without having to know that VPL exists. As the schools place the

orders, there would not be a need on the part of the schools to inform vendors of any changes, but merely to place the orders routinely.

More specifically about the process, VPL would inform key vendors, identified by the school, that the school will be working with FedEx/VPL as of a certain identified date. In the invoicing process, the schools would contact the vendors, providing the FedEx number, and would request that the vendor begin using that number to bill the shipping/freight costs. VPL would then encourage those vendors to use the TBR discounted Fedex rate, in which case the vendor would now be billing based on the actual weight/size dimensions of the packages. VPL would connect every FedEx charge to the appropriate PO, G/L, etc. in the schools' systems.

Mr. McGlade stated that once the program was implemented detailed reports would be provided that delineated the savings associated with usage of the program. Additionally, VPL will provide account managers who manage the entire process, with VPL being the liaison between TBR/schools and vendors.

Questions Pertaining to the Program

- A question was asked regarding the handling of goods damaged in transit. Mr. McGlade's responded by saying that nothing would change regarding shipping terms and the issue would be between school and vendor, based on the institution's shipping terms (typically F.O.B. destination).
- A Council member asked how free shipping was handled. Mr. McGlade responded by saying that free shipping was not dealt with by VPL. Additionally, Mr. Bledsoe mentioned at this point that contracts involving free shipping should be renegotiated down the road for a better savings to the school - as the shipping charges are not actually free, but are built into the cost of the product.
- Angela requested names of vendors already set up in the VPL system. Mr. McGlade replied that no formal list existed but the list would very lengthy and his team would need to identify the vendors who would be participating with higher education. Mr. McGlade went on to say that certain vendors such as OfficeMax, Staples, and any other vendors that make their own deliveries are not included in the program.
- A question then arose as to regionality performance/restriction issues using this program. Mr. McGlade stated that VPL would be proactive in analyses of contracts with vendors to obtain the best pricing in all situations.
- A Council member asked if vendors wanting to partner with FedEx/VPL would be saving as well by participating this program. Mr. McGlade said that vendors would benefit because typically vendors that participate in this program see an increase in institution purchases because of their willingness to participate. Mr. McGlade further stated that vendor acceptance of the program varied, with some accepting and understanding due to years of experience dealing with its usage in healthcare/hospital systems. Other vendors, however, refuse to participate and, in these instances, VPL would notify TBR/schools of their unwillingness to participate.
- A Council member asked what information from TBR would needed by VPL. Mr. McGlade responded that the information needed by VPL was very basic data, which would include a list of current vendor names, possibly the freight spend for vendor (although if freight was not a separate line item that is okay) and total spend for the year for each vendor. Mr. McGlade's team would extrapolate from that point and calculate estimated savings.

- Another question was asked about Dell Computers being a vendor. Mr. McGlade stated that Dell does not participate as a vendor in the program.
- The same question was asked, but with regard to Apple. Mr. McGlade was unsure whether Apple participates in the program. Mr. McGlade further stated that he does not see a lot of orders coming through on the university side.
- Angela mentioned that it would require a large effort on the part of the schools to provide VPL the necessary information, and requested that VPL provide a laundry list of VPL associated vendors in order to prevent a waste of time and manpower by the schools in the event certain vendors did not participate. Mr. McGlade agreed to analyze the data and provide this information.
- Angela then asked whether the universities who currently use the VPL program were Banner schools or PeopleSoft schools. The response was that many of the schools have SciQuest as the ordering system and PeopleSoft or Banner as the ERP system. VPL has, however, worked with hundreds of systems over the years. VPL's process system-wide is not programming; instead, it involves basic PO and invoicing data matching/reconciliation of the data provided by hospitals/schools, which does require some effort and time in the beginning to set up. VPL then supplies to the organization an invoice in whatever format the organization specifies. The general scheme in the billing process is essentially the same, however, and the schools would inform VPL the format desired. VPL will mimic whatever format the vendor is currently using, i.e. electronically.
- Mark Hodges asked if, in the process of VPL receiving the PO and working with SciQuest, should SciQuest distribution be changed to VPL on the PO? Mr. McGlade responded that nothing is actually changing on the SciQuest orders that are being placed on the schools' side and that they would still be sent directly to the vendor. Mr. McGlade went on to say that some customers prefer VPL to input the freight charges into SciQuest, with the data flowing into the G/L and some customers prefer that VPL bill all freight charges directly to the institution.
- A Council member asked for the acceptable ways for TBR to provide the PO information is to VPL. The response by Mr. McGlade included several ways, depending on the level of sophistication of the schools' systems. 99% of the information flows electronically from the schools' system (approximately 1% flows manually) every night, running in the job queues. Data specs are provided by VPL in the initial setup. The person at each school responsible for pulling the elements of data required would put together a small report, which would then be transmitted via email to VPL.
- Angela inquired if Emory utilizes SciQuest. Mr. McGlade indicated that they did utilize SciQuest.
- Angela informed MR. McGlade that all TBR schools use SciQuest and asked if Emory's information was derived from SciQuest. Mr. McGlade responded by saying that he believed the information from Emory was coming from PeopleSoft ERP System. The data is not typically derived by VPL from SciQuest, as SciQuest data is generally not all-inclusive. Therefore, VPL does not limit solely to SciQuest vendors.

Angela requested that any Council members with any additional questions call or email them to her. At that point Angela thanked Mr. Bledsoe and Mr. McGlade and informed them that TBR would begin internal discussions regarding the desirability and feasibility of the program.

Angela announced a five minute break and asked that Council members who had been participating in the Inbound Freight Cost Reduction webinar, please dial into the TBR conference call line to continue the COB meeting when we reconvene following the break.

Collaboration with the Central Procurement Office (CPO) for Goods/Services

Angela began by stating that discussions had taken place between TBR, UT and the Central CPO Office, at the CPO's request, regarding potentially partnering for the procurement of goods/services. These discussions began in the early fall timeframe. As a result of those conversations, the CPO identified a handful of commodities and asked both TBR and UT to provide contract documentation on how they are acquiring these commodities. Angie had reached out to the universities for this information and provided TBR's documentation to the CPO back in the Fall of 2014.

Angela explained to the Council that at this point, the CPO had identified four (4) contracts with the following proposed action:

1. HVAC/Plumbing/Electrical SubContractors – CPO is requesting a joint competitive process.
2. CISCO Equipment and Medical Testing – the CPO is recommending that TBR join their contracts.
3. Office Supplies – the CPO is considering joining TBR/UT's Contract, upon review of the final RFP results of the current process.

Dale Sims addressed the Council and provided a brief history of the origin of the partnership requests. Mr. Sims stated that cooperation was necessary and that the possibly using volume to obtain lower commodity prices would be feasible and would make the State government a value-add service to TBR. Dale also mentioned that other similar individual contracts be combined, i.e. TBR having 20 separate banking accounts which could possibly be combined. In closing, Mr. Sims stated that TBR needed to identify those items of most importance.

Regarding the HVAC/Plumbing/Electrical SubContractor Solicitation, Angela indicated that TBR will be participating and mentioned the need for additional TBR data. Angela has requested an Excel spreadsheet of the additional data they had indicated would be needed for this process. In addition, institutions will be asked to provide any volunteers on their campuses that would like to participate in this process, as TBR school involvement will be crucial to ensure that our needs will be met by the resulting contract of this solicitation. Angela also indicated that the CPO had been notified that no TBR institution would be required to cancel an existing contracts for these services and that TBR institutions would be allowed to use other providers if the cost was less to the Institution. Institutions with in-house resources will not be required to participate, although explanation of the economic decision of the college may be required.

The CPO's timeline for the HVAC/Plumbing/Electrical SubContractor solicitation was a release date of April as its current contract expires August 31st of this year. The CPO has developed a Focus Group that has begun discussions on the solicitation. Angela will send out an email within several days requesting additional campus data as well as a request for volunteers who wish to participate in this solicitation process.

Regarding the CPO's Cisco Equipment Contract, the CPO indicated that although TBR's contract discounts look to be better than the State's rates, further review had indicated that the State was actually paying less than TBR because of a secondary bid process that the CPO conducts for each Cisco Equipment procurement. Further discussion will be required before any action is taken by TBR as our current Cisco RFP is under review presently, as well as the fact of the additional staff demands that would be required for a secondary bidding process. performed by the State had been discussed. Pros and cons were addressed. The CPO has

indicated its willingness to conduct the secondary bid process for TBR which would have its challenges.

Medical Testing was the least favored service as many times researchers are using grant funds and have very set companies that conduct these services.

Angela concluded this topic of conversation by saying that some of the challenges warrant further discussion before a decision could be made on any type of collaboration.

OMB A-81 – Grant Tracking on Campus (direct grant expenditures and sub-awards)

A reminder was made by Angela for institutions to provide names of campus representatives who will participate in the February 3, 2015 meeting. All campus offices were invited to participate. Also, any relevant questions should be addressed to System Office by the February 13, 2015 deadline. Dyersburg will not be included. Wayne Pugh began discussion of grant expenditures by informing Council members that this issue will be addressed in a February meeting. The timeline for TBR Procurement to validate Federal grants exceeding \$3,000 is June, 2015.

TBR Purchasing Policy and Contract Guidelines

Angela and Mr. Pugh have worked on revisions relative to all of the Procurement Commission changes, laws, regulations, etc. A request was made to have a small group to assist with this. The direction desired would be to have very short policy and guideline, but to have an in-depth procedures manual in order to make changes and edits more easily.

GODBE – Diversity Expenditure Tracking

Angela informed the Council that the Governor's Office of Diversity Business Enterprise (GODBE) had reached out to her to discuss ways to increase TBR's numbers related to business with small, minority, women and veteran-owned businesses. Through further inquiry and discussion Angela learned that they GODBE Office was only counting vendors that had been officially certified by that office in its volume count and goal attainment by TBR. At this point in time it is unclear exactly how information regarding the number of businesses registered and certified could have been gleaned from the TBR report since the vendor name information is not included in the reports. A timing challenge was also discussed as the GODBE Office had indicated that most vendors can be officially certified within thirty (30) days and institutions cannot hold up orders waiting on the certification component.

Angela requested that the Council think about this challenge and offer any suggestions for more ways to have vendors certified, through the GODBE Office, with the least time and expense. A 'Yes/No' trigger question in the upcoming TSM Vendor Portal was mentioned as a possible solution. Angela did discuss with UT whom were also recently made aware of the GODBE's limited acceptance of the SMWV data provided and UT does not have a solution at this time.

SciQuest

- TSM Update - TBR has not signed the Order Form with Ellucian, to integrate SciQuest TSM and Banner. The cost is estimated to be approximately \$150,000 and will take 400 to 500 Ellucian man hours to implement. TBR has four other higher education institutions in the nation who are interested in potentially partnering with TBR. Those institutions are Wayne State, Drexel University, the New School in New York, and RPI in Michigan. The TBR System Office has drafted a business agreement between the four, stipulating portions to be paid on a proportionate basis which will be shared with those

institutions soon.

- Customer Service to your Campus Constituents – Angela stated that now that the SciQuest System has been in place and running at all institutions for a little over a year, it is time to start using SciQuest to produce spend analytics data for management and to provide customer service information to the various constituents at your institutions.

Mark Hodges then provided relevant details/reports with Council members of information/reports that the System Office has been providing. A sample pamphlet was provided to the Council as an example of a way in which to improve customer service with its departments showing the types of data that Purchasing could provide related to departmental spend. It was recommended that something of this type be implemented with TBR institutions. Each Council member was provided a handout of TBR Central eShop examples of training presentations, SciQuest user reminders, examples of various reports that can be run to provide the various departments with budget and management information and methods to easily discern and disseminate information through the search function to track expenses.

The Council was asked to provide any ideas and/or examples of the types of things the schools are doing, or considering doing, with respect to SciQuest data and reports aimed at providing information for management or better customer service to your campus constituents. This is the beginning of an ongoing discussion and development to enhance procurement customer service.

Please send any information or ideas you may have to Angela.Flynn@tbr.edu and Mark.Hodges@tbr.edu. The TBR System Office has a SciQuest Section on its webpage where this type of information is housed.

- Purchasing/AP Group – A group has been formed, which includes both Purchasing and A/P members. The purpose of the group is to discuss issues which arise, particularly with respect to Sci-Quest and other joint initiatives. Both departments are now collaborating and we anticipate that these calls will be very beneficial to all parties involved.

The first conference call took back in November, with a data request from the group regarding differences between A/P Express and A/P Director were requested. This information was sent to SciQuest but due to personnel turnover at Sci-Quest, the information has not been received. The System Office will follow-up with Sci-Quest to discuss this as well as next steps in other current initiatives.

Questions Pertaining to the Program

- A question was asked at this point by a Council member regarding latitude of schools to join the A/P Express, based on affordability. Angela responded, 'Yes.' Additionally, Angela expressed the possibility of the cost being based on a tiered system depending upon the schools participating.
- Another question asked was whether A/P Director would work with Sci-Quest Express. An explanation of the various models has been requested; the answer to this question is uncertain at this point.
- Consortium Vendor Additions - Angela asked if any Council members had been approached by vendors requesting to be added as consortium suppliers. TBR has had two: HD Supply and Insight. Difficulties have arisen in obtaining vendor information and comparing this information with other contracts. Once that process

is complete, a market basket analysis will be performed to ensure vendor availability and good rates. As of this week, both vendors appear to better understand the information that is being requested. It is our goal to obtain the information that has been asked for and get the information vetted through and potentially add these vendors as consortium vendors during the first quarter of 2015.

TBR Updates/Current Issues -

- 1) Apple Lease documents – Angela sent an email in December regarding a newly negotiated lease agreement with Apple for equipment. This occurred as a result of the request from Walters State to lease iPads for students. The actual exhibit with the lease schedule, was not attached to the email, however, and was uploaded to the TBR Contracts Log on January 7th and Angela will also email the revised documentation to the institutions.
- 2) The Online Course Management RFP is set to open January 15.
- 3) The Office Supply RFP is currently under a review and is in the Cost/Revenue Proposal analysis phase. A clarification has been sent to the vendors, with a deadline of next Wednesday for responses. At that point a decision has not been made whether TBR will stay with the current vendor or change vendors.
- 4) Cisco RFP opened January 7, with two responses received to date.
- 5) Title IX – SaVE Training RFP is in the works due to an act passed by President Obama in 2013 to protect women against violence. As a system, TBR is required to have online training for employees related to this subject. It will be similar to the harassment training currently done on campuses. Heather Stewart in the TBR Legal Department is heading up the initiative, with a committee comprised of Legal, HR, Academic, ROCC, UT, and TCAT representation. The second round of specifications are currently being reviewed with an anticipated release date in February. This training is mandated and thus will be required on the part of all schools. The cost is currently unknown. Additionally, a segment of this program includes a student portion, with a pilot and a grant helping to fund the ways the students will be educated on this matter. The RFP currently in process, therefore, will be primarily for employees but will contain an option for students to be added as well as other training components.

6) Library Update –

Current RFQs –

- a. Academic e-book Comprehensive Collection – with EBSCO being the successful proposer. The subscription cost is approximately \$107,000 per year and this is funded by ROCC. The anticipated start/access date for this service is 2/1/15.
- b. Academic Discovery Search License - this RFQ is being reissued due to the bankruptcy of the prior vendor, SWETS. This RFQ is scheduled to open 1/4/15.

Library Master Term Agreements - As previously mentioned, TBR is moving to the UT model to establish master terms enabling school libraries to have the capability of cutting POs and referencing back to the master terms. These terms would be broad enough to cover most all, if not all products/services offered by the library provider. This would be beneficial to the schools in negotiating terms with vendors. Four (4) vendors have been identified by the library directors to establish master terms: EBSCO, Alexander Street Press, Lexis/Nexis, and Springshare. Contact has been made with all four potential vendors; three have

been receptive, but Lexis/Nexis is unable to follow its contract with UT, indicating that UT's Agreement is inclusive of all UT departments, not just library needs. Lexis/Nexis has sent TBR another contract to be reviewed. The goal is to have these first four contracts in place by the end of the first quarter of 2015.

- Surplus Request - Angela mentioned she is currently serving on a library task force. As a result of conversations, the group's first request was additional language be added to the Surplus Property Policy to allow libraries the ability to donate books and periodicals to non-profits. In review of state law and CPO procedures, Wayne Pugh found nothing which would allow this process. It was mentioned by a Council member that TBR associated schools are allowed to donate to local school systems, and various manners of reporting for discarded items was mentioned.
- 7) Community College /TCAT Governor's Grant Equipment Purchases are coming to an end. Collectively, \$1,037,000 was saved by collectively procuring the equipment. One RFQ is still outstanding for the TCATS; otherwise, all purchase orders have been issued. The final three or four purchase orders were sent to the TCATs and respective community colleges during the first week of January.
 - 8) RJ Young Portion of TBR Webpage - A portion of the TBR webpage has been developed to provide data for implementation of RJ Young, including assessment data, sample invoices, training videos, etc. The inclusion of this part of the website is the result of difficulties having been experienced by ETSU in their implementation. ETSU was asked to review the webpage, and Mark Bragg of the ETSU IT Department provided helpful feedback. Topics such as pointer link issues are being corrected. Timetables for beginning implementation are provided, as well as various other options.
 - 9) Current Report Due Dates - January 7 was the due date for the reporting of quarterly contracts. Not all have been received, and are needed ASAP. The Diversity Report is due January 23; a template will be sent January 9. The Small/Minority/Women-Owned Business Veteran Report is due February 3 and information will be sent for this, as well. Angela offered a heads-up regarding the annual Senate Finance Ways and Means Committee Report. Renee Stewart typically asks that this data be provided in February. Council members were asked to send these reports to the System Purchasing and Contracts Office at: Procurement@tbr.edu. Stacy Young will receive and consolidate the reports into consolidated reports.

Updates from Institutions/Other – Angela asked Dart Hemrick to address the Council with his questions regarding electronic signatures.

Questions In General

- Amy Watts asked regarding the EBSCO flipster and whether it is a part of the award to EBSCO. Angela responded that it is not – the current award to EBSCO is specific to e-books. However, the master terms agreement that is being negotiated would be for essentially all items offered from EBSCO.
- Dart Hemrick stated that Mr. Chase, JSCC VP of Finance, sent JSCC employees the TBR policy document regarding electronic signatures, with a question as to whether electronic signatures could be used in all regards, including contracts. Mr. Hemrick asked for clarification of TBR policy regarding the use of electronic signatures on contracts instead of original signatures. He mentioned his policy of sending three original contracts to vendors for signature, and asked if it would possible to instead email these documents to vendors for electronic signature and return. Wayne Pugh responded

that current TBR guidelines state that original documents require original signatures, as noted in both G-030 and the Purchasing Policy. TBR is looking into the feasibility and legality of this, and indication was given that it could be done as requested, but that certain procedures and language must be in place. Because the current contracts do not contain this language, the recommendation was to continue original signatures on original documents. The electronic records and electronic signatures policy was discussed in the Finance Committee this week, but was deferred due to the amount of information contained in the policy. State requirements are being studied with regard to Record Destruction Authority, which must be signed off by the Public Records Commission. At this point, Angela mentioned the piloting of the DocuSign program at the TBR System Office, which will allow documents to be sent electronically for signature. Wayne Pugh supplemented this information, saying that, essentially, DocuSign creates a workflow with electronically created signatures in a format that is acceptable. The basis requiring original signatures is the need to have records admissible in court. Called Best Evidence Rules, the requirements have recently developed into an allowance of duplicate copies and scanned copies with scanned signatures being considered admissible. DocuSign requires compliance with statutes, and the documentation of all procedures to allow admission of contracts into court.

Cammie Stafford of Motlow State Community College asked whether contracts flowing between TBR institutions would be an exception, as in the case of Dual Service Agreements. Mr. Pugh responded that this example is precisely the reason TBR is investigating use of DocuSign. Ms. Stafford then requested clarification that the rule of having an original signature requirement still stands currently within TBR institutions. Mr. Pugh confirmed, saying it remains in current TBR Guidelines and Policies.

A question from Dyersburg State Community College was raised as to the validity of schools operating within their own policies and guidelines with regard to electronic signatures. Angela confirmed that, if the school has procedures developed, they may use these. Mr. Pugh confirmed that a policy approved by a school may be used if it is in accordance with B-095. Mr. Pugh added that a counterpart clause in the school contract is necessary for any scanned signatures; however, saying both the emailed signature and the scanned, returned signature together form the contract. Dyersburg mentioned their formation of an electronic signatures committee whereby the committee reviews all items needing signature, with the exception of contracts. Mr. Pugh requested clarification of the term 'electronic signature' in this case. The response included signatures which are faxed, emailed, or digital. Mr. Pugh then referred to the Electronic Transaction Act, which involves an original signature that is created electronically and recorded into a digital format. Additionally, Mr. Pugh acknowledged the efficiency of emailed signatures, and is currently studying G-030 in this regard. Angela mentioned that input by the schools is required by DocuSign in order for the schools to use DocuSign. A request was then made by a Council member that Mr. Pugh send the required counterpart contract language to the schools, to which he agreed.

- Angela asked for additional questions or comments. The question of Banking Contracts came up. Angela responded that, due to new statutes, longer term banking contracts are being discussed at the System Office. This is a discussion Mr. Sims will have with the Business Officers. A question was then asked if it would be permissible to agree to longer term contracts prior to a decision being made. Angela responded that she would discuss with Mr. Sims but the intent is to provide a consistent practice to the Institutions and that there are also some other potential changes being considered – such as institutions combining volumes for joint banking agreements.
- Donna Wallis asked for input regarding the handling of school athletic charter trips. The procedure at Tennessee Tech is to bid by team, by year. The question was asked whether

it would be feasible to do multi-year contracts for the team, or possibly to do a master bus contract for the entire school. A Jackson State representative mentioned that Jackson State sends schedules to the bus companies and includes all teams for the entire academic year. The bid made by the bus company is thus based on the combined information of all of the teams. Austin Peay reported handling contracts by season; however, Angela mentioned the need to notice any overlapping of seasons with this method and if competition would be limited due to the lack of buses with this method.

At this time, the meeting was adjourned by Angela and ended at 11:45 a.m.

Minutes recorded by Mark Hodges and Stacy Young.