

**East Tennessee State University**  
**Administrative Review Committee Meeting**  
**September 3, 2014 – Meeting Summary**

**Background**

ETSU held a meeting of the Administrative Review Committee on September 3, 2014. The goals for this meeting were as follows:

1. Meeting Summary from last meeting (August 20)
2. Proposal for Online Suggestion Box and Campus Communication Protocol
3. Next Steps

**Attendees**

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

Guests: Virginia Foley, Kelly Foster

rpkgROUP: Ashley Branca, via telephone

**Discussion**

The members present confirmed the August 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary was an accurate description of the meeting with the following corrections made to Page 3:

- “Review Organization Structure” was changed to “Increase in Professional Advisors”.
- Subgroup deliberation to action items #2 – “Marketing/promotional products” was deleted.
- Next Steps “Review Organization Structure – This committee will relinquish direct review” was deleted.

The Meeting Summaries will be posted to the website after they have been approved by the committee.

**Website**

Dr. Karen King reviewed the Administrative Services Review Committee portion of the website, pointing out where the Committee Action documents have been uploaded. Dr. King will work with the webmaster to determine where the Current Subgroups’ Charges and the Matrixes should be uploaded.

## Online Suggestion Box

Using the sample suggestion box presented by Dr. Jeffress, the committee determined that to be more effective:

- One suggestion box should be utilized by the three committees (as opposed to a suggestion box for Administrative Services Review Committee only). The three chairs would determine which committee would receive each submission.
- Remove the layers (clicks) to the suggestion box, even if it means to have it on multiple pages.
- Remove the section for name, email address, telephone number, etc. Provide an “auto response” that reflects the suggestion has been submitted. Provide a contact point for each of the three groups should the person want to be contacted.
- Platform – Mobile version

Other discussion points:

- The “how to be more effective” may not be communicated as well as it could be.
- In addition to the 3 areas: Budgetary Reduction, Revenue Generators, Pain Point Alleviation, a 4<sup>th</sup> choice might be added, i.e., “other” or “I’m not sure”.
- Identify the role of the person making the suggestion, i.e., faculty, staff, student, or other.

Using the suggestions presented and communicating with the chairs of the other two committees, Dr. Foster agreed to make revisions to the suggestion box. She will e-mail the committee members when it is ready and a response of “acceptable” or “not acceptable” could be used as a reply.

## Tentative Decisions

- Move ahead with the suggestion box as quickly as possible
- Do not conduct focus groups
- Conduct survey – The committee agreed that it would be premature to determine the specific nature of the survey at this time.
  - Dr. Foster agreed to provide assistance with the survey piece also.

## Next Steps

- Electronic Suggestion Box to go live as soon as possible.
- Tracking Matrix
  - The six identified potential action items will be incorporated into the Tracking Matrix (to the extent possible) for discussion at the next meeting (September 17<sup>th</sup>).
  - Identify additional focus areas that are close to moving into action item recommendations.
    - **Subgroup leads will telephone or e-mail Dr. Bach with these items prior to the September 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting.**