Council of Buyers
Meeting Minutes
January 5, 2017

Members/Attendees	School	In Attendance	Conference Call	Absent
Antoniak, Ed	UOM		√	
Arnold, Jon	COSCC	√		
Austin, Renee	VSCC			√
Blain, Judy	APSU			√
Bunch, Sharon	TSU		√	
Busch, Donta	TSU		√	
Butts, Constance	UOM		√	
Clark, John	PSCC	√		
Crisp, Kathy	MTSU		√	
Desrochers, Suzanne	APSU			√
Fennell, Charles	SWCC		√	
Flynn, Angela	TBR	√		
Fox, Alisha	CLSCC		√	
Harrison, Chris	VSCC		√	
Hemrick, Dart	JSCC	√		
Hodges, Mark	TBR	√		
Hull, Judy	TTU	√		
Jansen, Anita	TBR	√		
Jarnigan, Renee	WSCC	√		
Jones, Randal	NESCC		√	
Lowe, Doris	ETSU		√	
Lowe, Lee Ann	CLSCC		√	
Martin, Ron	CHSCC			√
McCarter, Debra	WSCC			√
Morrell, Jayne	ETSU			√
Mullins, Beth	DSCC	√		
Nabors, Jim	UOM		√	
Pugh, Wayne	TBR	√		
Ridgeway, John	TCAT McKenzie			√
Robbins, Canty	UOM		√	
Sims, Joel	TSU	√		
Smith, Jo	NSCC	√		
Stafford, Camilla	MSCC		√	
Staples, Mary Jane	MTSU		√	
Thomas, Sherman	MTSU			√
Thompson, Bethany	PSCC	√		
Turpin, Danice	TCAT Harriman			√
Wallis, Donna	TTU	√		
Walls, Leigh	MTSU		√	
Walton, Pat	APSU		√	
Watts, Amy	TBR	√		
West, Dana	RSCC	√		

Welcome/Opening Remarks

Angela began the meeting at 9:00 am by greeting everyone and wishing all a Happy New Year. This was the first Council of Buyers meeting at the System Office's new location, so Angela welcomed everyone to the new building and gave brief logistical information. Anita Jansen distributed some additional meeting documentation to those in the room and Angela distributed this electronically as well.

Angela told the Council that there were a couple of staffing changes related to the Council. Cassie Hodges at Cleveland State has taken another position within the College and Lee Ann Lowe will be the procurement person for Cleveland State going forward. Angela further informed the Council that Lynn Hamer at Walter State had been promoted at the College and Renee Jarnigan will be the procurement person for Walters State going forward. Angela welcomed both Lee Ann and Renee to the Council. Mary Jane at MTSU indicated that Will Pritchett had retired and that Shirman Thomas had been hired as the new Director and would be starting next week.

Angela completed the announcements regarding staffing changes by making sure that everyone was aware that on 12/27/16 the Tennessee Board of Regents voted unanimously to appoint Dr. Flora Tydings, the current president at Chattanooga State Community College, as the next Chancellor of the TBR System. Angela concluded by saying that Dr. Tydings will officially begin her position as Chancellor on February 1, 2017.

Attendance was taken by Anita Jansen.

RFP Template
Angela began the discussion of the RFP template by thanking everyone who had reviewed the template and provided feedback. Angela stated that she was appreciative to those that had taken time to read it and provide input. Angela took this opportunity to publicly thank Donna Wallis with TTU for her input and proof reading abilities. The final version of the RFP template was distributed to the Council. Going forward the Council is asked to utilize the new template.

DocuSign
With regards to DocuSign, all institutions are now required to use DocuSign for contracts and Order Forms with Ellucian, Touchnet and PeopleAdmin. The links to the Powerforms for Order Forms are located at the bottom of the same page where the Powerforms for contracts are located. Angela asked for the Council's patience as she is still working through identifying all the uniqueness at the campus level related to routing, approval and signatory authority. Angela asked the Council to please email her if any mistakes are discovered in the work flow routing, so that she can correct the issue and move the paper work in a timely fashion.

To assist institutions, Angela asked that institutions not route the Agreement to the final signatory in the Powerform, as Angela will send it to the campus as part of the management of the envelope. Angela further explained that if an institution is still utilizing its internal routing and approval to simply use the procurement or officer's name as the originator only to begin the routing process. Dart at Jackson State indicated that JSCC would have a new president soon and would be sending new routing/workflow instructions for his College.

The next issue Angela covered pertaining to DocuSign involved entities that refuse to sign via DocuSign. Angela explained to the Council that there are a couple of options. The first ask of a vendor when they refuse to use DocuSign is for the vendor to sign first. Once the vendor signs, the vendor can scan the institution a PDF and the schools can upload that into DocuSign for the regular routing/approval process. If the vendor refuses to sign first, then the institution will have to route this to the System Office for approval via the old hard copy paper forms. TBR has had this to happen in a few instances but for the most part, everyone has embraced the DocuSign process.

Cammie at Motlow State asked how an institution would know if a vendor would accept routing via the DocuSign process? Angela indicated that once the contract negotiations were complete, the institution would have to explain the new routing and approval process to get the name, title and signatory of the vendor. At that time is usually when the vendor raises the issue if there is a conflict with the process.

Fiscal Review Requirements for Non-Competitive and Competitive Agreements
Fiscal Review has made some changes to the types of contracts that come before the Committee for review and recommendation. These requirements now include all amendments/renewals/changes to non-competitive

contracts as well as those that were originally competitive procured which meet the $250,000 total value threshold. Angie informed the Council that TBR will be sending the institutions a survey in the next few days to assess volume and attempt to measure time/workload commitments so that discussions can take place with Fiscal Review staff to provide some sort of alternative submission requirements and/or relief related to these additional requirements. Angela asked the Council to be as accurate as possible in the survey to assist the System Office in getting the best volume data.

John with Pellissippi State asked if this applies to just contracts or if an institution issues purchase orders in lieu of contracts. Angela indicated in that case that purchase orders would apply. Judy at Tennessee Tech – asked for clarification, so are you saying if we have a contract that is over the 250,000.00 for 5 years or over 50,000.00 a year, every time we renew it would have to go in front of Fiscal review? Angela indicated that yes, renewals are considered amendments.

Angela also explained to the Council that certain members of the Fiscal Review Committee do not look favorably on Agreements with a full five (5) term at execution. If the institution executes an Agreement with a five (5) year term and subsequently has a change or amendment that is needed, Fiscal Review will question why a single five (5) year term was executed.

In addition to the additional workload/submittal requirements, Angela indicated that Agreements/Amendments are required to be submitted to the Committee sixty (60) days prior to the effective date of the Agreement/Amendment. Jo at Nashville State asked if this is going to be brought up at the business officers meeting at NSCC's contracts office is separate from purchasing. Angela indicated yes.

Angela informed the Council that the Central Procurement Commission is already doing this and that the Central Procurement Office had provided the System Office with its current process/templates for submissions. The System Office is reviewing this information.

Canty with UOM asked if Fiscal Review wants to see the original contract that was competitive? Angela indicated that when submitting Fiscal Review packets, there are 3 or 4 forms that must be completed. Once the Fiscal Review Staff review the packet, they can come back and ask for any type of submittal documentation, such as the original contract. In many cases, the staff will come back and ask for the current spend to date against the contract. Canty also asked for clarification that competitive contracts would not initially be presented to the Fiscal Review Committee, just the renewals and/or amendments? Angela indicated that Canty was correct. Canty asked if this included names changes by the vendor. Wayne Pugh in Legal answered yes, that name changes were specifically stated in the statute.

John at Pellissippi State asked if this would apply to existing contracts or just new ones going foward? Angela indicated that she was not sure at this time. The TBR System Office is reviewing everything and will also be discussing with UT to determine next steps.

Dart with Jackson State asked how would institutions submit to the Fiscal Review. Angela answered that the community colleges and TCATs' contracts would be submitted by the System Office. This will require a good bit of planning for consolidated preparation and submittal. The universities will soon be trained on how to submit its documentation to the Fiscal Review Committee for review and approval.

SciQuest

TSM - Amy Watts provided the Council and update on TSM vendor participation. Amy stated that since the TSM kick-off, five (5) months ago, collectively there are 4307 suppliers that are active in TSM. TBR has invited 531 suppliers to register and out of those 531invites, 324 have completed profiles. TBR is going back and encouraging those who have not completed the TSM process to do so at this time. At the adjournment of this meeting, there will be an additional TSM lunch working session.

Strategic Sourcing – A TBR institution was approached by National IPA stating it could offer TBR an additional 5% discount through CDW-G based upon TBR's overall spend, with CDW-G being one of TBR's current consortium suppliers. The System Office performed a cost analysis/savings process, taking the top 200 items that were purchased by TBR institutions and comparing that over the multiple contracts CDW-G has with cooperatives that TBR utilizes (NJPA, TCPN, etc). The results of this process didn't not yield great savings, only $136.42 for the whole year and the analysis showed that NJPA pricing was not the best price in most instances. As a result, TBR will not be moving forward with the purchase agreement with National IPA.

These types of comparisons are what TBR is reviewing to see where TBR, as a System, can be more strategic and identify additional cost savings opportunities. SciQuest is full of data, and Angela reminded the Council that one of the factors used in determining that the TBR System would license SciQuest for its eprocurement platform was the ability for institutions to not only have an electronic routing/workflow process, but also the ability to analyze spend to manage procurements and make cost effective changes/decisions. If your institution is not utilizing SciQuest in its fullest capacity, the System is asking institutions to pull these types of reports and look for cost savings or for things that could be renegotiated to arrive at the most optimal pricing for your institution.   If you have and you would like TBR to analyze spend on a particular commodity or contract, please let Amy Watts know and the System Office will do so.

Amazon - Mark Hodges provided an update on the Amazon consortium supplier enablement. The enablement process for the System Office is now complete; however, Amazon is still not complete in SciQuest production. The System Office is waiting on Amazon to provide its TSM information, to assign a Banner number. Amy has requested Amazon to complete the TSM Vendor Registration and the Amazon legal team is reviewing the process. Mark indicated that institutions may proceed in starting its enablement process by filing a ticket with SciQuest if the institutions wishes to enable Amazon as a supplier. Jo Smith indicated that NaSCC has elected to not to add Amazon as a supplier. Angela cautioned institutions that do choose to enable them to watch that office supplies are not being purchased, as TBR currently has a contract with Staples for office supply needs. Dana West indicated that this will be a good enablement for Roane State as there are many purchases for the biology area and the pricing is generally good for the items needed.

Other - Donna Wallis asked if/when TTU will get a new SciQuest Account Representative. Amy stated that Toni with SciQuest did email out a new account representatives contact information and which schools they would service. That will be forwarded to the Council of Buyers. The email from Toni stated that Greg Owens was the SciQuest Team leader for DSCC, NSCC, JSCC, WSCC, APSU, TTU, RSCC, CISCC, and MSCC. Amy will forward the email to Council of Buyers after the meeting. Dart with Jackson State indicated that Rob Christensen emailed him that he would be JSCC's new SciQuest Representative.

Upcoming Strategic Sourcing System Initiatives/Updates:

Janitorial Supplies – For the TBR/UT RFP collaboration, an RFP development/evaluation committee has been formed, members were notified before the holiday break and next week there has been a working session scheduled with the members on specifications for January. The current contract with American Paper & Twine expires 7/31/17 so the RFP will be released during the February time frame to ensure the process is complete prior to the current contract expiration. Jo at Nashville State asked what would happen to AP&T as a consortium supplier if there are not awarded the contract. Angela responded that they will look into this further and provide feedback to the Council. Angela further stated that AP&T has been a great partner for TBR, working diligently to provide TBR the best prices available whether utilizing TBR's contract or the State Contract. Mark added that if the AP&T punch out remained it would have to be revisited because the current punch out reflects current contract discounted pricing.

Student/Employee Behavioral Tracking Software – The Safety and Security Task Force that is comprised of system-wide representatives to discuss issues/initiatives related to the safety and security of our campuses has recommended that the TBR System procure a student/employee behavioral tracking software solution to meet the System's needs.   Related to the TCATs and Community Colleges, a budget request has been sent to the State for the funding of this initiative. TBR should learn in the early February timeframe if funds have been granted. Once that has been determined, the System Office will move forward with a collective procurement. TBR Universities will be asked if they would like to participate in the strategic sourcing opportunity to obtain the best overall pricing for everyone, with each university funding its portion.   For those that have already procured this service, please share the procurement method used to purchase. The System Office understands that a few institutions are utilizing Maxient as its provider. Lynn Goodman with the TBR System TCAT Office asked that once the System Office finds out if funds have been granted for this project, could TBR start the process or would it have to be delayed until new budget in July. Angela indicated that TBR could start the procurement process this fiscal year to have the procurement ready to finalize with the new budgets in July.

Purchasing from UT Solicitations

Angela distributed to the Council current language being used by the University of Tennessee in its solicitations related to extending pricing to TBR and State entities. This language does not require the bidder/proposer to make a determination in the response to the solicitation as to whether or not it agrees to extend terms/pricing to TBR or the State, but leaves the ability to extend up to the vendor's discretion.   The System Office's Audit and Legal Departments have reviewed this and stated that this language is acceptable and that if a bidder/proposer submits a bid/proposal and is awarded the solicitation, then TBR institutions are permitted to purchase from the resulting contract if the vendor indicates they are extending. This is term no. 83 in the UT Terms and Conditions. Kathy at ETSU asked why we ask proposers in both Sections 1.4 of the RFP, provide an attachment listing the entities, and then again in Attachment 6.3. Angela explained that Section 1.4 is the narrative, with reference to the specific institutions in the attachment, and that Attachment 6.3 is where proposers are asked to officially respond to the question. Kathy at ETSU asked if the proposer does not indicate yes or no on Attachment 6.3, would they be allowed to extend to other institutions? Wayne indicated that during the RFP evaluation process, a clarification should be sent to proposers that did not answer so that this is clear and documented. Angela indicated that she did like UT's language in the section that puts the successful proposer on notice that depending upon the number of entities that participate in the resulting contract, the institution reserves the right to re-negotiate with the successful proposer. This will be added to TBR's language related to this issue.

RFPs/RFQs in Process/Upcoming -

RFPs
Board Portal Software – TBR has issued an RFP for a Board Portal Software solution that opens today, 1/5/17. This RFP is for the System Office and universities that will have individual boards to manage the board materials for board and sub-committee meetings. There is a system-wide committee that participated in the specification development and will also evaluate the proposals received.

PCard/Travel Card, ePayables Card with US Bank - there have been discussions and information gathered on services provided by US Bank pcard program. It appears that interests are in business travel card, procurement and epayables along with athletic and student travel. TCATs have been added to the process for now they will be under the community college they are assigned too.

RFIs/RFQs
Bookstore Services for Community Colleges/TCATs – an RFI was issued in December and responses are due in February. There is a system-wide committee that will assist in the development of the resulting RFP and a sub-group of that committee will evaluate and score proposals received. The goal is to have a contract in place by early 2018. Those community colleges that have existing bookstore

contracts will be granted approval to extend those agreements until summer of 2018. Kathy Crisp at MTSU asked if the RFI was available on the TBR website. Angela indicated yes, that all System Office RFPs, RFQs and RFIs are out on the website.

TNeCampus 2017 Summer Academy - bids are due 1/4/17
TCAT Newbern, Diesel Program, Truck bids opens today 1/5/17

Updates

HCA/Tri-Star – Wayne Pugh shared with the Council that HCA has a new agreement. Legal has ran into a few language challenges, so if anyone runs into a situation where asked to sign the new agreement, do not sign and get in touch with Wayne.

Lease Guideline (B-026) – Wayne indicated that he had been in discussion with the state architect's office, and they are indicating that our Lease Guideline B-026 may be need some revision. Specifically, for leases in which the Institution is the lessor that are five (5) years or less in term or less than $150,000, additional approvals may be required other than a President/Director, Vice Chancellor or Chancellor. Wayne will review state laws and will follow up with the Council. Wayne asked the Council to please contact him if anyone is leasing property or subleasing property to a third party that falls within these parameters.

OMB-81- Angela informed the Council that President Obama signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), which contains language that sets the micro-purchase threshold at $10,000 for all federal awards. No official guidance has been issued by the COGR but TBR will notify institutions when it receives official notification.

Follett – Cleveland State was approached by Follett to sign an addendum to its Bookstore Agreement, taking computer purchase out of its commission structure.   The System Office has contacted Follett on behalf of all institutions for additional information as to why and if this will apply to all institutions that currently contract with Follett for bookstore services. Institutions are asked to not sign and the System Office will advise once more information is received. John at Pellissippi State indicated that they indicated to Follett that they would not sign this addendum. Alisha at Cleveland State indicated that Follett stated if the addendum was not signed, the would not offer computers and peripherals in the bookstore.

Long Term Disability Insurance – TBR and UT had made the decision to partner with the State on a competitive procurement for long term disability insurance. The results of that RFP process did not yield favorable rates for TBR and UT employees due to Tenncare Claims. A clarification was issued asking providers to provide separate rates for TBR and UT, based specifically on our claims history. Those rates were better but still not a good bit higher than what employees are currently paying in premiums. TBR and UT will issue a new procurement this summer. UT has extended it's current agreement that TBR utilizes.

Elavon – Elavon has indicated it will no longer honor the previously negotiated templates for TBR institutions. The System Office has negotiated the new templates. Elavon was not clear if institutions will be asked to replace their current contracts or if these will be required at renewal/new contract time. Angela will email the institutions the new templates and these will also be uploaded to the TBR contracts log so that institutions will have them when approached by Elavon.

Shared Services – the System Office is currently interviewing for the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance to lead this initiative. Applicable TBR System Office employees are participating in the candidate interviews.

NAEP Conference – the Conference this here will be held in Reno, NV, March 26-29, 2017.

FOCUS Act –

TBR Policy and Guideline Updates – each area of the System Office has been asked to review its policies and guidelines to make them applicable to community colleges and colleges of applied technology only.

COB Meetings Going Forward - Angela shared with the Council a new meeting structure that we begin post FOCUS Act. Going forward the agenda and mail out material will go out to everyone. Each meeting will begin by asking the Universities which items on the agenda are topics of interest and those will be discussed first and the Universities will then adjourn to a separate meeting space to discuss University matters, if the universities have requested space prior and space is available. Then the COB will continue with community colleges and TCATs will be the sole voting members of the Council going forward. Discussions are currently taking place regarding to adding TCAT representatives to the Council of Buyers. It is Angela's understanding that the human resources officers and the business officers meeting structure will follow this format as well.

Training for Universities – TBR will be contacting Universities for training on how to report to fiscal review and diversity. Member of the Fiscal Review Service will be on hand to answer questions and talk through the process. Separate reporting has not been announced.

General -   Angela state that for all procurements going forward, she has a great a concern for the negative impact the universities pulling out of procurements will have on the community colleges and TCATs. The reality is the Universities have the biggest volume. It is going to affect everyone's budgets significantly. Universities are asked to take part in procurement efforts when able to drive costs down for all institutions. Angela has been instructed to reach out to business department at the Universities every time a system wide procurement is being processed. Universities will have to submit in writing whether or not they would like participate. It has not been determined on whether or not Community Colleges and TCATs will be able to purchase off of University Contracts.

Other Updates/Questions from Institutions

Legal/Contracts Training - Cammie at Motlow asked if Legal could provide some additional traning on common issues. Wayne indicated that if the Council wanted to provide questions/subjects in advance notice of each quarterly meeting, he could research and provide information.

RFP Evaluation Software (Bonfire)- Judy Hull at TTU asked if anyone else had heard from this provider and/or seen a presentation. TTU had participated in a presentation and was impressed with the software. Judy APSU was impressed with the software that were offering for RFP's. Mark at the System Office had talked with this vendor by phone and participated in a webinar.   - stated that TBR currently does not allow for as much automation as the program allowed uses. As an example, the Bonfire program requires proposers to email their RFP proposals or RFQ bids, TBR specifically does not allow for this. Additionally, Bonfire has every step of the process on line including real time scores with evaluator comments.   This does not match up with our one-week file review period after notification of intent to award and does not match up with our preference that evaluator comments and notes be minimized. Having said that, the Bonfire program is a very slick looking program, it just doesn't match the way we currently do business.

Angela asked if there were any further topics for discussion. With none being brought to the Council's attention, the meeting concluded so that those staying for the TSM working lunch session could begin setup. Angela thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting adjourned at 11:06am.