

Agenda

Enterprise Goods & Services

Customer Utility Board



Members:

- Ray Brixey – Chair**
Dept. of Corrections
- Bob Baxter– Vice-Chair**
Judicial Dept.
- Gail Shibley**
Oregon Youth Authority
- Cyndi Wickham**
State Lands
- Sean McCormick**
Military Dept.
- Tracy Wroblewski**
ODOT
- Caleb Yant**
OHCS
- Shawn Waite**
Dept. of Revenue
- Vacant**
Teachers Standards and Practices
- Merle Lindsey**
Oregon Liquor Exchange Commission
- Ron Bersin**
Oregon Government Ethics Commission
- Martin Pittioni**
Board of Accountancy

- DAS Support Staff:**
- Bret West**
Interim CAO
- Bret West**
EGS Administrator
- Janet Savarro**
DBS Administrator
- Lieb Lee**
DBS Analyst
- Debby Dyer**
Administrative Support

Meeting Date: **August 17, 2016**
 Time: 10:00 a.m. – noon
 Location: Somerville Building | 775 Court St. NE

ITEM	PRESENTER	TIME
Welcome		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes review • Action Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bret send update to members on conference phone - Penny send link on user manual for phones to Debby - <i>Completed</i> 	Ray Brixey	10:00 – 10:05
SLA Performance Measure Review		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement Services continued • Publishing & Distribution • Risk Management <p>September: <i>Shared Financial Services</i></p>	Ty Hendrix Bret West Debbie Dennis Kelly Mix Tim Hendrix Penny Evans	10:05 – 11:45
Wrap Up		
Other issues for next meeting?		11:45 -11:50
<p>Next Meeting: September 21, 2016 10am – noon Somerville Building 775 Court St. NE Salem, Oregon 97301</p>		

Minutes

Enterprise Goods & Services

Customer Utility Board



Members:

- Ray Brixey – Chair**
DOC
- Bob Baxter– Vice-Chair**
Judicial Dept.
- Cyndi Wickham**
State Lands
- Sean McCormick**
Military Dept
- Merle Lindsey**
OLCC
- Tracy Wroblewski**
ODOT
- Caleb Yant**
OHCS
- Gail Shibley**
OYA
- Shawn Waite**
Dept. of Revenue
- Vacant**
Teachers Standards and Practices
- Ron Bersin**
Ethics Commission
- Martin Pittioni**
Board of Accountancy
- DAS Support Staff:**
- Bret West**
Interim CAO
- Janet Savarro**
DBS Administrator
- Bret West**
EGS Administrator
- Lieb Lee**
DBS Analyst
- Debby Dyer**
Administrative Support

Meeting Date: July 20, 2016

Time: 10:00 a.m. – Noon

Location: Somerville Building | 775 Court St NE, Salem OR 97301

Attendees: Tracy Wroblewski, Sharon Domaschofsky(for Merle Lindsey), Bob Baxter, Ray Brixey, Ron Bersin, Shawn Waite, Cyndi Wickham, Martin Pittioni, Bryce Dohrman (for Sean McCormick)
DAS Support: Bret West, Lieb Lee, Trudy Vidal, Penny Evans, Tim Hendrix, Brad Cunningham, Ty Hendrix, Eric Sexton, Katya Medvediva,

Guests: None

Absent: Gail Shibley, Caleb Yant

TOPIC	PRESENTER
Welcome	Ray Brixey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes review – approved • Action items – completed • Need 2 more volunteers for subgroup – Ron Bernsin, Cyndi Wickham, Martin Pittioni, and Shawn Waite are the 4 volunteers 	
eProcurement System	Bob Baxter Bret West
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bob Baxter was in a group that toured e-procurement systems in Jefferson, MO and Boston, MA. Down to 2 finalists, but no update other than that. Long term goal would be to replace ORPIN. • ORPIN fee waiver for certified businesses – Bret will continue to work with Serena in the Governor’s office. Wanting to make sure they are still on the same page. 	
Project Music	Bret West
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is in yellow, schedule status is still in red. • Making sure data is correct is biggest hurdle, eliminating phone lines not being used. • Projection sites are 5 weeks behind, production schedule being adjusted weekly • Conferences phones ordered to replace the Unify phones with Polycom’s • Hired several more staff for the team which should help <p>ACTION: Bret to get update on the conference phones and send out email to members</p> <p>ACTION: Penny will send link to user manual for phones to Debby to send out</p>	
Seismic Shutoff Valve project	Bret West
Continuing to move forward with the engineering study. Expecting to have the contract finalized very shortly, allowing the engineering firm to take a look at Youth Authority facilities, accessing the feasibility of putting in Seismic shutoff valves.	
EGS CUB Charter	Ray Brixey
Ty will send a doodle poll to the subgroup. Expecting it will take 2 or 3 sessions. Will be approximately a 3 month process.	

SLA Performance Measure review

- **FBS** measure review –
 1. Datamart availability – does it come up on time and is it loaded properly. Should we track the number of hours “down” instead of “number of times”?
Members agreed to suspend this measure.
 2. Percentage of SFMA nightly batch cycles completed successfully.
Members agreed to suspend this measure.
 3. Percentage of compliance-related OSPA updates released before mandated due date.
Members agreed to suspend this measure.
 4. Percentage of complete manual checks delivered/processed within the same day if requested before cutoff.
Members agreed to keep this measure.
 5. Percentage of PERS records suspended due to inaccurate information.
Members agreed to keep this measure, but lower target to 2%.
 6. Percentage of unusual/potentially suspicious SPOTS card transactions communicated to agencies within one business day.
Members agreed to keep this measure.
 7. Percentage of Shared Payroll Services’ client agency paychecks that are delivered within the timeframe applicable to each pay check.
Members agreed to keep this measure.

Suggestion to add measure for all 3 systems availability. Members agreed.

- **Procurement Services** –
 1. Percentage of contract quality surveys stating contract met business needs.
Members agreed to keep this measure but refine it. Will bring back at the next performance review.
 2. Percentage of contracts completed by the agreed upon date.
Members agreed to keep this measure.
 3. Percentage of complaints on statewide price agreement vendor performance.
Members agreed to suspend this measure for now.

Will pick up here for next CUB meeting.

Next meeting:

August 17, 2016

10:00 a.m. – Noon

Somerville Building | 775 Court ST NE

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Procurement Services				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)	Trend
			Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Current	
1	% of contract quality surveys stating contract met business needs	≥ 85%	No Data	No Data	86%	96.3%	
	# of respondents who answered yes to specific question				6	26	
	Total # of survey responses				7	27	
2	% of contracts completed by the agreed upon date	≥ 85%	70.1%	58.2%	50.0%	53.3%	
	# of contracts signed by the agreed upon date		188	153	126	129	
	# of contracts signed		268	263	252	242	
3	# of complaints on statewide price agreement vendor performance	TBD	0	0	4	5	
4	% of statewide price agreements with "how to buy" guides	≥ 15%	17%	18.1%	35.3%	41.2%	
	# of statewide price agreements with a "how to buy" guide		57	58	146	166	
	Total # of statewide price agreements		331	320	414	403	
5	Average rating of ease of use of statewide price agreements (1-10)	≥ 7.5	7.2	5.4	6.2	6.2	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		79	49	111	186	
	Total # of survey responses		11	9	18	30	
6	Average rating of ORPIN help desk staff effectiveness (1-10)	≥ 9	9.0	9.7	9.7	9.2	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		423	300	29	119	
	Total # of survey responses		47	31	3	13	
7	Average # of hours to resolve an ORPIN technical support request	TBD	No Data	3.5	5.1	3.3	
	Total # of hrs spent providing support/response to requests			69.7	132	53.2	
	Total # of tickets closed			20	26	16	
8	Average overall satisfaction rating by employees who have finished any procurement training course (1-10)	≥ 8	9.2	8.7	8.8	8.7	
	Sum of the ratings given by survey respondents		514	287	405	663	
	Total # of survey responses		56	33	46	76	

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
1. % of contract quality surveys stating contract met business needs	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>This is the second quarter this PM was measured. The survey was sent out to 75 customers, 27 responded to the survey. This response rate of 36% is similar to the response rate of 37% of the previous quarter (also similar to the response rate of the survey received six months prior). The respondents were selected from the set of customers for contract related tasks who received the weekly Entrepreneurial Management (EM) Model PM #11 (Customer Satisfaction) survey for sourcing related services six months ago, over the course of one month. The survey was sent out at one month intervals, resulting in 3 surveys for Q1 of 2016. There was only one respondent answering "no" to the main survey question. The reason for the negative response</p>
2. % of contracts completed within the agreed upon timeframe	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>The downwards trend of this PM seems to be stabilizing at 53%. There is a continuous effort to educate staff to consistently enter the completion date as well as to update the due date after an agreement has been reached with the customer. In addition, a detailed statistical analysis was performed to get a better understanding of additional underlying factors that could have a negative effect on this performance measure. The plan is to address each of these underlying causes individually through various approaches including education and more accurate measurements.</p>
3. # of complaints on statewide price agreement vendor performance	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>The low number of complaints is the result of a general unawareness among customers that they have the opportunity to provide complaints on the DAS-PS website. A Buyer Link email was sent out to our customers alerting them about this opportunity for complaints at the beginning of the quarter. The five complaints were about four statewide price agreements. Two were for the same PA, comments mention issues with price lists where the vendor sometimes admits the mistake but other times insists the website price is correct. Other comments were about a QRF janitorial services contract. The issue was resolved after the janitor was replaced. For the other two PAs there were no comments entered.</p>
4. % of statewide price agreements with "How to buy" guides	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>The percentage of buyers guides is steadily going up as new contracts tend to get more buyers guides created and old contracts without buyers guides expire.</p>
5. Average rating of ease of use of statewide price agreements	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>List of respondents was expanded after updating spend data (2012-2015 instead of 2007-2014) and relaxing spend thresholds (>\$5K in 2015 and >\$40K during 2012-2015 instead of >\$93K during 2007-2014). In addition, email addresses were checked to be valid and the DPO list is consistently updated with new members based on input through emails or DPO meetings. This quarter the list was further expanded with ORPIN "DPOs", which are senior buyers. In total, 89 invitations were sent out and 30 responded, resulting in a response rate of 34%. This is similar compared to the response rate of the previous quarter, which was 38%. Lowest scores for the "PA ease of use question" had comments ranging from a need for better PA documentation and searchability, more competitive pricing, and more agency involvement in developing a statewide PA.</p>
6. Average rating of ORPIN help desk state effectiveness	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>This is the first quarter respondents for the EMPM11 ORPIN survey questions were selected based on ORPIN help desk ticket information. At one month intervals the help desk ticket log is exported and filtered for duplicates, PS employees, and people who received the survey during the previous 3 months. In total 44 invitations were sent out, resulting in 13 responses, which is a response rate of 30%. This is slightly up from previous quarters. The majority of the comments were positive. The few negative comments were about slow response for actual fixes.</p>
7. Average # of hrs from receipt of request until closure	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>ORPIN helpdesk cycle times are back to what they were in Q3 2015 since there were no tickets that involved help from OGMA, which takes usually longer than a few days. All tasks taking more than one day had to do with setting up or changing user accounts. However, in other cases setting up or changing user accounts would take only a few hours. It seems that the help desk staff sometimes gets busy and does not get to complete a task till the next day.</p>
8. Average overall satisfaction rating by employees who have finished any procurement training course	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: #0070C0; color: white; margin: 0;">General Comments</p> <p>Results from the weekly EMPM11 survey invitations for training related services constitute the data for this SLA Metric. In total 168 survey invitations were sent out and 76 responded, resulting in a response rate of 45%, which is up from 40% for the previous quarter. This performance measure has been steady around 8.7 for the past three quarters and has in general positive comments. The comments for Q1 2016 were more mixed as compared to previous quarters with several mentioning inaccuracies in the training materials.</p>

Name of Program/ Division

DAS Procurement Services

Reporting Period

Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description
1					
2					
3					
4					

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Publishing and Distribution				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	% of times P&D estimates are delivered within 1 business day after initial consultation	90.0%	81.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	# of estimates delivered within 1 business day		17	7	11	11	
	Total # of estimates delivered		21	7	11	11	
2	% of times P&D meets the agreed upon delivery date for design jobs	99.0%	89.8%	88.9%	95.3%	94.4%	
	# of design jobs delivered by the agreed upon delivery date		44	16	41	17	
	Total # of design jobs delivered		49	18	43	18	
3	% of times P&D meets the agreed upon delivery date for production jobs	96.0%	98.5%	98.2%	98.7%	98.9%	
	# of production jobs delivered by the agreed upon delivery date		962	1,481	2,061	2,011	
	Total # of production jobs delivered		977	1,508	2,088	2,033	
4	% of times P&D meets the agreed upon delivery date for mail jobs	98.0%	97.2%	98.4%	98.3%	97.5%	
	# of mail jobs delivered by the agreed upon delivery date		517	505	681	575	
	Total # of mail jobs delivered		532	513	693	590	
5	% of jobs that need re-work per customer request	2.0%	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	
	# of jobs that need rework per customer request		20	19	34	30	
	Total # of jobs delivered		1,558	1,508	2,824	2,641	
6	% of delayed print jobs where the customer was notified timely	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	# of delayed print jobs where the customer was notified timely		1	2	1	1	
	Total # of delayed print jobs		1	2	1	1	
7	# of reported "double stuffing" mailing incidents	0	5	1	2	3	
8	% of times shuttle drivers adhere to schedule	95%	77.0%	80.7%	86.0%	83.7%	
	# of programmed shuttle stops on schedule		3,139	2,829	2,885	8,391	
	Total # of shuttle mail stops made		4,077	3,505	3,356	10,022	
9	% of times P&D drivers meet the agreed upon schedule	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	# of collections/deliveries within the agreed upon schedule		123	205	129	174	
	Total # of collections/deliveries made		123	205	129	174	
10	Percent of mail posted and sent out at the reduced postal rate	96%	98.0%	98.9%	97.0%	98.8%	
	# of mail pieces at reduced postage rate		7,329,723	6,985,499	6,742,691	7,751,415	
	Total # of mail pieces posted		7,477,659	7,061,503	6,949,713	7,847,673	

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
	General Comments
1. % of times P&D estimates are delivered within one business day after initial consultation	
	General Comments
2. % of times P&D meets the A.D.D for design jobs	
	General Comments
3. % of times P&D meets A.D.D for production jobs	
	General Comments
4. % of times P&D meets the A.D.D for mail jobs	
	General Comments
5. % of jobs that need to be redone per customer request	
	General Comments
6. % of delayed print jobs where the customer was notified timely	
	General Comments
7. # of reported "double stuffing" mailing incidents	
	General Comments
8. % of times shuttle drivers adhere to schedule	Summary % On Time (Salem) 88.83% Summary % On Time (South Routs - Eugene) 77.53% Summary % On Time North Routs - Portland) 81.30%
	General Comments
9. % of times P7D drivers meet the agreed upon schedule	
	General Comments
10. % of mail posted and sent out at the reduced postal rate	

Name of Program/ Division

PUBLISHING AND DISTRIBUTION

Reporting period

Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Risk Management				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	% of times 1st contact with customer is within 3 business days of the claim being received/reported	90.0%	97.0%	96.5%	93.5%	93.8%	
	# of claims with 1st contact within 3 business days		515	474	551	513	
	Total # of claims submitted		531	491	589	547	
2	Average # of days from restoration claim report date to close date	110	75.4	95.9	92.0	81.7	
	Sum of the days elapsed between report and closure		14,333	18,317	15,464	13,884	
	Total # of restoration claims closed		190	191	168	170	
3	Average # of days from liability claim report date to close date	180	151.7	150.1	165.5	159.7	
	Sum of the days elapsed between claim report date and close date		341,212	330,894	369,055	346,500	
	Total # of liability claims closed		2,249	2,205	2,230	2,170	
4	% of times SAIF provides a decision within 60 calendar days	90.0%	93.5%	93.0%	93.0%	93%	
	Total # of claims where a decision was made within 60 days		1,423	1,650	1,645	1,652	
	Total # of claims with a decision made		1,522	1,774	1,768	1,782	
5	Average cost per closed restoration claim	Tracked as a monitoring metric	\$8,784.57	\$10,244.07	\$10,451.83	\$12,203.06	
	Total costs associated with restoration claims		\$1,686,637.44	\$1,966,860.87	\$1,829,071.00	\$2,245,362.73	
	Total # of restoration claims closed		192	192	175	184	
6	Average cost per closed liability claim	Tracked as a monitoring metric	\$23,210.10	\$21,785.04	\$24,843.44	\$23,828.48	
	Total costs associated with liability claims		\$16,293,491.08	\$15,140,602.67	\$18,433,832.00	\$16,703,767.25	
	Total # of liability claims closed		702	695	742	701	
7	Average cost per non-severe WC claim	Tracked as a monitoring metric	\$3,603.60	\$3,614.30	\$3,402.88	\$3,863.92	
	Total costs incurred for all non-severe WC claims		\$4,854,055.00	\$4,951,589.27	\$4,546,252.27	\$5,274,257.00	
	Total # of WC claims filed		1,347	1,370	1,336	1,365	
8	Average cost per severe WC claim	Tracked as a monitoring metric	\$58,324.73	\$59,110.92	\$46,298.47	\$51,237.32	
	Total costs incurred for all severe WC claims		\$10,206,827.00	\$10,167,079.09	\$10,833,842.88	\$9,837,565.00	
	Total # of WC claims filed		175	172	234	192	
9	Average rating of safety training programs provided by SAIF (1-5)	4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	
	Sum of the ratings given by survey respondents		292	349	134	89	
	# of survey responses received		63	76	30	20	
10	Average # of business days to deliver an ad-hoc Risk report	2	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.4	
	Sum of the days elapsed between request and delivery		21	6	2	14	
	# of custom ad-hoc Risk reports delivered		14	4	2	10	
11	Average # of training hours received by Risk analysts and adjusters	20	21.1	13.5	12.9	23.0	
	Total # of training hours received by Risk analysts/adjusters		337	189	180.5	299.3	
	# of Risk analysts/adjusters		16	14	14	13	

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
1. % of times 1st contact with customer is within 3 business days	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>We are within the target on this measure. We are down an adjuster currently as we wait for a temp contract to be finalized. The team has done well to keep this metric on target in spite of the challenges with an increased workload.</p>
2. Average # of days from restoration claim report date to close date	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Good collaboration between Risk and our customers ensures we are able to meet this target.</p>
3. Average # of days from liability claim report date to close date	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>The collective experience of the Claims team allows us to be vigilant in meeting our target and in providing best outcomes to our agencies.</p>
4. % of times SAIF provides a decision within 60 calendar days	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Results remain steady and within statutory requirements.</p>
5. Average cost per closed restoration claim	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Up slightly over 3rd quarter due to 2 additional losses over \$100K. Q3 had 6 losses over \$50K and Q4 has 8.</p>
6. Average cost per closed liability claim	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Average remaining steady for now. Anticipate increase over next few quarters due to several high dollar claims that were recently paid or will be paid soon.</p>
7. Average cost per non-severe WC claim	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
8. Average cost per severe WC claim	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
9. Average rating of safety training programs provided by SAIF	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
10. Average # of business days to deliver an ad-hoc risk report	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Increase in number of requests likely related to agency consultations which were primarily in the last quarter of the year.</p>
11. Average # of training hrs received by Risk analysts and adjusters	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Goal exceeded for calendar year 2015.</p>

Name of Program/ Division	Risk Management
Date report is finalized	3/2/2016
Reporting Period	Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description