

**East Tennessee State University
Administrative Services Review Committee Meeting
March 4, 2015 – Meeting Summary**

Background

ETSU held a meeting of the Administrative Services Review Committee on March 4, 2015. The goals for this meeting were as follows:

1. Meeting Summary from last meeting (February 4th)
2. Updating the Matrices
3. Subgroup Reports
4. Consider topics that emerged from the Brainstorming Session on January 21st (time permitting)

Attendees

Bert Bach, Leslie Adebonojo, Gordon Anderson, Scott Beck, William N. Duncan, Marsh Grube, Michael Hoff, Scott Jeffress, Kathy Kelley, B.J. King, Karen King, Hal Knight, Barbi Ly-Worley, Stefanie Murphy, Mary Ellen Musick, Margaret Pate, William Rasnick, Donald Samples, Karen Tarnoff, Vincent Thompson, Patricia Van Zandt, Greg Wilgocki, Teresa Williams, Dora Wyett

Discussion

The members present confirmed that the February 4th Meeting Summary was an accurate description of the meeting.

Matrices – Lisa Clarke

Ms. Clarke asked the subgroup leads to update their matrices and forward her a copy. The matrices should capture all items identified to date, whether they are recommendations brought to the committee, items subgroups identified but chose not to bring to the committee, ideas resulting from the brainstorming session, ideas being reviewed, new ideas, etc. Ms. Clarke will then provide a summary report back to the committee.

Dr. Bach stated that at last Monday’s Executive Staff Meeting, Dr. Noland requested a summary of the actions taken to date by this committee. A summary has been prepared and the recommendations approved today will be incorporated into the document. The document will then be submitted to Dr. Noland.

Subgroup Reports

Administrative Structures – Patricia Van Zandt

i. Office of Information Technology

Recommendation: An audit of the Office of Information Technology with possible centralization of OIT operations. Prior to this process, we suggest that the President consider creating the position of Vice President for Information Technology or another position reporting directly to the President; the audit would be one of that position’s top priorities upon hire.

Dean Van Zandt stated that the consultant’s estimate of an audit by an outside consultant would be approximately \$70,000. The possible savings from consolidation of personnel and services could range from 11-22%, or \$402,000 to \$804,375 annually. Dean Van Zandt added that although it is not mentioned in the recommendation, the subgroup felt that Research Computing should be included in the audit as well.

It was noted that some departments, i.e., ATS, Research Computing and others, might need to stay somewhat segregated and report on a dotted line under the proposed newly created position. Dean Van Zandt moved that the recommendation be approved. The motion was seconded and carried.

ii. Office of Research and Sponsored Programs – William N. Duncan

Dr. Duncan reported that the goal of the subgroup's recommendations is to increase revenue coming from research by decreasing administrative costs associated with research.

Recommendation #1: The Office of the Vice Provost for Research should have a formal relationship with all centers of excellence and research institutions on campus.

Dr. Duncan reported that there has been criticism of the Office of Research in that it is too oriented toward regulation and compliance. The goal is for the campus to start seeing that office as a hub where people with mutual interests can connect with each other. All centers of excellence and other research based units should at minimum have some formal relationship with the Chief Research Officer, such as a dotted line relationship.

Dr. Bach asked Dr. Duncan if his group gave consideration to including Chairs of Excellence under this recommendation. Dr. Duncan replied that the group did not; however, it would be reasonable to include the Chairs of Excellence and he did not think anyone in his subgroup would object to them being included.

Recommendation #2: The Office of the Vice Provost for Research should have some relationship (formal or informal) with the Honors College and University Advancement.

Dr. Duncan reported that better communication between the Honors College and the Chief Research Officer should help incorporate these students into research opportunities and ultimately increase their skill set as they seek employment. Specifically, if the Innovation Lab, housed under the Vice Provost of Research's office, can become self-sustaining, a relationship between these two offices should help our students accrue hands on experience in emerging business ventures. Also, the Vice Provost of Research gives the Honors College \$15,000 per year. However, he receives no report back from the Honors College.

Dr. Duncan reported that currently there is no formal relationship between the Office of Research and University Advancement. If University Advancement was better informed about the research being conducted on campus they would be better equipped to engage people for donations.

Recommendation #3: Pre and Post-award grant management, specifically regarding budgets, should be moved into one unit to increase the service orientation of the granting process (internal and external).

Dr. Duncan reported that currently the application for grants and the management of grants are conducted in separate units. The subgroup recommends moving grant management under the Office of Research. This should not require the creation of new positions; it should simply involve physically moving people. He added that the subgroup considered a dotted line assignment; however, the group felt a stronger recommendation was needed.

Recommendation #4: The Office of the Vice Provost of Research should be elevated to a Vice President level.

Dr. Duncan reported that this change should allow the Chief Research Officer to focus on facilitating more opportunities for faculty and student research and ensuring that the research produced at ETSU is better leveraged for exposure in the community. A lower position should be put in charge of administering regulatory and compliance matters.

Recommendation #5: The subgroup recommends further consideration of college based grant offices.

Dr. Duncan reported that the university currently uses a very centralized model for its research. Many universities have had increased overall success using a service center model, by placing grant personnel (writing, budgeting) outside the centralized office. However, not knowing how the budget planning process will be changed going forward, the subgroup could not make a specific recommendation.

Dr. Beck noted that one recommendation was to pull grant accounting and grant management into one office and this recommendation was to decentralize it within the individual colleges. Dr. Duncan responded that the centralized part is compliance and going outside the university to help facilitate connecting our research to the community. Dr. Beck added that he can see points of conflict between the colleges and ORSPA with these recommendations.

When concern was expressed about recommendations being made to evaluate personnel, it was pointed out that the recommendations are to evaluate the structure of the department, not a single person in the department.

Dr. Bach asked to what extent these recommendations conform to, are consistent with, or parallel to the recommendations made by the group Rob Pack is chairing. Dr. Duncan stated that these are all consistent with Dr. Pack's group's recommendations, specifically the elevation of the Vice Provost of Research to the position of Vice President. In addition, he plans to share these recommendations with Dr. Pack.

Recommendation #6: The subgroup recommends increased data collection and analysis, and if appropriate, increased funding of the Research Development Committee (RDC) to increase the Return on Investment (ROI) from seed grants.

Dr. Duncan reported that the RDC currently generates a \$24 return for every \$1 invested, which is very good. The Vice Provost has data regarding what is given out by the RDC and grants, however, ETSU lacks a systematic way of tracking other products that emerge from RDC investment, e.g., plays, movies, publications. There is a need for data collection to determine how to maximize the ROI from that revenue.

Recommendation #7: Broaden the use of research courses/tracks like those used in the Bill Gatton School of Pharmacy.

Dr. Duncan reported that in the School of Pharmacy, students can model a series of tiered courses for independent research with an acknowledgement of their research focus listed on their transcripts. This practice would ultimately help to retain students and provide students with valuable hands on experience that will prepare them for the workforce.

The impact and value of dotted line relationships were briefly discussed (see recommendation 1). When asked if the subcommittee considered recommending an audit of Research, Dean Van Zandt replied that it did not. Dr. King stated that these recommendations included several significant issues that would impact a lot of people at the institution. Perhaps, recommending an audit would be a good solution rather than recommending specific changes. Dean Van Zandt stated that the subgroup could reframe the overall recommendation and put it in the form of an audit that would address these issues. This item was tabled and will be brought back to the committee at a future meeting.

Public Service – Scott Beck

i. Child Study Center

Recommendation: The Public Service subgroup recommends that a higher administration, including the Dean of the Clemmer College of Education, undertake a feasibility study to determine the positive and negative

outcomes to combining the operations and functions of the Child Study Center (CSC) and Little Bucs at one off-campus site.

Dr. Beck reported that in addition to being a full-day child care center for faculty and staff, the CSC is a research site. ETSU as well as other higher education institutions in the area have used the CSC for observations, training and research. Little Bucs is a separate operation for students to “drop off” children while they are on campus attending classes, studying or engaging in other activities. The CSC is housed in an off-site location and the Little Bucs is housed in Warf-Pickel; however, there is very little room for growth in Warf-Pickel. Little Bucs daycare basically pays for itself. The CSC is subsidized by ETSU at an annual cost of approximately \$350,000.

The CSC monthly rates included with the recommendation appeared to be excessive to some of the committee members. However, Dr. Knight stated that the rates are adjusted annually and are just above the midpoint of rates in the area. Dr. Knight added that the CSC is the only nationally accredited child care center in the region. Dr. Beck moved that the recommendation be approved, and the motion was seconded and carried.

Net Revenue Generators – Gordon Anderson

i. Summer School 2015

Dr. Anderson stated that the subgroup’s goal is to make more courses available and increase the number of students who take classes in the summer, allowing students to move through their programs in a more timely manner and getting them through to graduation. It has the additional side benefit of generating revenue for the University.

Recommendation #1: Student Program Service Fees should be capped at 6 credits. This would be a show of good will and might encourage students to take more than 6 hours.

It was noted that student program service fees are currently capped at 8 hours in the summer; students would realize a savings of \$170.00 as the fee for one credit hour is \$85.00. This may encourage students to take 9 hours instead of 6 hours.

Recommendation #2: We would like permission to run a pilot in which faculty members whose course enrollment does not cover their salary and benefits would have the choice to teach the course for less pay, instead of having the course canceled. This would follow the current X956 course and study abroad entrepreneurial model. In Arts and Sciences, the Departments of Social Work, Geosciences, Sociology and Anthropology, and Mass Communication have indicated an interest in participating in the pilot, if approved.

Dr. Anderson explained that this would simply give faculty in those departments (and others who may want to participate) the option to teach classes at a reduced rates if enrollment does not cover their salary and benefits.

Recommendation #3: In order to try to increase summer enrollment, we propose that a fixed sum be guaranteed to the general fund, not a percentage of all revenue. This would mean that, once that sum has been met, colleges could offer courses provided the instructor’s salary and benefits are covered. Based on last summer’s and this spring’s enrollment, we propose the general fund receive \$3,500,000. Summer School operations would also be kept as low as possible. College contributions would be prorated based on summer school 2014 numbers.

Dr. Anderson explained that for a number of years the summer school revenue model gave the first 53.5% of all revenue to the general fund (50%) and to summer school operations (3.5%). After that the instructors’ salaries and benefit costs are covered and any remaining funds would be returned to the college. This resulted in many classes being canceled. Last summer with the President’s approval, the College of Arts and Sciences operated under this pilot and it did increase revenues to the University compared to canceling the courses. By adopting

the proposed model before students register for summer 2015, colleges should be able to offer more courses in summer 2015 than in 2014.

Dr. Anderson stated that he might want to revise the recommendation to state that, “We recommend that we do not continue the model where a percentage up front goes to the general fund, but that we work with the President to develop a model for this summer that provides more incentives to the departments to offer more courses to students understanding that the general fund must receive a certain amount of the revenues generated.”

Dr. Knight moved to accept all three recommendations and the motion was seconded. Dr. Bach stated that Board policy is that summer school instructors receive 1/32 of salary per credit hour; therefore, the Board will have to approve this exception. Dr. Knight’s motion carried.

Dr. Kelley requested that documentation for the recommendations be shared with the committee members a couple of days prior to the meeting. The subgroup leads being in agreement with Dr. Kelley’s request, Dr. Bach asked the leads to provide their documentation for recommendations to Dora in order for them to be included with the agenda which is generally distributed one to two days prior to the meetings.

Items Identified in the Brainstorming Session on January 21, 2015

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) – Assigned to the **Administrative Structures** Subgroup. Dean Van Zandt indicated that her subgroup should have a recommendation at the next meeting regarding the ORSP that would address these areas and several others.

- Compliance vs. support
- Ideas: center for research

Public Service – Assigned to the **Public Service** Subgroup. Dr. Beck indicated that the subgroup should have a recommendation by the March 4th Committee meeting regarding this item.

- Address barriers; build bridges

Advancement – Does not warrant further consideration by this committee. The Office of Advancement has recently changed a lot of its software. In addition, there is a search currently underway for a new Vice President for Advancement. These changes may help resolve the current situation.

- Data needs to be current
- Not current; data changes
- Capture alumni, follow on social media connect

Financial Aid – The **Student Support Structures** subgroup has addressed this matter. Dr. B.J. King stated that she will ask Margaret Miller and Joe Sherlin to provide a report by possibly adding measures to the first two bullets and she will provide a report on the last two bullets.

- Several new initiatives, awaiting results on new initiatives’ effectiveness
 - Ex: Call Center

- Embracing technology and electronic documents
 - Loading files
 - Loaded aid files prior to August
 - Estimated aid award letters
- Barriers
 - Staffing
 - Layout of space
- Promissory note review
 - Promise to pay – Do 18 year olds understand?
 - Investigate bridge loans but beware of consequences

Electronic Documents – This item was addressed in Dr. Karen King’s recommendation regarding Dynamic Forms.

- Dynamic Forms
 - On the table
- Work flow
- OIT workflow
- Dynamic

Auto Fleet – Outsource Motor Pool – Does not warrant further consideration by this Committee as the State has it out for bids and Dr. Collins’ office is working with this matter.

- May need to review

Distributed Staff → efficient vs. effective – The **Administrative Structures** subgroup will address this item (except Academic Advisors) with the assistance of Lisa Clarke. The **Academic Support Structures** subgroup will address the Academic Advisors piece of this item.

- OIT – how do we handle distributed IT staff
- Financial Managers
 - Training
 - Qualifications
 - Budgeting/compensation
- Facilities Officers
- Academic Advisors (added at today’s meeting)

Support Staff → efficient vs. effective – The **Administrative Structures** subgroup will take this item under advisement to determine if it warrants further consideration by this Committee.

- Combining departments
- Look at pooling
- Consider changes in jobs – more technical
- Clarify clerical needs
- What is appropriate model of support

Real Estate Foundation – Does not warrant further consideration by this Committee.

- TBR and State rules

Museums and Galleries – The Public Service subgroup will conduct an analysis of the inventory, need, and cost avoidance and provide a recommendation back to the Committee.

- Need?
- Consolidate under single governance?

Kingsport Centers & Valleybrook – Warrants further discussion – to be determined

- Function
- Costs
- Downtown – upper level & graduate (currently at capacity)
- Allendale – most vulnerable to TN Promise
- How does “online” component interface with various campus sites
- Broadcast option to desktop in homes
- Alternative use for Allendale
- Place for distance learning students
- Valleybrook needs to be utilized more

TBR Meetings – The Leveraging Technology subgroup will address this item.

- Technical resources for meetings on campus; reduce travel
- Consider “politics” networking opportunities
- Call in option available at times

Website Designs – The Leveraging Technology subgroup will address this item.

- Different
- Varying degrees of expertise
- Emerging Technology Center
 - Reasonably low cost – C. Novak
 - Can University negotiate design for University

Student information

- Needs to be user friendly
- Up to date
- Who monitors this?

Innovation lab

- Cost analysis
- Research generation

Energy Usage – Greg Wilgocki’s subgroup area

Enterprise E-portfolios – add-on tool to D2L

- Collecting assessment for accreditation
- Know purpose and client

Shared Services with City and County

- Trash removal
- Public safety
- Parking services
- Fire
- Snow removal
- Emergency preparedness

University School – Child Study Center – Little Bucs

- Decision vs. opportunities vs. politics
- Facility at University School inadequate
- Future → student * employee * community

Administrative Structure

- Roles, titles, layers of leadership
- Across levels of University
- Policy – 3 levels of stipend for faculty serving as chair
 - Gradient system
 - 10 years – retains stipend
 - Rationale to be compensated for lack of professional progress
- Do we need as many department chairs?
- This is a job of academic portfolio committee
- Workflow → workers

IT Infrastructure

- Data center
- As we go forward – review new opportunities and flexibility

Intercollegiate Athletics – Auxiliaries

- Auxiliary function
- Less subsidized
- What is the cost?
- Fundraising their own costs