# Procurement Modernization Commission
# Workforce Workgroup Minutes

Wednesday, June 29, 2016
10 AM - 12 PM

**A.** Participants:

Tyler Bennett – Alexander & Cleaver for Blind Industries and Services of Maryland
Monica Best-James – Blind Industries and Services of Maryland
Sheryl Brissette Chapman – The National Center for Children and Families
Doug Carrey-Beaver – OAG, DOIT
Rachel Hershey – Procurement Supervisor, DBM
Herb Jordan – GOMA
David Lasher – DHMH, DOIT
John Molnar – Integrity Consulting
Sheila McDonald – Executive Secretary, BPW
Suzette Moore – Assistant Secretary, DGS
Marc Nicole – Deputy Secretary, DBM
Pat Pscherer – Governor's Office for Performance Improvement
Devan Perry – BPW
Eileen Straughan – Straughan Environmental, LLC
Jamie Tomaszewski – Chief of Procurement, DBM
Barbara Wilkins– Director of Government Relations, DBM

**B.** Minutes:

**1.** The meeting commenced at 10 a.m. with introductions and a review of the duties assigned to the Workforce Workgroup, namely:

(a) Standardizing best practices and COMAR interpretations across all State agencies;
(c) Developing Statewide procurement procedures manual, divided by industry sector;
(d) Developing Statewide procurement training curriculum;
(e) Addressing impediments to attracting and retaining quality procurement staff; and
(f) Developing self-directed training module for businesses to learn how to bid on State contracts.

**2.** Workgroup members then provided updates on assigned action items from the 6/1/2016 Workgroup meeting:

a. **Salary and compensation: Complete compilation of job classifications and distribute information ahead of next meeting for consideration of possible recommendations.**

DBM reported and distributed information on procurement salaries in an effort to move toward a recommendation on the state's procurement classifications. The information presented included classifications among State agencies, national surveys of procurement compensation, and federal procurement job classifications. Classification information on various procurement positions within all state agencies were presented for comparison. MDOT featured the most expansive range of positions and typically higher salaries than most state agencies. National procurement salary surveys from national procurement groups including the National Institute for Public Procurement and the National Contract Management Association were also provided. Finally, DBM's Division of Classification and Salary provided an analysis of State procurement classifications and salaries compared to similar federal job classifications as provided by the Office of Personnel Management. It was noted that the federal positions required more formal education but, in some cases, less experience than equivalent state jobs. It was suggested that contract administrator positions in the State be included in the job classification discussions, and also that the analysis focus on attracting qualified individuals to State procurement as well as retaining management level procurement officials. Workgroup members recommended further analysis of the salary and classification information.

**b. Complete webpages mock-up to distribute by next meeting.**

DBM, working in conjunction with DOIT, introduced a series of newly created webpages in production status establishing a procurement landing page on *eMaryland Marketplace* with links to control agencies identified by industry, the BPW, vendor training and information, procurement staff, and a Maryland.gov procurement home page. Workgroup members noted that procurement homepages of control agencies should be standardized so that consistent format is found on each control agency page. Discussion also involved listing procurement official contact information under the "procurement staff" tab so vendors and the public can find the appropriate contacts for industry sectors and particular procurements. Because determining an appropriate contact for procurement industries can be difficult, a procurement concierge was suggested as a possible means for directing inquiries to the party with the most relevant response. The workgroup suggested distributing the webpages to the workgroup participants for further review and comment.

**c. Procurement Manual. Compile content into recommended outline. Contact other states for information on development process of procurement manuals.**

DBM reported on its survey of methods used by other states in developing its procurement manual. The survey compiled information from Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, Virginia and Washington and found all states used internal resources, i.e., state procurement officials either convened by task force or assigned as individuals, to develop content and write their respective procurement manuals. Some states employed professionals such as technical writers, instructional designers, or software consultants to translate the content into a usable, accessible

training tool. Many states also identified processes for maintaining their manuals once written. Discussion focused on the scope of the manual as a comprehensive training document or desk book of checklists and sample forms, or both, and whether the manual can be equally useful to vendors as procurement officers and should, for that reason, be made easily available to both. DBM shared a sample outline based on Georgia's manual to illustrate topics for inclusion, noting that the process-oriented organization of the outline would be subject to change based on the preferences of the entity that will ultimately produce the manual. The workgroup then discussed drafting a recommendation that would recommend how the manual would be developed, who would be involved in developing the manual, how much time to devote to the project, estimated costs for the project, and suggested organization of the manual.

**d. Gap analysis, starting with a determination of factors affecting Maryland's procurement ranking in Governing Magazine article**.

This item was tabled until the next workgroup meeting.

**3.** Structure of Procurement. At the request of the Lt. Governor, the workgroup engaged in a discussion of the structure of procurement in Maryland as it relates to centralization under a particular department or a newly created entity for such a purpose. It was noted the BPW's role in overseeing procurement did not include the reporting structure to enforce practices and protocols on executive agencies, which are accountable to the governor exclusively. Workgroup members discussed a hybrid model of centralization whereby agencies would report to chief of procurement office for procurement practices that would allow attunement with the goals of the Procurement Modernization Commission without the disruption of complete reorganization. Workgroup members discussed whether such an office would have adequate enforcement abilities. Workgroup members concurred that standardization of procurement practices, currently lacking in the existing procurement structure, would benefit the State.

**4.** Discussion continued with an overview of the Workforce Workgroups tasks in relation to those of the other Workgroups. The meeting concluded around noon with an announcement of the next meeting and determination and assignment of next steps as follows *(parties assigned)*:

**a.** Salary and compensation: Complete analysis of job classifications for consideration of possible recommendation *(DBM)*;

**b.** Website: Distribute webpages mock up to committee members for further review and comment. (*DBM);*

**c.** Procurement Manual: Development draft recommendation related to Procurement Manual *(DBM).*

**d.** (Tabled from 6/1/2016 meeting) Gap analysis: Follow up with Governing magazine contacts to determine factors affecting Maryland's procurement ranking in the *Governing* magazine article "Purchase Power" by Liz Farmer (*Merril Oliver).*

**e.** Create Excel Spreadsheet with five tabs as repository for draft recommendations, related comments, and information. *(DBM)*

**f.** Recommendations and comments from the *Workforce Workgroup members* due to Jamie.Tomaszewski@maryland.gov by Monday, June 11, 2016.

**C.** Next Workforce Workgroup Meeting:

**a.** Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 10 a.m.

**b.** Same location: DBM, 45 Calvert Street, Room 158, Annapolis, MD 21401

**c.** The next three workgroup meetings have been scheduled and email invitations were sent to all members.