To: MTSU Employees

From: Dr. Sidney A. McPhee

President

Date: March 2, 2009

Subject: University Oversight Steering Committee Final Report

On Friday, February 27, Dr. Charles Perry, Chair of the University Oversight Steering Committee on Positioning the University for the Future Initiative, submitted the Committee's report to my office.

Having taken the opportunity over the weekend to review the report and the supporting documentation which accompanied it, I believe that the Steering Committee, with the support of the four Strategic Work Groups, did an outstanding job in completing its charge. The recommendations in the report that are now under consideration, will not only help us effectively address the critical budget challenges that lie ahead of us but also provide direction for the future of the institution.

Today, I am releasing the report in its entirety. The report is on the *Positioning the University for the Future* Web page for your review and feedback. I have also included several other documents, which were provided by the Committee, that I thought would be helpful in your understanding of the recommendations as presented. As I have reminded the University community throughout this process, **I have not yet approved any recommendations** and have not made any final decisions *and will not do so* until our faculty, staff, students and other key constituents have had an opportunity to offer feedback not only on the Steering Committee's recommendations but also on my preliminary recommendations as President.

Over the next several weeks, I will be meeting with key constituents groups to listen to their concerns regarding specific recommendations that are under serious consideration and to review other alternatives to our long- and short-term budget challenges. As you can see from the tentative schedule below, I have asked the Faculty Senate to provide me with their formal response to the academic related recommendations by April 6. I will also host two University wide forums on April 1 and 2 to give the campus community an opportunity to provide me with direct feedback about the recommendations.

#### **Tentative Schedule for Developing Final Budget Recommendations**

Date	Activity
February 27, 2009	Steering Committee Report Submitted to the President
March 2, 2009	Steering Committee Report Posted to the University Web Site

March 20, 2009	Faculty Senate Provided with the President's Preliminary Recommendations for Review and Feedback/President's Preliminary Recommendations Posted to the University Web Site
April 1 & 2, 2009	President to Conduct Open Forums to Provide an Overview and Rationale for Preliminary Recommendations
April 6, 2009	Receive Report from Faculty Senate on Preliminary Recommendations
May 1, 2009	Submit the Final Set of Recommendations to the Board/Post Recommendations to University Web Site

Note: The President will meet with various constituent groups to obtain feedback regarding his preliminary recommendations between March 20 and April 10.

It is important to note that some of my final recommendations may not come directly from any of those suggested by the Steering Committee or the Strategic Work Groups, but you will have an opportunity to offer feedback on these recommendations as well before any final decisions are made. Please continue to use the electronic suggestion form on the *Positioning the University for the Future* Web site to submit additional concerns or feedback regarding the recommendations. At this stage of the process, your responses will be sent directly to me for review and consideration.

While I realize that this process has created quite a bit of anxiety and uncertainty for many individuals and departments across campus, I appreciate the support and patience that you have demonstrated as we have worked together to address these challenges as opportunities brought on by the current financial crisis. The Steering Committee, Strategic Work Groups and countless others have been diligent in their efforts to get us to this point in the process, and I am extremely grateful for all of the hard work that has been extended for the benefit of positioning this outstanding university for the future. I look forward to your continued involvement in this process as I seek to now develop and finalize my decisions. Thank you.

C: Chancellor Charles Manning
TBR Senior Staff
TBR Vice Chair Bob Thomas
TBR Regent Agenia Clark – Committee Chair for Academic Affairs

# Prepared for Dr. Sidney McPhee February 27, 2009

#### **Committee Members:**

Jill Austin, Management and Marketing
Kim Bailey, Human Resource Services
Jim Burton, Dean, College of Business
John Cothern, Senior Vice President
Virginia Donnell, Speech and Theatre
Tonjanita Johnson, Associate VP Marketing and Communications
Janet Kelly, Agribusiness and Agriscience
Alfred Lutz, English
Patrick McCarthy, Psychology
Richard Moffett, Psychology, Vice Chair
Loren Mulraine, Recording Industry
Charles Perry, Engineering Technology, Chair
Deb Sells, VP for Student Affairs and Vice Provost for Enrollment Services
Marcy Videau, Student
Larry Wilson, Student

#### Contents

Introduction	Page 2
Executive Summary	Page 3
Academic and Instruction Review	Page 4
Non-Academic Support Units	Page 14
Energy Efficiency and Conservation	Page 17
External Resources Development	Page 23

**Introduction:** Background and reference information relative to this report are located at <a href="www.mtsu.edu/strategic/">www.mtsu.edu/strategic/</a>. In reviewing, discussing, and vetting all recommendations from the four Work Groups, the Committee used the following priorities:

- A. Positioning the University for the Future, i.e., Strategic Direction
- B. Fiscal year '09/'10 savings versus longer-term savings potential
- C. Impact of recommendations
  - 1. Academic Quality
  - 2. Controlled Growth in Enrollment/Retention
  - 3. Community Impact and Relevance, Partnerships
- D. Potential for Self-Sufficiency
- E. Initial Investment Requirement

While the four Work Groups and the Steering Committee were not charged with meeting specific dollar targets, a budget reduction guideline was necessary. For the purpose of this report the Committee chose the upper goal of reducing MTSU's budget by \$19.3 million for fiscal year '09/'10. Furthermore, the Committee assumed that this could be a permanent budget reduction going beyond the upcoming fiscal year. While there is a possibility of new funds augmenting the current State budget, the Committee did not take this into account.

All recommended actions from the four Work Groups will be discussed in this report. In each section the recommended actions of the respective Work Group will be reviewed, modified, expanded, and prioritized. The Committee in its deliberations had to address two difficult realities: 1. Major budget cuts are necessary and 2. Recommendations for painful cuts had to be made. As stated above, the highest priority considered was positioning the University for the future. It is the desire of all members of the Committee that this will be reflected in this report. Although there was not unanimous agreement on some of the recommended actions in this report, the recommendations do reflect the general consensus of the Committee. The Committee has attempted to capture the full range of discussion in the attached minutes of the deliberations, and has forwarded all Work Group reports in their entirety so that they may be further reviewed as desired.

# **Executive Summary**

This report combines all the recommendations from the four Work Groups discussed in the introduction. The Oversight Steering Committee, hereafter referred to as the Committee, has added to these recommendations. The report is in four main sections corresponding to the four Work Groups. The summary of the recommendations with potential dollar savings are as follows:

<b>Academic and Instruction Review</b>	Fiscal '09/' 10 Savings	<b>Long-Term Savings</b>
Reduction of Temporary Faculty	\$2.9M	
Eliminate 48 Majors/Conc.	TBD	
Elimination of Academic Departmer	TBD	
Merge/Eliminate Departments		TBD
Other Cuts	\$4.0M	
Non-Academic Support Units		
General Cuts	\$3.0M	
Strategic Cuts		\$1.4M
<b>Energy and Efficiency</b>		
Energy/Utilities	\$277K	
Physical Plant	\$506K	
Internal Processes	\$113K	
Other	\$112K	
Strategic		TBD

#### **External Resources**

Sought new external funds, not budget reduction.

As can be seen in the above summary, the maximum potential savings for fiscal year '09/'10 is just under \$11M. With a potential budget reduction of \$19.3M this leaves approximately \$8M that still needs to be cut. There are potential actions that might add \$1-2M of cuts in the upcoming fiscal year by accelerating longer-term recommendations but not the whole amount. Therefore, consideration must be given to temporary bridge reductions until the longer-term actions take effect. Two of the Work Groups suggested furloughs as a temporary action. The Committee recognizes that bridge reductions might be necessary.

#### Section I, Academic and Instruction Review

#### References:

- 1. Academic and Instruction Review, Final Report, 02-12-09
- 2. Summary of Staffing Profiles
- 3. Workload Issues Reduction in Faculty
- 4. Major and Concentrations Listing Fall 2007 and Fall 2008
- 5. Steering Committee Minutes, 02-17-09
- 6. Steering Committee Minutes, 02-19-09
- 7. Steering Committee Minutes, 02-20-09
- 8. Steering Committee Minutes, 02-21-09
- 9. Alternative Delivery and Innovative Scheduling

This section is presented in six Proposals:

Proposal 1: Reduction of Temporary Faculty

Proposal 2: Elimination of Majors/Concentrations

Proposal 3: Elimination of Departments

Proposal 4: Merging of Departments

Proposal 5: Smaller Cuts from the Academic Work Group and Related Topics

Proposal 6: Longer-Term Strategies

**Proposal 1: Reduction of Temporary Faculty**. Offers the potential for savings of \$2.2M to \$2.9M in fiscal year '09/'10. The Committee felt that the recommendations from the Academic Work Group, (Ref. 1), regarding elimination of temporary faculty based on adjusted credit hours was a "one size fits all" approach. The Committee recommends a more strategic approach:

#### Possible Proposals for Faculty Reduction, Ref. 2, Ref. 3

1. <u>Cut temporary faculty from over-staffed departments</u>. Cut one temporary faculty only from departments that are overstaffed by one or more. (The level of temporary faculty cuts will reduce overstaffed departments so that there is no more than one faculty position left in overstaffing.)

	Overstaffing	Estimated	
Department	(Excluding to	Reduction of	Notes
	Including	Faculty	
	GTAs)		
Agribusiness	1.89	1	
Computer Science	1.63 - 2.03	1 - 2	Only one temporary faculty
			member
Math	1.14 - 2.54	1 - 2	
Bus. Comm/Entre.	1.03	1	
Health/Human Perf.	-2.61 - 3.55	1 - 3	
Human Sciences	1.47	1	

Art	1.22	1	
English	14.06 – 20.66	13 - 19	
Social Work	1.19	1	
Sociology/Anth.	1.56	1	
Speech/Theatre	5.77	5	
Electronic Media	1.01	1	
Comm.			
Journalism	3.92	3	Only two temporary faculty
			members
Recording Industry	3.46 - 4.46	3 - 4	Only one temporary faculty
			member
TOTAL		32 - 45	Max to be cut is 40 – due to
			lack of temporary faculty in
			some departments

32 temporary faculty x \$40,000 = \$1,280,000

40 temporary faculty x \$40,000 = \$1,600,000

There may be reasons *not* to reduce temporary faculty from some of these departments: Ph.D. programs. Reduce cuts in these two departments by 2 temporary faculty:

English - 17 Health and Human Performance - 1

Reduce number of cuts from 40 temporary faculty members to 36 temporary faculty members:

36 temporary faculty 
$$x $40,000 = $1,440,000$$

- \*\* Departments that are overstaffed, but do not have temporary faculty for reductions should not be allowed to fill vacant faculty positions up to the number of faculty they are overstaffed (computer science, journalism, and recording industry).
- 2. <u>Cut one temporary faculty position in each department</u>. Each academic department should eliminate one temporary faculty position or one unfilled tenure-track position.

34 departments 
$$x $40,000 = $1,360,000$$

Requiring each academic department to share in the cuts seems like a fair way to ask everyone to give something to help the university. Additional cuts that are targeted to areas that are overstaffed or are offering too much reassigned time to faculty makes more sense than an across the board cut to save dollars.

3. Combine proposals # 1 and # 2.

32 temporary faculty x \$40,000 = \$1,280,000 (item # 1 above) 40 temporary faculty x \$40,000 = \$1,600,000 (item # 1 above)

Adjusted Item #2 above -20 departments did not have cuts in the analysis from item #1, so 20 departments could cut one temporary faculty member.

20 temporary faculty x \$4,000 = \$800,000

Save \$1,280,000 million + \$800,000 = \$2.08 million

Save \$1,600,000 million + \$800,000 = \$2.4 million

4. Overstaffed departments with more than 10 % of adjuncts as a percent of faculty. Reduce adjuncts for departments that are *overstaffed* and have more than 10 % of adjuncts as a percent of faculty.

		Adjuncts as %
Department	Overstaffing	of Total
Math	1.14 - 2.54	10.8 %
Nursing	.95	11.6 %
Health/Human Perf.	- 2.62 – 3.55	20.51 %
Human Sciences	1.47	12.6 %
Art	1.22	10.5 %
English	14.06 – 20.66	10.2 %
Music	.63	33.7 %
Speech/Theatre	5.77	13.5 %

Could likely save \$40,000 - \$60,000 each year (\$2,000 per adjunct) by reducing the number of adjuncts in these departments.

5. <u>Consider how to correct chair reassignment understaffing from overstaffed</u> departments. Chairs in the departments below may have reductions made due to their overstaffing so additional cuts may not be warranted. However, reducing the amount of chair reassignment would allow for more course sections to be covered with fewer faculty or adjuncts.

Department	Overstaffing	Total	Chair	Number of Faculty
		Designated	Designated	Positions Reassigned by
		Reassigned	Reassigned	Chair (15 hrs. position)
		Time	Time	
Math	1.14 - 2.54	44.40	17.40	1.16 faculty positions
Health/Human Perf.	-2.61 – 3.55	32.50	20.70	1.38 faculty positions
English	14.06 – 20.66	48.75	27.75	1.85 faculty positions
Social Work	1.19	24.00	18.00	1.20 faculty positions
Recording Industry	3.46 - 4.46	27.00	15.00	1 faculty position

5 faculty x \$40,000 = \$200,000 5 faculty x \$50,000 = \$250,000 5 faculty x \$70,000 = \$350,000

6. Reduce faculty from <u>understaffed</u> positions (one position) in departments with more than a total of one faculty member of reassigned time (designated by the chair) -15 hrs. = 1 faculty position

Department	Understaffing	Total	Chair	Number of Faculty
_		Designated	Designated	Positions
		Reassigned	Reassigned	Reassigned by
		Time	Time	Chair (15 hrs.
				position)
Biology	-10.545.82	28.80	18.80	1.25 faculty
				positions
Chemistry	-9.69 – -5.89	37.20	28.20	1.92 faculty
				positions
Nursing	05 - +.95	22.75	19.75	1.32 faculty
				positions
Psychology	- 4.16	58.25	37.25	2.48 faculty
				positions

\*\* These four departments would have received one cut to temporary faculty (if every department is asked to cut one temporary line) from item # 2 above. Paying faculty for some of the reassignment and/or not making the reassignment are two possible solutions to understaffing for these four departments – it is possible that one additional faculty line could be cut from each department.

4 faculty x \$40,000 = \$160,000 4 faculty x \$50,000 = \$200,000 4 faculty x \$70,000 = \$280,000

**Proposal 2: Eliminations of Majors/Concentrations**. The Committee reviewed all undergraduate and graduate majors and concentrations. Using the guidelines of University strategic direction and student enrollment (Ref. 4), the Committee recommends that 44 undergraduate and 4 graduate Majors and Concentrations be considered for elimination. Also considered were departments that offered both a B.A. and B.S. in the same Major/Concentration in which one was recommended for elimination. The 44 Majors and Concentrations represent approximately 20% of the undergraduate Majors and Concentrations. This suggests that significant long-term savings could result. The Committee expects that specific recommendations will be reviewed by the respective Deans of the Colleges.

Programs/Concentrations/Degrees recommended for consideration to be eliminated (undergraduate)

#### **Basic and Applied:**

- All three Agri-Communications concentrations.
- Plant Biology.
- Electrical Construction Management (needs further review).
- Engineering Systems Technology. Energy Technology. Environmental Health and Safety. Planning and Site Analysis. Water and Waste Management. (This constitutes the total Environmental Science and Technology Concentration within the major.)
- Applications of Math, Professional Math
- Medical physics, astronomy

#### **Business**

- Office management *major*
- Public finance. General finance

#### **Education and Behavioral Science**

- Special ed major appears viable, but two concentrations need to be analyzed to insure they have sufficient numbers. *Data presented was incomplete*.
- Health and Wellness, Outdoor Recreation, Recreation Administration, Recreation Therapy. *The Recreation and Leisure Services major should be reviewed further.*
- Family and Consumer Science Education

#### **Liberal Arts**

• Medieval & Renaissance Art History, Modern and Contemporary Art History, BS in French, BS in German, BA in German, BS in Spanish, Geography, Geology, Public History, Globalization and Commerce, Globalization and Culture, Jazz Studies, Theory and Composition, Philosophy (as a major), Public Administration (BS and BA), the Pre-law BA in Political Science, BA in Sociology and BA in the Anthropology Concentration, BA and BS in Communication Studies (consolidate with Organizational Communication), BA in Communication Disorders. The Geosciences major should be reviewed further.

#### **Mass Communication**

• Media Design and Graphics

#### **Continuing Ed**

• No recommendations for elimination

**Proposal 3: Elimination of Departments.** As stated in the introduction, the current budget reduction could extend for two or more years. The Committee had to consider this as a real possibility. The Committee is in the very difficult position of having to consider the elimination of departments. Elimination of departments can be defined as elimination of the chair's position, administrative support staff, and possibly faculty. Degree programs and concentrations may in some cases remain and be integrated into other departments. The Academic Work Group ranked all 35 departments at the University.

The criteria used by the Academic Work Group are listed in the Ref. 1. The Committee continued this task using the following criteria:

OD Steering Committee's revised prioritization of criteria for Academic review:

- o 1) Positioning for the future (strategic value to Academic Master Plan)
- o 2) # student majors (not only department-level, also subgroup program-level)
- o 3) Student credit hours generated (SCHs)
- o 4) Doctoral program offerings
- o 5) Masters program offerings
- o 6) General education course offerings

#### Academic Work Group Ranking, Ref.1

- 1, English
- 2. Biology
- 3. Mathematical Sciences
- 4. School of Nursing
- 5. Chemistry
- 6. Elem & Special Ed.
- 7. History
- 8. Psychology
- 9. Recording Industry
- 10. Aerospace
- 11. Economics and Finance
- 12. Mgmt. and Marketing
- 13. Accounting
- 14. Elec. Media Comm.
- 15. Music
- 16. Military Science
- 17. Foreign Lang. and Lit.
- 18. Speech and Theatre
- 19. Educational Leadership
- 20. Health and Human Performance
- 21. Physics
- 22. Computer Inform. Syst.
- 23. Geosciences
- 24. Political Science
- 25. Journalism
- 26. Art
- 27. Computer Science
- 28. Engineering Tech.
- 29. Sociology & Anthropology
- 30. Bus Comm & Entrepre.
- 31. Agribusiness/Agriscience
- 32. Philosophy
- 33. Social Work
- 34. Human Sciences
- 35. Criminal Justice Admin.

Based on the criteria stated above, the bolded departments (Physics, Geosciences, Philosophy, Criminal Justice Administration), were moved to the lowest priority. In the final analysis, elimination of departments is a grave action that needs the collective wisdom of the President, VP's, Deans, Chairs, Faculty, Staff and Students.

**Proposal 4: Merging/Elimination of Departments/Graduate Degrees.** Elimination of departments can be defined as elimination of the chair's position, administrative support staff, and possibly faculty. Degree programs and concentrations may in some cases remain and be integrated into other departments. With regard to the recommendations on merging of departments given in the Academic report, Ref. 1, the Committee makes the following suggestions as detailed in Ref. 7. If departments are not eliminated, the following may still be appropriate:

- 1. Support the merger of the Social Work, Criminal Justice Administration, and Sociology and Anthropology departments. Due to low undergraduate SCHs that are not part of the General Education curriculum, consideration should be given to offering Criminal Justice on the graduate level only.
- 2. Support the merger of Philosophy with the Political Science department. Eliminate the major in Philosophy. Philosophy courses needed for General Education or for other priority reasons could be taught as part of the Political Science department.
- 3. Support the merger of Computer Science and Mathematical Science departments.
- 4. Support the possible consolidation of Human Sciences with other departments, as noted in the Ref. 1. Human Sciences is one of the departments that is ranked low and has been considered for elimination.
- 5. Geosciences, as a distinct department and degree program, is recommended for elimination. Geosciences courses needed for General Education or for other priority reasons could be taught as part of the Chemistry department.
- 6. Committee does not support the proposal from the Academic Work Group to consolidate MTSU's six Colleges into three. Committee believes this consolidation is not an appropriate strategic decision for the future.

#### THE FOLLOWING ARE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE:

7. Physics, as a distinct department and degree program, is recommended for elimination. Physics courses needed for General Education or for other priority reasons could be taught as part of the Chemistry department.

- 8. The Committee recommends a review of the strategic value of the department of Military Science.
- 9. The Committee recommends the merger of Aerospace Education M.Ed. and Aviation Administration M.S.
- 10. Eliminate Chemistry D.A.
- 11. Eliminate Curriculum and Instruction/Elementary Education Ed.S.
- 12. Eliminate Curriculum and Instruction/Psychology Ed.S.
- 13. Eliminate Foreign Languages M.A.T.
- 14. Eliminate Reading M.Ed.
- 15. Mathematics M.S. and Mathematics M.S.T. keep degrees, evaluate and consolidate concentrations

#### Proposal 5: Smaller Cuts from Academic Work Group Report and Related Topics.

The Academic Work Group made 19 proposed cuts which were estimated to save approximately \$4M, Ref. 1. The following recommendations and revisions apply to the 19 items. Only changes will be noted in this report. No change means support by the Committee.

- 1. Reduce classified and administrative staff in Academic Affairs by 5%.
  - There is a perception of overstaffing in the Provost's office, and to a lesser extent, a perception of overstaffing in the administration of some of the academic Colleges. This perception may not be based in reality.
  - Rather than a 5% cut, the Committee generally recommends that each of the five divisions and the President's Office should examine their structure and staffing for further consolidation, restructuring, or elimination of positions, projects, and programs from the perspective of mission criticality.
- 2. Support the suspension of overtime pay for clerical workers unless funded externally.
- 3. Support the elimination of the Farm Lab. Associated courses and majors could be maintained. Recommend researching more cost effective methods of instruction.
- 4. Support creation of media center (Sidelines, WMOT, WMTS, Channel 10, COLLAGE, and SR Records) as proposed.

- 5. Support consolidation of Audio Visual Services, Instructional Media Resources, and the Instructional Technology Support Center. Develop plans for revenue production with the goal of becoming self-supporting.
- 6. Support canceling low-enrollment summer school courses as proposed.
- 7. Do not support suspending MTSU support for Governor's School. Committee questioned if this was a decision that could be made by MTSU and whether this would be strategic.
- 8. Support temporary deferral of internally funded faculty grants, with the exception of faculty research grants for spring and fall semesters.
- 9. Do not support elimination of Small Business Development Center. Committee considers this strategic.
- 10. Do not support temporary deferral of Non-Instructional Assignments. Committee considers this strategic.
- 11. Do not support elimination of required Academic Support Services advising for students enrolled in prescribed courses. Committee considers this strategic for student retention.
- 12. Do not support elimination of the Center for Economic Education. Committee considers this strategic with regard to community partnerships.
- 13. Support eliminating one clerical position from Academic Enrichment. Committee further recommends review of the strategic role of Academic Enrichment.
- 14. Support encouragement of senior tenured faculty to retire and begin post-retirement teaching.
- 15. Support with following changes, "Encourage administrative personnel who are tenured within an academic department to teach one course per year."
- 16. Support merger of the Center for Popular Music with the Walker Library.
- 17. Do not support elimination of funding College development officers. Committee recommends review of Development Officers for productivity and cost effectiveness.
- 18. Support elimination of all PHED 1000- and 2000-level courses and reassign instructors to teach courses required for majors and general education.
- 19. Committee recommends elimination of funding for the Debate Team.

#### **Proposal 6: Longer-Term Strategies**

- 1. Committee suggests analysis and discussion of the viability of a tri-semester schedule but does not make a recommendation at this time.
- 2. Committee recommends a six day schedule of M/W, T/R, F/S classes for more efficient use of the facilities, greater productivity and expansion of offerings.
- 3. Committee supports a study to determine if some courses could be offered in six-week mini-sessions each fall and spring as proposed by the Academic Work Group.
- 4. Committee considers online and hybrid course offerings to be of significant strategic importance to MTSU. Not only does the Committee support this proposal from the Academic Work Group, but a small sub team of the Committee prepared an expansion of this subject for this report. Ref. 10, "Alternative Delivery and Innovative Scheduling" is included in this report as a recommendation from the Committee.
- 5. Committee does not endorse the E4 consortium.

#### **Additional Committee Recommendations**

- 1. Doctoral Programs: Committee recognizes the need for additional investments and reallocations of funds to further invest in strategic initiatives that position the University for the future. Committee recommends the following priority issues be carefully considered as the University makes decisions regarding investing limited funds:
  - The mix of programs necessary to achieve the goal of 20 graduates annually
  - Investment in current programs that are strategic to the University mission
  - New programs should be established based on their mission relevance, potential partnerships and funding opportunities
- 2. Chairs of Excellence: Committee recommends review of Chairs of Excellence for mission relevance and productivity even though funding does not rely completely on University dollars.
- 3. Honors College: Committee recommends that the Honors College should examine structure and staffing for further consolidations, restructuring or elimination of positions, projects, and programs from the perspective of mission criticality and efficiencies.

- 4. Independent/Interdisciplinary Minors: Committee recommends that faculty assignments and resources dedicated to these minors be reviewed.
- 5. Summer Terms: Committee recommends evaluation of scheduling and the number of terms.

#### Section II, Non-Academic Support Units

Reference 10: Non Academic Work Group Final Report, February 19, 2009

This section is presented in two proposals:

Proposal 1: Actions for 2009-10 Proposal 2: Strategic Actions

**Proposal 1: Actions for 2009-10.** The following actions from the Non-Academic Work Group are listed in the priority order recommended by the Work Group. Dollar figures in this report will differ slightly from the Work Group report based on Committee consideration.

- 1. Community Engagement and Support: Committee recommends consolidation with Office of Marketing and Communications, Division of Development and University Relations to eliminate redundant functions. Estimated savings: \$200K
- 2a. Student Involvement and Leadership: Committee supports elimination of Off Campus Services and June Anderson Women's Center. Committee does not support elimination of Greek Life Director position based on mission relevance. Est. savings: \$250K
- 2b. International Programs and Partnerships:
  - Committee supports this recommendation with regard to consolidation of International Student Services with Intercultural and Diversity Affairs and the Scholars Academy.
  - Committee recommends reconsideration and consolidation of existing services related to international education. Additionally, Committee recommends a seamless, cost effective structure to better coordinate the Office of International Education, MT Abroad, and English as a second language initiatives.
     Est. savings \$150K
- 3. Murphy Center Custodial: Committee supports recommendation to outsource custodial services. Est. savings \$260K
- 4. Retiree Athletic Tickets: Committee supports recommendation to eliminate free Athletic tickets to retirees. Est. savings \$235K

- 5. Athletic Private Giving (BRAA): Committee supports exploration of reduction possibilities of administrative cost. Est. saving \$100K
- 6. Athletics Sports Information and Athletic Marketing: Committee supports the consolidation of these offices but would rank it as a lower priority.

Est. savings \$175K

- 7. Day Care Service Campus-Wide: Committee supports recommendation of administrative consolidation of Day Care Lab, Project Help, and Child Development Center. Committee further recommends that they become self-sufficient.

  Est. savings \$100K
- 8. Evening Extended School Program, InRoads, and Administrative Services: Committee supports recommendation to eliminate. Est. savings \$250K
- 9. Publications and Graphics: Committee does not support requirement for exclusive use of on-campus print services due to limitations of on-campus operations.
- 10. Distribution/Receiving/Post Office: Committee supports recommendation of consolidation of departments. Est. savings \$100K
- 11a. University-wide Marketing: Committee supports consolidation of marketing and external communications efforts across campus such as News/Public Affairs, University Brand Campaign, Marketing and Communication, and Publications/Graphics.

  Est. savings \$100K
- 11b. Walker Library Specialist Position: Committee supports this recommendation but would rank it as a lower priority.

Est. savings \$60K

12. Information Technology (Servers): Committee supports recommendation to consolidate department servers to centralized system.

Est. savings \$75K per year for four years

- 13. Sidelines student newspaper: Committee supports recommendation to consolidate Sidelines into the Media Center as discussed in the Academic Work Group report (see Ref. 1, page 3, item 4).

  Est. savings \$100K
- 14. Central Scheduling/Event Coordination: Committee supports recommendation to consolidate event scheduling/event coordination into one office for improved efficiencies.

  Est. savings \$135K
- 15. Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research: Committee supports the recommendation to consolidate Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research.

  Est. savings \$100K

16. Audio Visual Services, News and Public Affairs, Video Production: Committee supports recommendation to consolidate all audiovisual related services (video services, broadcast TV/video, News/Public Affairs, Athletics.) Combine management and hosting for reduced operating personnel.

Est. savings \$100K

- 17. Walker Library: Committee recommends revision of hours of operation for more efficient utilization. Est. savings \$100K
- 18. Faculty Instructional Tech. Center and Learning Teaching and Innovation Tech. Center: Committee supports recommendation to consolidate centers.

  Est. savings \$60K
- 19. Printing Services, Publications and Graphics, and Photographic Services: Committee supports recommendation to combine administrative oversight. (see recommendation 9 above). Est. savings \$60K
- 20. Alumni Record, MTSU Magazine, The Record: Committee supports recommendation of online distribution of The Record, updated mailing lists.

  Est. savings \$75K
- 21. Speech Clinic: Committee supports recommendation to restructure fee schedule for outside clients in order to generate more funds.

Est. savings \$15K

#### **Proposal 2: Strategic Actions.**

- 1. WMOT: Committee supports consolidation of WMOT and WMTS radio stations. We concur with the Academic Work Group's recommendation (Ref. 1, page 3, item4) to create a consolidated media center. Est. savings \$300K
- 2. Tennessee Miller Coliseum and Tennessee Livestock Center: Committee supports recommendation for restructuring of Miller Coliseum and the Livestock Center with a plan to achieve self-sufficiency. Est. savings \$350K
- 3. Division of Student Affairs: Committee supports recommendation for restructure analysis of Student Affairs. Est. savings \$300K
- 4. Student Email Services: Committee supports recommendation for outsourcing of student email services/accounts to third party hosting. Est. savings \$250K
- 5. Academic Advising, Student Athlete Enhancement, and Transfer Student Services: Committee does not support recommendation for the consolidation of these programs. Each has a unique function that requires specific expertise.

- 6. Information Technology Services: Committee supports recommendation for the consolidation of Information Technology Services for greater general efficiency. Committee does not support consolidation of computer specialists supported by Colleges and departments due to the unique needs of those areas.

  Est. savings \$100K
- 7. Farm Lab: Committee supports recommendation for elimination of the Farm Lab as discussed in the Academic section. The savings is included in the Academic section.
- 8. Dual Services Contracts: Committee does not support recommendation for restructuring this process. Current process is minimum required to comply with TBR policy.
- 9. Timekeeping: Committee supports the recommendation for implementation of online Timekeeping through BANNER to increase efficiency. However, the transition will need to be carefully managed due to the requirement of a two-week hold back in pay for staff.

  Est. Savings \$50K

#### **Additional Committee Discussion:**

- 1. Suggestion was made to consider the elimination of the printed University catalogue. Consensus of the group was to support this idea, as well as elimination of the printed phone book.
- 2. Suggestion was made to analyze fee schedules for facilities that are available for rental and enforcement of those fees.

# Section III, Energy Efficiency and Conservation

Reference 11: Energy Efficiency and Conservation Final Report, February 18, 2009

The referenced Work Group reviewed potential savings in the areas of Energy/Utilities, Physical Resources/Physical Plant, Internal Processes/Work Flow, and Other. In each case the Work Group made recommendations for immediate savings that could be implemented in Fiscal year '09/'10 and strategic actions that would not only save money but would also position the University for the future. The maximum estimated immediate savings are \$1M. Estimated savings for the strategic actions were not presented. All recommended actions from the Energy Work Group are presented in tabular form. The information in the tables will be included with comments from the Committee on each action.

1. Table III-A: Immediate Savings – Energy/Utilities Committee supports all actions in this table and recommends development of guidelines for an energy audit for the University. This should include major lighting issues on campus including athletic venues.

Table III-A: Immediate Savings – Energy/Utilities					
Recommendation	Annual Energy Cost Savings		Comments	Recommendation Form ID	
	Lower	Upper			
Lights Out Campaign	\$102,000	\$102,000	Target 20% reduction in lighting energy	E/U-IS-1	
Reset Temperature Set- points – Occupied Hours	\$50,000	\$75,000	Target 2% reduction in heating and cooling energy	E/U-IS-2	
Reset Temperature Set- points – Unoccupied Hours	\$50,000	\$75,000	Target 2% reduction in heating and cooling energy	E/U-IS-3	
Reduce Plug Load Energy	\$10,000	\$20,000	Target 1% electrical energy	E/U-IS-4	
De-lamp Pepsi Vending Machines	\$5,500	\$5,500	Includes "green" marketing campaign from University and vendor	E/U-IS-5	
Totals	\$217,500	\$277,500			

#### Notes

- 1. Annual energy cost savings are based on projected energy reduction of each measure at current utility rates. It does not account for energy increases in other areas of the campus or utility rate increases.
- 2. Most measures require participation from building occupants and administrative support for meeting/exceeding targets.

# 2. Table III-B: Positioning the University for the Future – Energy/Utilities Committee supports all actions

Table III-B: Positioning for the Future – Energy/Utilities				
Recommendation	Comments	Recommendation		
		Form ID		
Provide/Expand Opportunities for	Incorporate TBR, MTSU resources	E/U-PF-1		
Energy Efficient Projects	where possible (including			
	Sustainable Campus Fee)			
Implement Watering/Irrigation	Could produce immediate savings	E/U-PF-2		
Strategy to Reduce Watering Costs	once implemented			
Incorporate Economically Sound	Implement Tennessee Sustainable	E/U-PF-3		
Sustainability Initiatives in New	Guidelines as required on future			
Construction	capital projects			

3. Table III-C: Immediate Savings – Physical Resources/Physical Plant Committee supports all actions

Table III-C: Immediate Savings – Physical Resources/Physical Plant				
Recommendation	Annual Cost Savings		Comments	Recommendation Form ID
	Lower	Upper		
Reduce Cleaning Standards for E&G Facilities	\$150,000	\$150,000	Reduce cleaning levels from 3 to 4 (maintain level 2 in restrooms)	PP-IS-1
Rebid Custodial Contract	\$50,000	\$100,000	Leverage competitive process	PP-IS-2
Reduce Grounds/Greenhouse Services to E&G	\$75,000	\$100,000	Convert to less intensive maintenance areas – decrease aesthetics	PP-IS-3
Discontinue Lease for Off-campus Warehouse	\$86,500	\$86,500	Relocate to on campus function-requires space	PP-IS-4
Reduce Standards for Uniforms for Facilities Services	\$20,000	\$20,000	Furnish uniform shirts only – discontinue laundering services	PP-IS-5
Update Chargeback Procedures to Auxiliaries for Trash Services	\$45,000	\$50,000	Charge Auxiliary Services a prorated share (based on building square footage) of the Trash Services costs	PP-IS-6
Totals	\$426,500	\$506,500		

4. Table III-D Positioning for the Future – Physical Resources/Physical Plant Committee supports all actions but note that new Campus Fees will not be allowed at the present time.

Table III-D: Positioning for the Future – Physical Resources/Physical Plant					
Recommendation	Comments	Recommendation			
		Form ID			
Initiate Campus Facilities Fee	Request facilities fee (similar to	PP-PF-1			
_	other institutions) to apply toward				
	improving various facility				
	conditions				
Develop program/funding source to	Reduce deferred maintenance	PP-PF-2			
address deferred maintenance	through combination of funding				
	sources				

5. Table III-E Immediate Savings – Internal Processes/Workflow Committee supports all actions

Table III-E: Immediate Savings – Internal Processes/Workflow							
Recommendation	Annual Co	ost Savings	Comments	Recommendation Form ID			
	Lower	Upper					
Expand P-Card use for travel (airlines)	\$26,000	\$40,000		IP-IS-1			
Reduce Paper Usage – guidelines	\$35,000	\$73,500	Target a reduction of 25% in paper usage	IP-IS-2			
2 sided copying							
Minimize printing/copying			Would produce additional savings from reduced purchase of toner and ink cartridges				
Totals	\$61,000	\$113,500					

# 6. Table III-F Positioning for the Future – Internal Processes/Workflow Committee supports all actions

Table III-F: Positioning for the Future – Internal Processes/Workflow					
Recommendation	Comments	Recommendation Form ID			
Implement cost effective business	Will require appropriate	IP-PF-1			
travel guidelines	communication and/or training				
Increase tenant awareness and	Will require appropriate	IP-PF-2			
participation in efficient work flow	communication and/or training				
practices					
Increase participation in paperless	Will require appropriate	IP-PF-3			
activities	communication and/or training				

Table III-G: Immediate Savings – Other						
Recommendation	Annual Cost Savings		One-time Cost Savings	Comments	Recommendation Form ID	
	Lower	Upper				
Reduce Depreciation Charges for Motor Pool	\$50,000	\$112,000		Remove vehicles that are fully depreciated per the R&R account balance	OTR-IS-1	
Eliminate Motor Pool			\$166,000	Savings based on selling fleet vehicles only. Not recommended due to the one-time nature of the savings	OTR-IS-2	
Totals	\$50,000	\$112,000	\$166,000			

Committee concurs with the recommended actions regarding the Motor Pool.

#### **Additional Considerations:**

The EEC Work Group believes several of the below measures merit consideration by the appropriate business units. Committee generally concurs with these items.

#### **Energy/Utilities**

- 1. Update procurement standards for equipment to require Energy Star labels The Governor's Energy Task Force is preparing to require Energy Star labels on all appropriate equipment and appliances for State institutions. MTSU will have to ensure that this requirement is fully adhered to in the future by updating any procurement documents that are deficient.
- 2. Implement a 4-day work week to save energy/utilities This measure has been reviewed for the energy savings benefits. It is estimated that there is a \$2,000 to \$2,400 per day savings in energy/utilities. This was not considered significant compared to the lost value of closing the university.
- 3. Energy savings measures and projects here is several energy saving measures that were reviewed by the EEC workgroup including lighting, LEDs, wind power, photovoltaics, geothermal applications, methane, etc. These measure further consideration on a project by project basis. The Tennessee Sustainable Design Guidelines serve as the primary vehicle by which this will occur on both new buildings and retrofits.P

#### Physical Resources/Physical Plant

1. Review chargeback procedures to non-E&G customers for O&M services and event support -

Recently, a new policy for event charge-backs was developed. However not every group using university facilities for events is charged for the costs of event. Non-paying group events should be minimized.

- 2. Review outsourcing and in sourcing opportunities Each department should consider contracted services that could be economically There may be opportunities for both scenarios.
- 3. Reduce preventative maintenance –

This involves reducing various maintenance services to save the associated costs. Maintenance is considered a priority due to the negative impacts on the functioning of facilities and systems and the potential costs of running systems to failure. **The EEC workgroup is opposed to these actions.** 

4. Access the affects of furloughs on the departments within the O&M function – In general, furloughing employees across the campus (as has been recommended by other work groups) would "save" approximately \$12,900 per day (excluding employees making less than \$25,000 per year) for the personnel in the O&M function. One consideration for furloughing would be to have a university-wide furlough date(s), similar to holidays. This would allow a more complete closing of the campus providing greater opportunities for some energy savings. One negative implication is the effect(s) on maintenance activities that are performed during days and weeks the university is closed or classes are not in session.

#### **Internal Processes/Work Flow**

- 1. Investigate telecommuting opportunities This has the potential to reduce the need for on-campus office space.
- 2. Cost effective expansion of recycling –

The recycling program on campus provides economic benefits in the form of both revenues for recycled materials and reduced waste disposal fees. Any plans to expand the program must include the costs of the expansion as well as the calculated benefits. The primary opportunities for expansion consist of optimizing the collection processes to decrease the costs and increase the volumes of materials.

#### Other

1. Reduce bus schedules/outsourcing bus service — While there may be some savings opportunities with this measure, the EEC work group did not pursue because of master plan parking /transportation

considerations, non-E&G funding, etc.

2. Expand use of Work Study students –

Potential measure in the area would include redefining work activities for student workers to include recycling collection support, exterior trash pickup support, and other activities similar to an "adopt-a-building" program

#### Section IV, External Resources Development

Reference 12: External Resources Development, Final Report, February 17, 2009

The External Resources Work Group made their recommendations in three areas ranked in priority order: Enhancing Alternative Education Delivery Modes, Increasing MTSU's Ability to Compete for External Resources, and Creating a Campus Culture for Life-Long Engagement. The recommendations in these three areas are presented in three tables in the referenced report. The information in the tables will be discussed with comments from the Committee on each action.

#### 1. Enhanced Alternative Education Delivery Modes as Revenue Enhancers

Projected 2009 investment: \$250K

Potential yield: \$3.0M

- -Subsidies to recruit students: Committee believes this activity is already underway, so the need for additional investment is unclear.
- -Accelerate development of executive formal courses: Committee supports but believes activity already underway.
- -E-tuition rate: This action will require TBR action. Committee supports this action but this action may already be underway.
- -Center for Military Affairs: Committee supports but believes this is already underway and does not see the need for more investment.

# 2. Improve MTSU's Ability to Compete for External Resources through Federal, Private Sector, Foundation, and Non-Profit Alliances

Projected Investment Costs: \$900K Potential Yield: \$2.0 to \$5.0M

- -Office for Strategic Alliances: Committee supports the idea of strategic coordination, but is unclear as to the need for another new Office. Recommends Finding an existing model at another University and studying its applicability to MTSU.
- -Consultant for Federal Appropriations: Another similar contract has been recently terminated. Committee does not support this investment at this time.
- -Glen Leven Center: Committee supports this effort but believes it is already underway.
- -New incentives for faculty involvement in external resources: Committee does not support this investment at this time.

# 3. Long-Term Strategies, 2009-2011: Creating a Culture of Life-Long Engagement

\$225K immediate savings

\$3.0M potential future annual yield

Student attitudes and alumni-pride, alumni support, and MTSU message: Committee in general supports the concepts, but individual steps outlined are not considered practical. Generally supports the notion of improving student attitude and alumni pride, but recommends specific action steps be carefully evaluated.

# Additional comments/recommendations from the Committee, based on the overall spirit of the External Development Task Force report, Table 2, Office of Strategic Alliances:

We have a number of initiatives and a lot of energy for entrepreneurial activities both on campus and in the region, but little synergy and coordination between all the pieces of the existing puzzle. Too many disconnected programs and offices that need a common focus—there is a need to create an identity and space for coordination among MTSU initiatives of this sort. A regional incubator that also creates the ability to share costs and resources. Could include such areas as the Small Business Development Center, COHRE, Nashville Health Care Council—projects that have an entrepreneurial focus, both on campus and in the community, with MTSU as a driving player. This would require an investment, but could have long term payoff for the university. *Committee recommends this concept be assigned to an identified university champion for further development of a specific plan*.

In addition to the recommendations from the External Work Group the Committee recommends the following strategic action be considered.

# Co-location of On-going Entrepreneurship and Economic Development Efforts in Middle Tennessee

As a major economic force in the region, Middle Tennessee State University has a significant role to play in the future of the region. MTSU's Academic Master Plan endorses partnerships as one of its three central strategic goals. Specifically, the university is committed to "pursue partnerships between and among public and private institutions, agencies, businesses and industries to address regional issues." MTSU is the best and most appropriate entity to harness the energies of these various groups.

A highly visible MTSU facility to co-locate all of the efforts currently underway that are promoting business and economic development would focus on leveraging University resources. These resources could include the Small Business Development Center, Wright Travel Chair in Entrepreneurship, Business and Economic Research Center, Center for Organizational and Human Resource Effectiveness, College of Continuing Education and Distance Learning, faculty, students, etc. By integrating these resources under one umbrella, significant synergy can be realized to assist various types of organizations (for-profit and non-profit). Not only could this facility assist organizations that are already in the area, but it could also attract new organizations to the region. Additionally, this effort could generate external funding for the University and valuable experiences for its students and faculty. Therefore, the Committee recommends a thorough assessment of how this might be accomplished, including the possibility of using the University's property located at the intersection of I-24 and 840 as the site for an appropriate building to house such groups.

The final discussion in the Committee were issues relating to co-curricular and other extra-curricular issues.

- 1. Athletics: The NCAA has requirements that limit latitude for eliminating programs/sports. Three types of funding: Athletic revenue (20%), student fee (\$7M, 40%), general fund support (\$7M, 40%). Focus needs to be on increasing athletic department revenue and reducing general fund support.
  - Athletics has and will continue to be asked to make proportionate cuts to their budget, reflecting parity with cuts being made to academics and other programs.
  - Keeping an athletic program is important to the long-term strategic positioning of the university.

- 2. Review and discussion of additional co-curricular programs: Band, Spirit Squads, Music concerts, Theater and Dance productions, other programs.
  - Band and Spirit Squads: Funds are currently allocated for operating budget and staff, as well as approximately \$200K in travel. Band is required for music education majors. Committee generally supports consideration of appropriate reduction of size of spirit squads to reduce costs. Committee supports reduction of travel budget.
  - Other co-curricular activities included those noted above and others: Generally, we should consider selling tickets to performances to help off-set costs. Where appropriate, i.e. Music, additional departmental fee for courses may be in place or may be appropriate. We suggest reconsidering fee rental schedules for Tucker Theatre and Wright Music Hall. Departments should carefully consider continued viability of these programs, contribution to learning and student retention, investment/operating dollars required.