

# Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

**A REPORT ON THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES**

Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan  
January 2008



# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Section I: Collaborative Cost Savings</b>	7
Michigan Universities Self Insurance Corporation	8
Michigan Universities Coalition on Health	10
Merit Network	12
Midwestern Higher Education Compact	13
Michigan Delivering Extended Agreements Locally	15
<b>Section II: Collaborative Efforts to Promote and Improve Quality</b>	16
Michigan Universities Commercialization Initiative	17
Core Technology Alliance	18
Higher Education Recruitment Consortium	19
Michigan Transfer Network	21
Japan Center for Michigan Universities	22
Academic Program Review	23
Detroit Compact and Wade McCree Scholars	24
Arts in the Legislature	25
Professor of the Year	25
<b>Conclusion</b>	27
<b>Appendix</b>	28
State by State Comparison of Cost Savings MHEC	28
Estimated Cumulative Costs Savings by State, MHEC	29

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS



# Introduction

Section 466 of PA 136 of 2007 requires the Presidents Council to provide the executive and legislative branches with a report on the coordination of purchased goods by the state universities in the previous fiscal year. We are pleased to comply with the request and we do so by providing a report that reflects a range of collaborative arrangements entered into by our universities.

Michigan is perhaps the most unique state in terms of its higher education environment. The public universities are constitutionally autonomous and as such operate independently of any formal coordinating body. The fact that they are autonomous should not suggest however, that they do not recognize and leverage their collective power to more efficiently run their operations. In this report, we discuss a full array of inter-institutional collaborative efforts among the public universities. Many of these initiatives realize actual cost savings but others are simply a matter of improved practice.

Michigan public universities collaborate as a matter of professional practice because they understand the benefits of operating their institutions as efficiently as possible to maintain their commitment to the highest quality education for their students. Equally, our universities continue to explore opportunities to collaborate and will do so in an effort to cut costs and to remain efficient, effective and of the highest quality. Our students demand it and our state relies upon it.

This report reflects an important array of collaborative efforts that in some way work through the Presidents Council, but does not reflect the countless collaborative efforts entered independently. The Committee on Institutional Collaboration (CIC) is one example where the Big Ten Institutions and the University of Chicago partner in an effort to advance academic excellence by promoting and coordinating collaborative activities and sharing resources. Its programs and activities extend to all aspects of university activity except intercollegiate athletics. These endeavors are organized to augment and complement institutional programs without supplanting them or reducing their individual importance.

Another example is the Michigan Library Consortium. The MLC is a nonprofit, membership organization, which provides libraries a convenient, single point of contact for training, group purchasing and technical support for electronic resources. Libraries take advantage of the MLC services and pricing in order to continue to offer library users the ability to access information using the latest technology.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### INTRODUCTION

# Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

## INTRODUCTION

In this report, we provide information on two types of collaborative efforts. The first section addresses those initiatives that are specifically intended to save money. In this section we describe our collaborative arrangements through the Michigan Universities Self-Insurance Corporation (MUSIC), the Michigan Universities Coalition on Health (MUCH), the Merit Network, the Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC), and Michigan Delivering Extended Agreements Locally (MiDEAL). Collectively, these efforts save the public universities millions of dollars on property insurance, health care, networking technologies, computer hardware and software purchasing and a whole range of durable goods.

Section II provides some description of collaborative efforts that demonstrate a shared commitment to the quality of the education provided at each institution. It is difficult to capture cost savings among these efforts, but they certainly contribute to the important work undertaken by public higher education in the state. These initiatives include the Michigan Universities Commercialization Initiative (MUCI), the Core Technology Alliance (CTA), the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), the Michigan Transfer Network (MTN), Arts in the Legislature, Professor of the Year, and the Academic Program Review (APR). In many cases, cost savings may be realized but they are difficult to approximate. For example, HERC allows participating institutions to actively pursue top faculty and research talent and to accommodate possible trailing partners. Without collaboration, either the institutions absorb the cost of hiring the second person or they run the risk of not attracting top candidates. In this case, HERC provides a mechanism to work collectively to hire and place professional couples in a way that maintains a commitment to quality and also more efficiently placing individuals where they can make the strongest contribution.

## Section I: Collaborative Cost Savings

In this section we discuss the range of collaborative efforts specifically intended to save universities money. In each case, we highlight which universities participate. Our universities differ in terms of size, scope of programs, and the extent of research conducted and as such, the collaborating institutions may depend entirely upon whether the institution will in fact, benefit from participation. In each section, a list of the 15 public universities is provided in the left hand column. Participating institutions are identified in bold and dark lettering and the others are listed in grey. Actual cost savings is difficult to approximate, and as such relies upon certain assumptions. In most cases, those assumptions are addressed or references to larger reports are made available. In the case of MiDEAL, actual cost savings figures were not available, but it is assumed that the state contract is as good or better than any arrangement public institutions can make on their own for a range of goods including energy and the purchase of vehicles.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **SECTION ONE**

# Michigan Universities Self-Insurance Corporation (MUSIC)

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### MUSIC

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

**Lake Superior State  
University**

Michigan State  
University

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State  
University**

University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor

University of Michigan  
- Dearborn

University of Michigan  
- Flint

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

In Michigan's challenging budgetary atmosphere and with growing pressures for identifying ways to save money through cooperative purchasing and other collaborative ventures, the Michigan Universities Self-Insurance Corporation (MUSIC) is a shining example of one of the first successful and effective public university collaborations.

In 1985 the Business officers and Risk Managers of the thirteen public universities recognized that insurance coverages were either unavailable or very expensive. In response to that crisis, a task force was formed to study the problem and make a recommendation to the Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan<sup>1</sup>. Under the leadership of Robert Romkema, then Vice President for Business and Finance of Eastern Michigan University, the task force recommended the formation of a risk sharing facility. With the support and approval of the Presidents Council, ten of the thirteen public institutions signed a participation agreement on June 25, 1987 authorizing the formation of a non-profit organization called the Michigan Higher Education Group Self-Insurance and Risk-Management Facility doing business as the Michigan Universities Self-Insurance Corporation – MUSIC.

Now, that precedent breaking venture has completed its twentieth year of operation. MUSIC has saved its eleven members<sup>2</sup> several million premium dollars while providing broad coverages to the universities. Errors and Omissions (E&O) and Commercial General Liability (CGL) – the original coverages – continue to be the heart of the program. Property coverage was added in 1989 with several other coverages such as excess Workers Compensation, Automobile Liability and Physical Damage, Foreign Liability, Medical Malpractice and non-owned Aviation added as group purchases over the years.

MUSIC members have long been of the opinion that MUSIC premiums and retentions are less and more predictable than could be obtained in the traditional insurance markets. To test this postulate, Marsh, Inc. MUSIC's Facility Manager, obtained premium and deductible information from our underwriting partners and competitors. Attachment 1 is a representation of the estimated premium and retention savings for the member institutions for the four years for which we have data. The savings for the most recent policy year were **\$7.2 million in premium and \$2.9 million in retentions.**

<sup>1</sup>The Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan, based in Lansing, is a nonprofit higher education association serving Michigan's 15 state universities. Each year, Michigan's public universities serve about 280,000 students, focusing on the delivery of excellent undergraduate and graduate education and equal educational opportunity.  
<sup>2</sup>Saginaw Valley State and Lake Superior State joined in 1990 and Michigan State dropped its participation in 2000.

If we were to conservatively estimate the average savings to be \$6.3 million in premium and \$2.9 million in retentions, the **savings would total \$133.2 million in premium and \$61 million in retentions** over the 21 year life of the facility.

More importantly and in keeping with the values of MUSIC, **our coverages are broader than any available in the traditional insurance market place**, and some are not otherwise available at any price.

In addition, MUSIC **has declared dividends that have returned \$27.4 million** to its Member Institutions (see Attachment 2). In the traditional commercial insurance environment these dollars would have been gone forever. Only through prudent financial management, attention to loss control, and effective claims handling have these financial expedencies been possible.

Future initiatives include continuing to understand the new and emerging exposures on our member institution campuses and identifying methods to manage these risks. Such things as cyber risks, environmental risks and campus security risks are just a few of the exposures we are investigating in terms of risk minimization/transfer, loss control and risk financing.

### **Mission Statement**

“The Mission of MUSIC is to provide a comprehensive risk management and loss control program to Member Universities by providing broad coverage for common exposures in the most cost effective manner.”

Collaborating  
for Efficiency  
and Quality

---

**MUSIC**

# Michigan Universities Coalition on Health (MUCH)

The Michigan Universities Coalition on Health was established in 1997 as a committee, reporting to the Business Affairs Officers of the PCSUM. In March 2005, at the urging of the Business Affairs Officers, MUCH incorporated as a Michigan non-profit corporation and subsequently received federal tax exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Twelve Michigan public universities are the founding members of MUCH, Inc. At its June 2007 Board meeting, the MUCH Board elected Renee Rivard, Director of Benefits for Michigan State University, as its new President and Chairperson. Beverly White, Lake Superior State University, continues to serve as Vice Chair. Gavin Leach, Northern Michigan University continues to serve as Treasurer. Lori Hella, Central Michigan University will serve as Secretary.

At its October 2007 Board meeting, Patti Klobucar was named Executive Director of MUCH, Inc. Patti joins MUCH, Inc. after many years with Blue Cross Blue Shield and Blue Care Network of Michigan. During her tenure with the Blues, she held positions in finance, Medicare, customer service and sales. Ms. Klobucar was the Account Manager for Michigan State University and was instrumental in facilitating the negotiation of the MUCH contract with Blue Cross Blue Shield.

## Mission

The purpose of MUCH, Inc. is "to further higher education and relieve the burdens of government by operating for the benefit of...its members, all of which shall be institutions of higher learning that are Michigan state universities, Michigan community colleges or tax-exempt private colleges or universities providing education in Michigan...[and] shall gather and share among the members useful information concerning benefit programs for their employees and negotiate advantageous employee benefit services for which Members may individually contract..."

## Health Plan Initiative

MUCH, Inc. has successfully negotiated a uniform standard third-party administrator contract with Blue Cross Blue Shield following the issuance of a Request for Proposals and a thorough review of the responses. Four universities are now using that standard contract: Central Michigan, Ferris State, Michigan State and Wayne State. Combined, they have approximately 12,500 contracts covered under this arrangement and collectively spend approximately \$68.6 million annually on health care through these contracts. Through this group purchasing leverage, the MUCH, Inc. contract results in lower administrative fees for all participants (including capped annual increases), which will provide greater cost reduction as more lives are covered under these contracts. In addition, other aspects of the contract such as negotiated provider and facility discount guarantees, performance guarantees and penalties, a centralized service center and other cost control features will provide additional cost reductions. **During the current fiscal year, it is estimated that collaborative health plan purchasing has saved the four**

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### MUCH

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

**Lake Superior State  
University**

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State  
University**

University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor

University of Michigan  
- Dearborn

University of Michigan  
- Flint

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

**participating universities \$393,000<sup>3</sup> in fixed administrative fees with an additional \$131,000 in provider discount guarantee credits totaling \$524,000 in savings for 2007. Combining the current savings with an estimated \$229,000 from the previous period, the four participating universities achieved an estimated cumulative savings of \$753,000 since July 2005.**

Several other universities are seriously evaluating the opportunity of joining these universities under the negotiated uniform contract. They must weigh several factors in their decision-making, including collective bargaining agreements, timing of their specific benefit plan years, and any existing special benefits in their current benefit plan design.

Since the initial Request for Proposal was released in early 2004 significant change in the health care landscape (i.e. Aetna's purchase of the PPOM network) has occurred. With this in mind, MUCH, Inc. issued a Request for Information in November 2007 and a comprehensive evaluation of the responses is underway. Following the evaluation and analysis a decision is expected by mid-2008.

There has also been interest expressed by other colleges and universities in Michigan in joining MUCH, Inc., however, such interest will be evaluated based on being consistent with the purpose of MUCH, Inc. and the impact and/or benefit to founding member universities.

### **Pharmacy Benefit Manager Initiatives**

With the successful implementation of the Health Plan initiative, MUCH, Inc. is now exploring a similar process for pharmaceutical benefits. An agreement is being finalized which will allow MUCH, Inc. to become an affiliate member of AEPC, a Labor-Employer Benefits Coalition. Affiliation with AEPC will allow MUCH, Inc. access to favorable coalition pricing that was negotiated with CVS/Caremark. The affiliation also allows MUCH, Inc. to collaborate with Trivantage Pharmacy Strategies, Inc. a leading pharmacy benefit consulting firm that uses pharmacy expertise, broad-based PBM experience and fact-based business strategies to enhance pharmacy benefit value while reducing costs. It is estimated that universities may achieve savings of up to ten percent (10%) by utilizing CVS/Caremark as their Pharmacy Benefits Manager and accessing the favorable AEPC negotiated pricing.

### **Other Initiatives**

Other projects that MUCH, Inc. intends to pursue include the potential for dental, vision and other employee benefits which lend themselves to a collaborative purchasing strategy. In addition to the value that the universities experience who are participating in the uniform health plan contract, all MUCH, Inc. participating universities also receive value through education, sharing of data (annual survey of health plans at each university is updated on an ongoing basis) including regular and ad hoc requests. Members consistently identify value in the opportunity to have regular dialogue about health care and benefit issues of common concern, education on current topics, sharing information on and from vendors and in having a statewide network of colleagues to call when needed. Recent discussions have centered on retiree health benefits.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

**MUCH**

<sup>3</sup>Assumes administrative fees would have increased three percent (3%) from the previous carrier or the Blue Cross Blue Shield direct per contract administrative fees.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **MERIT NETWORK**

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

**Lake Superior State  
University**

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

Saginaw Valley State  
University

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

## Merit Network

Merit Network, Inc. is a nonprofit, member-owned organization formed in 1966 to design and implement a computer network between public universities in Michigan. After 40 years of innovation, Merit continues to provide high-performance networking and services to the research and education communities in Michigan and beyond.

Merit continues to leverage its experience managing NSFNet, the precursor to the modern Internet, to catapult Michigan into the forefront of networking technologies. Merit is in the process of implementing a 10 Gbps backbone across Michigan to continue to provide a flexible, robust architecture to support the research and education needs within the region. This build-out is completely self-funded. Merit received no legislative dollars to support the effort. Merit is truly a case study on how higher education can work collaboratively to promote technology transfer and economic development.

Merit's plan involves acquiring control of fiber in wavelengths, rather than leasing circuits to connect every public university in the state. Owning the network has allowed the universities to stabilize the cost of internet access well into the future. Stability, consortium pricing and university control are among the main reasons Michigan's universities received high speed internet access earlier than in almost any other state. Through Merit, Michigan public universities have developed their own solution to the networking challenges and today, the State of Michigan is also a customer.

# Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC)

The Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC) was established in 1991. The Compact's charge is to promote interstate cooperation and resource sharing in postsecondary education. MHEC's member states are: **Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio and Wisconsin.**

The Michigan Commissioners are: Lieutenant Governor John Cherry; State Senator Tony Stamas; State Representative Pam Byrnes; President David Eisler, Ferris State University; President Conway Jeffress, Schoolcraft College. Edward Blews, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Michigan (AICUM), John Austin, Vice President for the State Board of Education, and Michael Boulus; Presidents' Council State Universities of Michigan (PCSUM), serve as Commissioner-Alternates.

The work of the Compact is financed largely through member-state obligations, cost savings initiatives and foundation grants. A small, full-time staff located in Minneapolis administers MHEC's daily operations, programming, and policy-research activities. The Compact's three core functions are: cost-savings, student access, and policy research. MHEC offers a range of cost-saving strategies for member states and the public universities are among the participating institutions. Those programs and estimated cost savings for 2006-07 are provided below. All 15 public universities participate in one or more of these cost savings programs.

MHEC provides cost saving strategies in four areas – computer hardware, Novell software, telecommunications, office products, and master property – and the total estimated cost savings to Michigan was \$8,720,955<sup>4</sup>. These programs are available to a variety of institutions in Michigan from the public universities and community colleges to the private universities, K-12 education, and in some cases even other non-profit organizations in the state. Where possible, we will highlight the cost savings associated with the public universities.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **MHEC**

**Central Michigan University**

**Eastern Michigan University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State University**

**Lake Superior State University**

**Michigan State University**

**Michigan Technological University**

**Northern Michigan University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State University**

**University of Michigan - Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan - Dearborn**

**University of Michigan - Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan University**

<sup>4</sup>Complete report is available at <http://www.mhec.org/mhecwww/pdfs/FINALmi0506.pdf>. Updated figures for 2006-07 are available at <http://www.mhec.org/mhecwww/pdfs/0607mi.pdf>.

# Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

MHEC

**Michigan saves more than any of the eleven states using MHEC programs. Michigan's total savings for 2006-07 was \$10,520,252 (including the student exchange program not listed below).<sup>5</sup>**

**Computer Hardware Program Savings: \$3,988,609**

MHEC has purchasing agreements established with Dell, Gateway, MPC, and Lenovo. In 2006-07, Michigan public universities purchased more than \$4.2 million of equipment through MHEC purchasing agreements for an estimated savings of \$382,055. More than half of the savings realized by Michigan in terms of computer purchasing was realized by K-12 school districts.

**Novell Software Program Savings: \$302,295**

Currently, four of our public universities utilize the Novell licensing agreement through MHEC, which guarantees participating institutions the lowest discount available through Novell. Typically, the lowest discount of 46% is available to institutions larger than 100,000 FTE students. The participating public universities saved approximately \$78,000 in software licensing fees through this agreement.

**ATAlliance Telecommunications Program Savings: \$2,407,182**

MHEC is a founding member of the American TelEdCommunications Alliance (ATAlliance), a program that offers discount pricing for long distance, local and cellular telephone service, Internet access, video services, course management systems and other services. The MHEC-ATAlliance program along with MHEC's two earlier telecommunications programs have led to considerable savings for member states and their institutions. Over the course of the program, the MHEC-ATAlliance Program has saved Michigan education, government and nonprofit organizations approximately \$38,331,815. This years total is an appreciable increase from 2005-2006 (\$1,425,407). Public universities account for less than 5% of the savings to the state, but it is an important piece in the context of statewide cost savings.

**Master Property Program Savings: \$2,022,869**

The Master Property Program (MPP) has brought property insurance benefits to institutions of higher education since 1994. The program was established to broaden property coverage, reduce program costs and encourage improved asset protection strategies for colleges and universities in the Midwestern Higher Education Compact's (MHEC) eleven member states. Currently, higher education institutions in Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri and Nebraska participate in the program. In addition, collaboration with the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) in June 2004 opened up the program to institutions in the West. With this, the Nevada System of Higher Education joined the Master Property Program on July 1, 2004. The program insures Total Insurable Values (TIV) in excess of \$51.9 billion with 76 campuses participating in the program, comparable in size to a Fortune 500 company. Currently, 11 public universities participate in the master property program, accounting for more than \$2 million in savings between savings on premiums and dividends paid back to the institutions.

<sup>5</sup>See tables 1 and 2 in the Appendix for more detail.

# Michigan Delivering Extended Agreements Locally (MiDEAL)

MiDEAL allows Michigan local units of government to benefit from the State's negotiating and purchasing power by permitting them to purchase from the State's contracts on the same terms, conditions, and prices as State government. Higher education can benefit not only from the reduced cost of goods and services, but also from indirect savings related to writing specifications, researching industries, processing invitations to bid, recruiting a diverse pool of potential suppliers, and making awards. The MiDEAL program is authorized by Michigan legislation and has been in existence since 1975. These purchasing agreements have been made available to the public universities and have been used extensively by our institutions.

Purchasing and acquisition services at the university level are done by very savvy, cost-conscious officials. Universities are always looking for opportunities to work more closely together with the state and amongst themselves toward a common goal of reducing costs for operations. The Presidents Council was instrumental in formally establishing the State of Michigan/University Purchasing Task Force in 2003. The task force regularly discusses the expanded use of existing contracts, identifies joint efforts for future contracts, and explores additional cost reduction strategies.

Our purchasing officers appreciate the opportunity to work more closely with the state toward the common goal of reducing costs for our operations. The taskforce allows us to constantly look for opportunities for collaborative purchasing efforts between the state and universities. The taskforce has identified five areas to focus their efforts: energy (electricity, natural gas), information technology, travel, vehicles and written agreements.

All of Michigan's public universities participate in MiDEAL, as well as full or partial participation in the state's cooperative gas and electricity buying program. The cooperative electricity buying program was one of the first initiatives through the purchasing taskforce. It is difficult to put a specific dollar amount on the captured savings given the number of contracts and prices available from the state. According to the Michigan Department of Management & Budget's Acquisition Services Office, participants can save both time and up to 38% savings off the State of Michigan's contracts. The state program can also be used to leverage even better prices from competing and local vendors.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **MIDEAL**

**Central Michigan University**

**Eastern Michigan University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State University**

**Lake Superior State University**

**Michigan State University**

**Michigan Technological University**

**Northern Michigan University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State University**

**University of Michigan - Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan - Dearborn**

**University of Michigan - Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan University**

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **SECTION TWO**

## Section II: Collaborative Efforts to Promote and Improve Quality

Universities are catalysts for economic growth and they drive innovation, but in order to do so, they must maintain a commitment to the highest quality. As such, the public universities participate in a number of collaborative opportunities that enhance their ability to maintain a high level of commitment to pure and applied research and its commercialization, to attract and retain the best faculty, offer cutting edge programs that will train individuals for future opportunities, to recognize the importance of strong teaching in the classroom and a sustainable commitment to the arts. Part of quality is to attract and retain the best and brightest students and to simplify the process of transferring institutions throughout their academic journeys. While cost savings is possible and even likely among many of these initiatives, they serve a very different purpose, but with a common end to improve each institution in an effort to better serve the state and its residents.

# Michigan Universities Commercialization Initiative (MUCI)

Prior to the initiation of the first Michigan Life Sciences Corridor (MLSC) funding competition, a grass roots committee experienced in commercialization issues was asked by to develop some common perspectives on Life Sciences intellectual property (IP) management for the Corridor. The overarching principle of the committee was that by bringing together Corridor representatives responsible for facilitating and negotiating intellectual property and technology commercialization “deals” based on university research, we could improve the climate for technology transfer and promote a successful life sciences industry. Michigan State University, University of Michigan, and Wayne State University teamed up to submit a proposal titled, “The Michigan Universities Commercialization Initiative” (MUCI) to the 2000 MLSC RFP. This proposal included several major objectives:

- Initiate and sustain an IP Commercialization Committee (IPCC) to provide oversight and facilitate technology transfer between universities, investors, and industry
- Establish a \$2 million commercialization Challenge Fund
- Develop a database of commercialization resources
- Provide entrepreneurship training and education
- Support incubation planning

The MUCI proposal was funded and shortly thereafter, the Van Andel Research Institute was included as a partner in this collaborative effort. Additionally, this cohort submitted a second MUCI proposal, requesting funds to further advance the work that had already begun. This request was granted, boosting the commercialization challenge fund to over \$2.57 million. A \$250,000 grant from MEDC (the Michigan Economic Development Corporation) in 2005 extended the project further.

MUCI is currently supported by a grant from the 21st Century Jobs Fund. This award created a new Challenge Fund of \$4.5 million to support commercialization projects in advanced automotive & manufacturing, alternative energy, homeland security, and life sciences technologies. In the first years, MUCI helped foster technology transfer activities in Michigan by disseminating technology transfer educational materials and sharing best practices through newsletters, a website, publications, and joint meetings.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **MUCI**

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

Ferris State University

**Grand Valley State  
University**

Lake Superior State  
University

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

Saginaw Valley State  
University

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **CORE TECHNOLOGY ALLIANCE**

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

Ferris State University

**Grand Valley State  
University**

Lake Superior State  
University

**Michigan State  
University**

Michigan Technological  
University

Northern Michigan  
University

Oakland University

Saginaw Valley State  
University

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

University of Michigan  
- Dearborn

University of Michigan  
- Flint

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

## Core Technology Alliance

The CTA Corp. is a not-for-profit, non-stock membership organization owned equally by founding members Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, Wayne State University and the Van Andel Research Institute as well as non-founding members Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo Valley Community College and Grand Valley State University. It enables coordinated scientific leadership, marketing, strategic planning, and decision-making across the core facilities.

The CTA is a collaborative network of advanced technology service facilities located at major research institutions across Michigan. These commercially oriented, community-spirited, and technologically sophisticated centers of excellence are fee-for-service laboratories to support biomedical research in the areas of genomics, proteomics, structural biology, animal models, bio-informatics, bio-imaging, high-throughput screening, and antibody technology. The CTA cutting-edge infrastructure is augmenting the growth of Michigan life science sector. The CTA offers its unique and extraordinary services to diverse customers in academic or industrial setting either in-State or out-of-State.

Each member institution owns, operates and provides the services offered by its core facilities. The faculty and staff associated with the core facilities are employed by the individual institutions. A representative is appointed by each institution to the CTA Board of Directors.

# Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC)

The first Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) began in Northern California, the home of Silicon Valley, as a collaborative response of member institutions to the many challenges of academic recruitment and retention. One particular interest of the Northern California HERC is finding effective ways to assist the spouses and partners of faculty and staff to secure area employment. A vital aspect of HERC is the web-based search engine that includes faculty and staff job listings at all member institutions. This search engine is free and available to anyone seeking employment in higher education.

There are now HERCs in other competitive areas where the hunt for talent is at a premium including southern California, metro New York/southern Connecticut, New Jersey, upstate New York and New England. HERCs are also planned for the Chicago region and metro St. Louis. Plans are underway to create a national HERC that will establish itself as an independent non-profit organization and provide services to all the regional HERCs.

Twenty-three public and private Michigan colleges and universities have banded together to launch the Michigan Higher Education Recruitment Consortium to share information and resources to attract and retain talented faculty and staff. University of Michigan President Mary Sue Coleman, Michigan State University President Lou Anna Simon and Wayne State University President Irvin D. Reid, jointly invited the state's other public and private colleges and universities to form the Michigan HERC.

"Working together makes it easier for us to keep the best workers in the state and to attract new talent to the state," said Linda Berauer, executive director of Michigan HERC. "Regions known for their large pools of knowledge workers already have similar organizations and this will make Michigan's colleges and universities more competitive."

After an organizational meeting at MSU last spring, the group quickly set up a dues structure and grew to 23 public and private colleges and universities of all sizes. HERC recently hired an administrator with plans to launch a web site connecting their job opportunities together in the fourth quarter of 2007.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### HERC

**Central Michigan University**

**Eastern Michigan University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State University**

Lake Superior State University

**Michigan State University**

Michigan Technological University

Northern Michigan University

**Oakland University**

Saginaw Valley State University

**University of Michigan - Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan - Dearborn**

**University of Michigan - Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan University**

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

**HERC**

With a growing number of two income couples, human resource staffers often struggle when they pursue a talented worker whose spouse is in a field where they might not have an opening. Often they need to look to other potential employers within the region.

The consortium is designed to make it easier to recruit or retain talented faculty and staff by helping spouses find openings at nearby universities within the same region, to create networking opportunities and share best practices among member institutions through regular meetings, and to reduce costs through joint purchasing arrangements.

The Michigan HERC public universities are identified in the box above and additional 2-year and private 4-year institutions include: Alma College, College for Creative Studies, Concordia University, Cornerstone University, Davenport University, Delta College, Grand Rapids Community College, Henry Ford Community College, Mott Community College, Oakland Community College, Washtenaw Community College, and Wayne County Community College District.

## Michigan Transfer Network (MTN)

In 2004, the Lt. Governor's Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth made 19 recommendations to Governor Jennifer Granholm regarding how best to improve higher education in Michigan. Responding to the Cherry Commission's recommendation that transfer between Michigan colleges and universities be facilitated through the establishment of a centralized course transfer equivalency system, Michigan State University has partnered with the Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (MACRAO) to create and operate the web-based Michigan Transfer Network (MTN). Students will have a convenient and accurate resource to utilize when considering transfer to another school or before taking a course at home during the summer.

MACRAO is providing the hardware and system software and will coordinate and control institutional participation, while Michigan State has developed the MTN web-based system and is housing and providing ongoing technical support. Currently, 53 public and private, two- and four-year institutions are participating in the project and 13 of 15 public universities have loaded their transfer course equivalencies.

The first phase of the project is now available to students and two additional phases are planned. In phase 2, MACRAO plans to provide students the opportunity to create profiles and save courses while expanding the range of courses to include CLEP and AP in addition to out-of-state schools. Phase 3 suggests the creation of a comparison tool for auditing progress toward degree requirements.

The Michigan Transfer Network (MTN) can be accessed at <http://www.michigantransfernetnetwork.org/>.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### MTN

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

Grand Valley State  
University

**Lake Superior State  
University**

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State  
University**

University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

# Japan Center for Michigan Universities

The Japan Center for Michigan Universities (JCMU) was created in 1989 on the 20th anniversary of the established relationship between the state of Michigan and the Shiga prefecture in Japan. The 15 public universities have collaborated since that time to provide academic programs in Japan and the prefecture the facilities, logistical support, and a rich learning environment for students and faculty. JCMU is the only inter-institutional cooperative program among all 15 public universities. The program previously had received funding from the legislature, but is now completely self-sustaining.

JCMU offers four major programs for American students:

1. Japanese Language and Culture – this is the largest program enrolling more than 200 students for a semester or year long academic program and cultural experience. In their time, students complete intensive Japanese language training, which is complemented by substantive courses in Japanese society and culture. Students engage in a range of activities from field trips and service opportunities to home stays with Japanese families.
2. Summer Intensive Japanese Language Program – students enrolled in this program complete the equivalent of a full year of Japanese language study in the span of 8 to 10 weeks.
3. May Short Program – Each year, a select number of faculty proposals for short courses are offered at the Japan center. These programs are short in duration and do not require extensive language training.
4. Environmental Sciences in Japan – the program was initiated in 2001 and is intended for environmental and natural science students. The academic experience includes guest lectures from leading Japanese and American researchers in the field combined with Japanese language training.

Since 2003, the Japan Center has provided a rich and transformative experience for more than 600 Michigan public university students. The program is a strong example of how our universities are preparing students to operate effectively in a global community and economy and how they collaborate to make these sorts of opportunities available to a broad array of students, which might not be available if left to a single institution.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

### **JAPAN CENTER FOR MICHIGAN UNIVERSITIES**

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

**Lake Superior State  
University**

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State  
University**

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

# Academic Program Review (APR)

The special role of public higher education is to provide quality education at a reasonable cost and to make that education accessible to all income segments and geographic sections of the state's population. To fulfill this role the public universities of Michigan have developed a cooperative review process for all proposed new academic programs and a mechanism to report significant modifications or programmatic changes. The Presidents Council delegates review of academic programs to the Academic Affairs Officers Committee. In presenting new program proposals, institutions are expected to address the need, adequacy of resources, academic quality and consistency with institutional mission and future directions.

**Institutional Mission and Future Direction.** It is expected that new programs and modifications of existing programs will be aligned with the institution's mission and plans for the future. Therefore, how the proposed program is consistent with the institution's stated mission and plans for the future should be articulated.

**Need.** With respect to the need for the proposed program, questions such as the following are examined: What is the rationale for the proposed program? Will the program serve a specified purpose in the local community, a particular region, the state as a whole or within a particular field? Are there similar programs offered by other institutions? If so, how does the proposed program differ? Will the new program provide access to underserved constituencies?

**Resources.** Faculty, information resources (e.g., library) and facilities are recognized as being essential for quality academic programs. Recognition is also given to the availability and source of funds to provide adequate support for the proposed new program. How will the resources allocated to a new initiative impact funding for existing programs and will the proposed program represent an effective and efficient use of institutional resources?

**Quality.** While each institution attends to the issue of quality control in the development of academic programs, the Academic Affairs Officers Committee systematically reviews proposals noting in particular curricular design, faculty qualifications, plans for outcomes assessment and support services. The objective is to assure that new programs are not only needed and can be adequately supported, but that high standards will prevail in all such academic endeavors.

All of the above criteria and considerations apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs. In May of each year, the Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan, assembles a report of all new degree programs approved and all programs discontinued at the universities over the course of the previous year and reports them to the Michigan legislature pursuant to section 701(2)(e) of the higher education appropriations act.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### APR

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

**Lake Superior State  
University**

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State  
University**

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

# Detroit Compact & Wade McCree Scholars Programs

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **SCHOLARS PROGRAMS**

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

Lake Superior State Uni-  
versity

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

Saginaw Valley State  
University

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

For nearly 20 years, the Presidents Council and the public universities have worked with the Detroit Public Schools to guarantee that any college qualified student in Detroit Public Schools would be able to attend college tuition free. The programs are designed to incentivize high school academic success and achievement and as such, students are required to earn a 3.0 minimum GPA and score a 21 or better composite score on the ACT. In addition, they must maintain 95% attendance in high school and remain in good behavioral standing.

The two programs operate in slightly different ways but share the same minimum requirements and tuition guarantee. For the Wade McCree Incentive Scholarship Program, students are nominated and identified for participation in the program by the school district. Most McCree Scholars attend one of the three exam schools – Renaissance, Cass Tech, and Martin Luther King. Selected students are assigned to a specific participating university with the intent that they will attend that institution if they remain eligible and are successfully admitted. In turn, the sponsoring university provides ongoing opportunities for the student to prepare for college and become familiar with the institution. The program is named after Judge Wade McCree, former Solicitor General for the state of Michigan, who was a native Detroiter committed to higher education.

The Detroit Compact is similar in that students sign a pledge in the ninth grade and if they do what is required of them, the universities cover the full cost of tuition and fees. The Detroit Compact is specifically intended to provide the guarantee for students attending neighborhood schools (all high schools outside of the three exam schools). The Detroit Regional Chamber sponsors the program and it contributes \$500 per student per year for every Detroit Compact student attending one of the participating public universities.

Combined, these institutionally sponsored programs alleviate the cost of tuition and fees for nearly all qualified Detroit Public School students. In any given year, more than 150 DPS students enter a participating institution on one of these scholarships and an estimated 500 students are Compact or McCree scholars are enrolled in these universities at any given time. And the results are promising. Compact Scholars and McCree Scholars do as well or better than the state average graduation rates. The McCree program has also been adopted in other communities and operates much like the Kalamazoo Promise, but with the universities providing the financial support.

## Arts in the Legislature Program

In 2005, the Presidents Council partnered with the House and Senate Business offices to recognize student artwork and to display that work in the office buildings of the legislature. In three years, more than 90 student paintings, photographs and wall mounted sculptures have been displayed for public viewing throughout the House and Senate office buildings. Artwork is identified by each of the public universities and two pieces from each institution are selected for display. Chosen works remain in the public spaces of the building for a year and a recognition ceremony is held to honor the artists.

Students enjoy participating in the program because it provides formal recognition and external validation for the quality of their work and the exposure from a public display and the office buildings benefit from a consistent and dynamic collection of artwork that contributes to the aesthetic appeal of the buildings.

## Professor of the Year Awards

A central mission of all 15 Michigan public universities is the provision of high quality undergraduate education. The Michigan Distinguished Professor of the Year recognition program recognizes outstanding faculty contributions to undergraduate instruction.

Each institution will nominate one faculty member in a given year for the award. The nominating institutions are asked to prepare a package of materials, including a letter of endorsement from the Provost, a statement of teaching philosophy, and a narrative that highlights the contributions of the nominee to undergraduate education at their institution and beyond. The selection criteria includes the following:

### **Student Learning**

Interactions with students, academic advising, undergraduate research opportunities, scholarship on teaching and learning, and experiential learning are at the very heart of higher education and its commitment to student learning. The social exchange between professor and student is where learning occurs and individual transformation is possible.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **PROGRAMS AND AWARDS**

**Central Michigan  
University**

**Eastern Michigan  
University**

**Ferris State University**

**Grand Valley State  
University**

**Lake Superior State  
University**

**Michigan State  
University**

**Michigan Technological  
University**

**Northern Michigan  
University**

**Oakland University**

**Saginaw Valley State  
University**

**University of Michigan  
- Ann Arbor**

**University of Michigan  
- Dearborn**

**University of Michigan  
- Flint**

**Wayne State University**

**Western Michigan  
University**

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### **PROFESSOR OF THE YEAR AWARDS**

#### **Interactions with Undergraduates**

Successful students make time to meet with professors. Engaged instructors make themselves open and available to all students with the hope that all can be successful. How has the professor made time to engage and interact with students?

#### **Experiential Learning**

Students learn in a variety of ways and increasingly, students report a desire and a need to find ways to connect the material to the world within which they operate. How has the professor explored ways to infuse experience into their curricula?

#### **Academic Advising**

Advising students through the institution as they find purpose and direction in their academic careers is an essential role professors play. How has the professor utilized time with students to inform the trajectory of their academic lives?

#### **Undergraduate Research Opportunities**

A distinctive advantage of undergraduate education at a university is the accessibility of research and the generation of new knowledge. How has the professor made research opportunities available to a potential cohort of new graduate students?

#### **Scholarship on Teaching and Learning**

Scholarship is consistently valued in the context of promotion and tenure. Less commonly considered are contributions to the advancement and innovation of teaching. How has the professor found and infused innovative strategies into their teaching and made that available to a broader professional community?

#### **Award Distribution and Recognition**

The Presidents Council hosts an awards ceremony to recognize all nominated faculty and announce the three Michigan Distinguished Professors of the Year. All nominees will be recognized at the banquet and the three winners will receive a commemorative plaque and \$3000 to continue their good work.

## Conclusion

Collaboration is at the very heart of what we do in public higher education. That collaboration takes a variety of different forms and results in an array of benefits, but the bottom line is that collaboration among our public universities is good for students, it is good for the institutions, and it is good for the state. Recently, President Mary Sue Coleman (UM – Ann Arbor) announced a potential collaborative opportunity for all 15 public universities as they move forward to develop and enhance entrepreneurship and innovation education on their campuses. She has proposed the formation of the Michigan Fund for Innovation and Entrepreneurship which will:

- Provide substantial “gap funds” to ensure that promising university research reaches the commercialization stage;
- Establish “Industry engagement and talent retention funds” to promote new partnerships between universities and industry that ensure the growth of Michigan’s knowledge based economy;
- Create “entrepreneurial education funds” to provide opportunities for students and faculty to learn how to transform their ideas into projects with economic impact.

This is just one example of how the public universities continue to seek and identify promising collaborative opportunities to improve the quality of the education they provide while simultaneously working to meet the growing and rapidly evolving needs of the state of Michigan. Recently, the Presidents Council and representatives from the university came together in an effort to develop a statewide strategy for helping connect students and parents with the information they need to navigate the college going process. This college knowledge initiative includes partners in community colleges and independent colleges as well as other organizations that share a common purpose.

The public universities are proud of the many collaborative efforts in which they participate and they will remain active and engaged collaborators both to operate in cost efficient ways and to remain among the very best in terms of the quality they provide to the state and its students.

## Collaborating for Efficiency and Quality

---

### CONCLUSION

# Appendix

Table 1.  
 State by State Comparison for Cost Savings as a MHEC Member State

State	What States Pay 2006-2007	What States Save		Where States and Citizens Save							Student Access
	Member State Annual State Commitment to MHEC	Total Annual Savings	Net Annual Savings	Cost Savings Programs							Midwest Student Exchange Program <sup>6</sup>
				Computing Hardware Program <sup>2</sup>	Computing Software Program <sup>3</sup>	Master Property Insurance Program <sup>4</sup>	Office Products Program	Telecom & Technology ATAlliance Program <sup>5</sup>			
1. Illinois	90,000	8,266,839	8,176,839	5,340,772	374,998	1,895,417	80,458	575,193	NP <sup>7</sup>	NP <sup>7</sup>	
2. Indiana	90,000	2,802,765	2,712,765	2,180,409	182,085	73,177	367,093	NP <sup>7</sup>	NP <sup>7</sup>	NP <sup>7</sup>	
3. Iowa	90,000	421,786	331,786	275,736	40,026	47,847	58,177	2,907,023	1,799,297	641,091	
4. Kansas	90,000	3,545,528	3,455,528	286,756	131,163	58,440	26,104	136,042	1,893,073	3,230,481	
5. Michigan	90,000	10,520,252	10,430,252	3,988,609	302,295	2,022,869	0	2,407,182	179,121	179,121	
6. Minnesota	90,000	2,357,107	2,267,107	359,121	126,641	1,185,164	12,896	32,195	1,893,073	3,230,481	
7. Missouri	90,000	5,484,554	5,374,554	940,190	201,004	2,194,209	34,343	201,734	179,121	179,121	
8. Nebraska	90,000	4,344,658	4,254,658	145,130	34,895	838,224	53	95,876	179,121	179,121	
9. North Dakota	90,000	250,621	160,621	43,450	27,853	197	0	0	179,121	179,121	
10. Ohio	90,000	3,193,569	3,103,569	1,840,095	267,939	122,097	963,439	1,133,474	1,133,474	1,133,474	
11. Wisconsin	90,000	2,535,959	2,445,959	1,176,165	25,644	860	199,817	1,133,474	1,133,474	1,133,474	
<b>Program Totals</b>	<b>\$990,000</b>	<b>\$43,703,639</b>	<b>\$42,713,639</b>	<b>\$16,576,433</b>	<b>\$1,714,544</b>	<b>\$8,194,322</b>	<b>\$398,032</b>	<b>\$5,036,749</b>	<b>\$11,783,560</b>	<b>\$11,783,560</b>	

**Footnotes:**

- <sup>2</sup> Hardware program savings include those from Dell, Gateway, MPC, and Xerox
- <sup>3</sup> Software program savings are from the Novell/MHEC Collaborative Program, Oracle and
- <sup>4</sup> Based on premium & loss information as of June 30, 2007
- <sup>5</sup> ATAlliance estimated savings for joint programs with the three other regional higher education compacts and MICTA
- <sup>6</sup> Student tuition savings for the academic year 2005-2006
- <sup>7</sup> Non-participating state for 2006-2007

November 1, 2007

Table 2.  
Estimated Cumulative Cost Savings by State, MHEC States

Member States	Cost Savings Programs							Student Access	Savings		
	Computing Hardware Program <sup>2</sup>	Computing Software Program <sup>3</sup>	Master Property Program (Insurance) <sup>4</sup>	Office Products Program <sup>5</sup>	Technology ATAlliance Program <sup>6</sup>	Other Initiatives <sup>7</sup>	Midwest Student Exchange Program (Reduced Tuition) <sup>8</sup>		Cumulative STATE GROSS SAVINGS	Cumulative State Commitment Paid through 11/01/2007	Cumulative STATE NET SAVINGS
<b>Illinois</b>	17,489,130	2,015,627	8,528,999	237,304	9,379,667	6,055,215	NA	43,705,943	1,014,659	42,691,284	
<b>Indiana</b>	10,227,882	836,933	NA	194,899	4,890,364	273,308	NA	16,423,387	841,500	15,581,887	
<b>Iowa</b>	371,855	67,165	NA	139,661	91,710	NA	NA	670,391	180,000	490,391	
<b>Kansas</b>	555,630	389,444	289,940	34,905	2,699,093	291,264	29,913,315	34,173,592	1,015,500	33,158,092	
<b>Michigan</b>	11,009,907	1,283,535	7,595,646	26,701	40,738,997	2,457,168	10,417,068	73,529,022	1,015,500	72,513,522	
<b>Minnesota</b>	1,194,427	596,142	7,504,818	48,608	7,083,901	3,743,565	3,997,049	24,168,510	1,015,500	23,153,010	
<b>Missouri</b>	4,058,718	588,006	9,915,624	76,494	4,008,973	1,399,463	12,693,099	32,740,378	1,015,500	31,724,878	
<b>Nebraska</b>	964,217	157,497	4,896,214	248	2,012,539	115,132	23,482,767	31,628,613	1,015,500	30,613,113	
<b>North Dakota</b>	113,700	137,632	NA	696	971,326	28,800	585,337	1,837,491	667,500	1,169,991	
<b>Ohio</b>	5,886,424	1,387,077	45,000	398,405	28,648,349	3,151,531	NA	39,516,785	1,015,500	38,501,285	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	2,365,675	89,826	NA	3,719	6,122,857	620,887	1,133,474	10,336,437	875,000	9,461,437	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$54,237,565</b>	<b>\$7,548,885</b>	<b>\$38,776,240</b>	<b>\$1,161,640</b>	<b>\$106,647,777</b>	<b>\$18,136,333</b>	<b>\$82,222,109</b>	<b>\$308,730,548</b>	<b>\$9,671,659</b>	<b>\$299,058,889</b>	

Footnotes:

- <sup>2</sup> Hardware program savings include those from Dell, Gateway, MPC, and Xerox.
- <sup>3</sup> Software program savings are from the Novell/MHEC Collaborative Program.
- <sup>4</sup> Based on premium & loss information as of June 30, 2007
- <sup>5</sup> Office Products Program began Jan. 2005
- <sup>6</sup> ATAlliance estimated savings for joint programs with the other regional higher education compacts and MICTA
- <sup>7</sup> Sunsetted Programs: Academic Position Network, Academic Scheduling, Equipment Maintenance Management, Natural Gas, and MHEC Interactive Video
- <sup>8</sup> Student tuition savings through the academic year 2006-2007



**Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan**  
101 S. Washington Square, Suite 600  
Lansing, Michigan 48933  
Ph: 517.482.1563  
Fax: 517.482.1241