

East Tennessee State University
Administrative Services Review Committee Meeting
December 3, 2014 – Meeting Summary

Background

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

1. Review and approval of Meeting Summary from last meeting (November 19)
2. Discussion of Subgroup lead reports
3. Discussion of committee process:
 - a. Sequencing of initiative reviews
 - b. Review of committee recommendations by president/university planning committee
4. Creation of next steps and milestone dates
5. Communication plan update

Attendees

Bert Bach, Leslie Adebonojo, Scott Beck, Marsh Grube, Michael Hoff, Scott Jeffress, Mary Jordan, B.J. King, Karen King, Hal Knight, Michaele Laws, Barbi Ly-Worley, Stefanie Murphy, Mary Ellen Musick, William Rasnick, Donald Samples, Vincent Thompson, Patricia Van Zandt, Teresa Williams, Dora Wyatt

rpkGROUP: Rick Staisloff and Alisa Cunningham (Lisa Clarke, via teleconference)

Discussion

The members present confirmed the November 19th Meeting Summary was an accurate description of the meeting, with the correction of two clerical errors. The corrections will be made before the Meeting Summary is published.

Status of approval and recommendation process – Dr. Bach reported that a debriefing regarding the President’s Retreat will be held on January 12th. The recommendations from this committee and the other two committees in the Strategic Budget Realignment Initiative currently go to the University Strategic Planning Committee. There has been discussion that some alternative procedure may be considered at the meeting on January 12th.

Dean Van Zandt reported that she took from the President’s Retreat that this committee has done an excellent job of documenting its work and posting it to the website. There was some concern that perhaps we are placing too much emphasis on cost savings and net revenue generation and not enough on services for student success. There was also a question about the approval process. It appears that question is going to be addressed.

Dr. King reported that it was evident that this committee has done a lot of work. All of the issues the subgroups are addressing do in fact need to be addressed. It is good to have a venue to bring the issues forward and have them addressed in a relatively short period of time. Additional discussion related to how we communicate to the campus in a way that is effective and efficient and that can be maintained over a long period of time.

Meeting Goals – Mr. Rick Staisloff

Mr. Staisloff shared that in a typical process for a charge such as that given to the Committee, it would create the universe (get a complete set of ideas/opportunities on the table), determine if there are any gaps (gap analysis), populate the matrix and then go into the prioritization process. As opposed to surfacing ideas individually as is currently

being done, the subgroups may want to capture their ideas and then prioritize them. In addition, Mr. Staisloff suggested that a time period be set to complete this process.

Subgroup Presentation of Action Recommendations

Student Support Structures – B.J. King

1. Bucs Care Corner (*for students currently enrolled in the University*)

Recommendation – Create the Bucs Care Corner to provide a single location on the ETSU homepage (www.etsu.edu), D2L, and GoldLink for student support organizations to promote ease of access to services.

Emphasizing that student retention is critical to the University, Dr. King stated that the Bucs Care Corner would provide a single location on the web of 5-6 links for returning students (as well as faculty and staff who are assisting students) to “click on” to get to the resources they need. Dr. King added that the subgroup based this thought process on an EAB report, *Hardwiring Student Success*. Discussion followed regarding the feasibility and technical difficulties of redesigning the homepage and the required resources to support this recommendation.

2. Centralized Promotion of Behavioral/Emotional Health Services

Recommendation – Centralize promotion of various behavioral and emotional health services on the ETSU home page through *Bucs Care Corner*, and on D2L, ETSU Mobile App, and any other relevant outlets.

Dr. King reported that there are at least five departments on campus who provide these types of services to students and others. However, students, faculty, and staff are often confused about how and where to seek available mental health services. One of the major reasons for student withdrawal is behavioral/emotional health issues. The University has the services; they simply need to be coordinated. If the Bucs Care Corner moves forward, the recommendation would be to include this item as one of its links. If not, it could link off the A-Z index. Dr. King moved to create a single webpage that lists all of the behavioral/emotional health services provided on the campus. Dr. Leslie Adebonojo seconded the motion and the motion carried.

3. Undergraduate Student Success Specialists

Recommendation – Establish an undergraduate student success specialist program to provide assistance in life, financial health, academic and other issues that pose obstacles to success. The University has seen an increase in retention of graduate students through a similar program. The recommendation includes hiring a MSW supervisor and five GAs for an annual cost of around \$125,000. In addition, these people would be in charge of the Bucs Care Corner if that recommendation is approved. Dr. Samples recommended that the new academic advisors be trained to address these issues, by using a cheat sheet if necessary. Mrs. Williams stated that the new advisors will have expanded roles and her department will have resources to address these matters. Dr. Bach asked for a motion to table this matter. Ms. Jordan so moved. Dean Van Zandt seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Next Steps – Rick Staisloff

Mr. Staisloff congratulated the committee on its work to date, and noted the benefit of moving some individual initiatives forward. However, he strongly advised that the committee and its subgroups now push to finalize the surfacing of opportunities for cost savings and net revenue, combined with service level maintenance and enhancement. A date should be established to finalize the surfacing of opportunities (though Mr. Staisloff noted that good ideas which surfaced later could still be considered). Mr. Staisloff recommended that the committee establish January 30 to finalize the surfacing of opportunities. At that point, the full committee and rpkGROUP could conduct a gap analysis to

determine if additional opportunities might exist.

Once the universe of opportunities is established, Mr. Staisloff recommended the following process for the committee to reach its final recommendations:

- Subcommittees complete the matrix data elements for each initiative;
- Committee establishes prioritization criteria and prioritizes all subcommittee initiatives;
- Committee creates its final recommendations and report.

Committee members noted the challenges within some of their subcommittees of getting the “hard choices” on the table. Mr. Staisloff noted the subcommittees do not have to make the final decisions – that will be a responsibility of senior leadership at the University. Rather, the work of the committee and subcommittees is to surface opportunities, prioritize them and then submit them to the University to determine how to take advantage of the opportunities. Dr. Adebajo stated that it has been hard for her group not to get “mired” in trying to populate the matrix. Mr. Staisloff suggested that it may help to get the ideas on the table first, and then come back to the matrix. He offered to meet with the subgroups to assist with the matrices.

Dr. Bach stated that the committee could take another look at Mr. Staisloff’s suggestion to identify a larger pool of opportunities. Perhaps the committee has overemphasized some of the ideas that “could be moved to the right side of the chart.” However, some of them (for instance, the Adobe project) were real needs for which there were real solutions.