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East Carolina University aspires to be a national model for student success, public service, and regional transformation. The ECU mission, which embraces those aspirations, was approved by the UNC Board of Governors on February 21, 2014. ECU has adopted six strategic directions as guidance for staying on task and achieving its mission. Current funding, from all sources, is under continuing downward pressure and few new resources are available for investment in strategic priorities. The University must employ all resources in the most efficient manner possible within and across all divisions. In addition, the University must be vigilant in diversifying and expanding its revenue streams. Institutional self-discipline and creativity are at a premium in securing new revenues while reducing costs. Careful self-examination is essential to achieving the University’s mission and to be good stewards of our resources. Parochial (unit level) self-interest must (at times) yield in order to maximize the University’s beneficial impacts on our students, our region, and North Carolina.

The University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability (UCFS) was appointed by Chancellor Ballard at the beginning of fall semester 2013. The UCFS has been charged with developing recommendations that will improve the institution’s ability to cope with mounting financial pressures in the short and longer terms. It is critically important to note that our recommendations encompass a few which can be accomplished in a few weeks or months but many will take years to come to fruition. It is also critically important to note that fiscal pressure, appropriations reductions, and reallocation actions are likely to continue for many years to come.

The UCFS has examined all University inventories, programs, and processes from revenue and cost perspectives. The committee is co-chaired by Rick Niswander and Ron Mitchelson with 16 members and four ex-officio participants. UCFS membership includes:

- Rick Niswander
- Todd Fraley
- Angela Lamson
- Mark Sprague
- Ron Mitchelson
- John Given
- Mandee Lancaster
- Ed Stellwag
- Lorrie Basnight
- Phyllis Horns
- Chris Locklear
- John Sutherland
- Stan Eakins
- Garrett Killian
- Marilyn Sheerer
- Tracey Tuten

The UCFS met at least twice per month in the Academic Year, reviewed the UNC system strategic directions, received reports from internal ECU units, and conducted campus-wide surveys and forums. The Committee received financial reports of existing conditions, challenges, and opportunities from units and divisions across the entire campus. The UCFS conducted a survey during fall 2013. These survey data provided very useful input and a basis for discussions by the UCFS on several types of recommendations. A draft of recommendations was issued to the entire campus community on March 28, 2014 followed by two open forums on April 8 and 9 and an on-line survey with nearly 750 responses.

Recommendations contained in this document have been modified to reflect feedback from the campus community and are provided to the Chancellor by the UCFS on May 1, 2014.

There are some compelling empirical realities that ECU faces during these difficult times and these are presented in the next section of this report. These realities help to frame some of the recommendations that follow. These realities include: cuts to state appropriations, declining enrollment, expanded employment, large numbers of degree programs, large numbers of under-enrolled sections, and a relative lack of overall productivity.
Recommendations contained in this document purposefully do not include estimates of new revenues, reduced costs, or savings. This is because most of the recommendations involve “evaluation” or “further study” or “exploration.” In all cases a recommendation requires another working or study group to examine the situation and to provide a more explicit plan for implementation. The second level of analysis should provide the needed cost and saving or revenue estimates. While some of these phase-two studies can be very quickly accomplished, others will take months in order to be properly considered and to adhere to existing university policy. We recommend the aforementioned work groups be established with deliberate speed and that the work groups be asked to provide estimates of applicable cost savings or revenue generation as part of their implementation recommendations.

**Empirical Realities**

1. University finances are different than yours. When you get paid, you can use that money for groceries, a car payment, movie tickets, rent, or a thousand other purposes. That is not the case in a state-supported university. A considerable proportion of the inflows in a university budget must be used for specified purposes and specified outflows. Funds appropriated by the legislature to repair a building must be used for that purpose. Fee revenue collected for ECU Transit must be spent on ECU Transit. Housing receipts must be spent to maintain and operate our dorms. In effect, money has a color: purple money can be used for purple purposes, orange money can be used for orange purposes, but orange money cannot be used for purple purposes.

   This notion is important when we consider the impact and use of savings. If we increase the efficiencies in our housing operations and save money as a result, that savings can go to dampen upward pressure on housing charges or even to reduce those fees. The savings cannot be used to hire an Administrative Assistant in an academic department or pay for faculty travel to an academic conference. Broadly, fungible dollars are those generated by state appropriations and tuition (for the most part). Even then, some restrictions apply (e.g., some tuition is earmarked for need-based tuition or some appropriations are allocated to faculty positions or building operations). Savings in those areas would revert to the specified use.

2. ECU is in a modest (total) enrollment decline which includes substantial declines in graduate enrollment (see chart, next page). This decline is associated with headcount and student-credit-hours (SCH) and has an impact on current revenues and reversions back to the state because budgets are based upon forecasted credit hour values that have recently been over-stated.
Between fall 2008 and 2012, while student enrollment declined by 9,162 SCH (-3%), Faculty FTE grew by 77.8 (+4.4%), Overall Staff FTE declined by 10.3 (-0.5%), Executive FTE declined by 10.8 (-5.7%) and Professional FTE grew by 81.9 (+6.1%). A portion of the increase in the Professional category stems from reclassification of positions in Staff and Executive along with expansion of ECU Physicians. At least part of the fiscal pressure that ECU currently experiences stems from declining enrollment in concert with expanding employment.  
Source: ECU Factbook, 1990-2013

Compared to ECU’s NC doctoral and research peers (NCSU, UNC-CH, UNCC, UNCG, NCA&T), ECU has a large number of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. In fall 2011, ECU hosted 110 undergraduate degree programs while the mean at the other doctoral and research peers was 69 programs. At the graduate level, ECU had 78 master degrees versus an average of 62 at other UNC doctoral and research institutions. Some of the outcomes deriving from this level of fragmentation are under-enrolled programs and under-enrolled course sections.

5. ECU has significantly less discretionary budget today than it did prior to the “great recession.” The key budget comparison (between 2008 and 2013) is the new funding that came from enrollment growth [+$44.98 million] and campus based tuition and fees [+$17.34 million] in contrast to $89.94 million in permanent cuts that have been absorbed over the same period. The net change in these key categories is a reduction of $27.63 million (about 10% of state appropriations). Most of the enrollment growth funding was derived from expansion of doctoral programs and highly (formula) funded programs like engineering and nursing. As a result, while headcount and SCH declined, ECU had a modest expansion in enrollment growth money between 2008 and 2013. That expansion will change to a $2.8 million contraction (reduced revenue) in 2014-15.

Between 2008 and 2013 ECU’s total permanent budget (state appropriation plus tuition/fees) increased in the net from $334.3 million to $373.7 million (+$39.4m, +11.8%). However, much of the increase is highly targeted and earmarked for explicit purposes ($28.3m in legislative increases to salary and benefits, $15.5m to develop the School of Dental Medicine, $2.0m to indigent care, $2.0m to UNC Coastal Studies Institute, $9.3m in maintenance and operations funds for new buildings, etc.). As indicated in number one above, the color of money has a significant impact on how it can be used.


6. University spending is heavily concentrated in personnel. In 2013, 88% of appropriations and tuition was spent on salaries and benefits. That proportion has not varied materially since 2008.

7. The amount spent on ECU campus operations (accounting, payroll, HR, IT, advancement, legal, audit, facilities, research, safety) in the UNC system declined by 4% during 2008-2012. Compared to ECU’s official peer institutions, ECU spent 18% less on institutional support per student FTE (comparative means for 2009, 2010, and 2011). The number of ECU campus operations positions decreased by 2% between fall 2008 and fall 2012. From another perspective, ECU spend 12.5% more on instruction than its peers established by the Board of Governors (see Appendix for list) while expending 27.1% less on other educational categories than its peers.


8. Among doctoral and research intensive universities in the UNC System in FY 2013, ECU is among the least efficient as measured by teaching and funded research output per full-time faculty member (see tables, next page). While there may be many reasons for these types of outcomes, the fiscal pressure implied is independent of cause.

9. ECU has a significant proportion of lecture sections with low enrollment. If we assume that under-enrolled lecture sections are defined as: fewer than 20 students in lower-division (1000 & 2000 level) undergraduate courses, fewer than 10 students in upper-division (3000 & 4000) undergraduate courses, and fewer than 5 students in graduate (5000 and above) courses. Using these definitions and data from census day in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, slightly under 20% (1,333) of lecture sections are under-enrolled. As with the efficiency measures noted in the item above, there may be many reasons for this outcome, but the fiscal pressure – and the inequity across departments – remains. 
Source: Census Day data. ECU Office of the Registrar and IPAR.

10. Universities have a mix of lecture, lab, independent study, internship, and other types of classes. By their very nature, sections which are non-lecture have lower average enrollment than lecture sections. At ECU, fully 42% of our total sections are non-lecture. Average class size for lecture sections is 28.4 and the average for non-lecture sections is less than a third of that, at 9.3. As with the two points above, there may be many reasons for this outcome, but the fiscal pressure remains.
Source: Census Day data. ECU Office of the Registrar and IPAR.

While this report focuses on new revenues, efficiencies, and savings, ECU has established strategic priorities which require growth and probable investment in certain academic areas, e.g., engineering, a School of Public Health, Honors College, and a School of the Coast. Thus, the recommendations proposed in this document – and the necessity to expand revenues and to reallocate our existing resources – are of even greater importance.
Recommendations

Recommendations contained in this report are categorized for convenience into: Revenue (R), Operational Cost (OC), Consolidation and Reorganization (CR), Academic Programming (AP), Workloads (W), and Other (O). The categories are not mutually exclusive and some overlap exists.

In most cases, accepted recommendations will need to be evaluated and/or implemented under the direction of an individual, group, department, office, standing committee, or ad hoc committee. Establishing the responsible party and implementation timeline will be part of accepting the recommendation. In addition, the acceptance process should establish mechanisms for monitoring activities, reporting progress, and disclosing results.

The process and outcomes related to all actions will be conducted in accordance with established university policies.

R – Revenue

R1. Create and publicize operational plans and processes to clearly assist various student niches (such as transfer students, part-way home, military veterans, international, etc.) to efficiently and effectively enter the university. This recommendation is consistent with the findings of UNC’s strategic plan, Our Time Our Future. The intent is to reestablish rational enrollment growth at undergraduate and graduate levels. Examination of existing admissions criteria and the establishment of diverse pipelines is anticipated.

R2. Reduce the operational and administrative barriers to the seamless transition of transfer students, particularly those from community colleges. Re-evaluate the minimum GPA requirements for certain transfer populations (e.g., military) consistent with maintaining academic quality. Evaluate the transfer equivalency process as well as cognate and foundations course requirements to aid student transition.

R3. Purposefully increase enrollment (freshmen, transfers, and graduate) consistent with maintaining academic quality and having sufficient fiscal and physical capacity.

R4. Examine operational and administrative barriers which impede faculty from engaging in external consulting projects, offering continuing professional education, and related revenue-generating activities through the university. Expand the ability of units to utilize funds created by these activities to support faculty, students, and the university. The intent is to liberate a greater entrepreneurial spirit among faculty and units.

R5. Evaluate the establishment of one or more Millennial campuses to encourage public-private partnerships and revenue retention. The Millennial designation is authorized by the NC Legislature and bestowed by the UNC Board of Governors. The designation permits the receipt and retention of rents and permits state employees to partner with private sector entities, including spin-out companies. Business incubation, commercialization of new products and processes, and job creation are expected outcomes from these types of environments.
R6. Encourage University Advancement to analyze existing business practices for efficiency and effectiveness and to establish and disseminate public metrics of giving (percentage of alumni, faculty, and staff giving, average giving levels, or other appropriate measures).

R7. Establish policies and procedures to support and encourage creation of corporate sponsorship of field courses, software, labs, scholarships, equipment, supplies, etc. Examine best practices in sponsorship by other public universities.

R8. Evaluate a reorganization of Continuing Education to focus on revenue opportunities and coordinated support of the academic enterprise. For summer school, provide greater support to those programs and courses which are unable to meet student demand in fall and spring.

R9. Units should evaluate whether offering courses with a term length of other-than 15 weeks will serve certain student groups (e.g., military or full-time workers) while maintaining appropriate academic standards.

R10. Units should evaluate alternative mechanisms for admission to graduate programs, consistent with maintaining student quality and accreditation standards. Such mechanisms might include automatic graduate admission for ECU students with very high GPAs, use of structured certificates to evaluate ability to handle graduate work, and similar ideas. Units should consider use of alternative indicators of ability to perform graduate work, particularly among non-traditional student populations.

R11. Conduct market analyses and encourage the establishment of academic and certificate programs. Often times, this would involve carefully articulated “stackable” credentials in fields like business, technology, and analytics. Such credentials could also be a pathway to graduate degree programs, especially in Distanced Education.

R12. Encourage units to evaluate and develop, if appropriate, degree or certificate programs which are not on the funding model and are, thus, funded by program receipts.

R13. Examine ways to increase visibility and coordination of summer activities on campus to create revenue streams. Utilize our web portal and encourage establishment of additional activities (e.g., lifelong learning).

R14. Find methods to support increased revenue generation in our research enterprise including increased clinical trials, increased research proposals, and increased corporate funding. Assessment of internal business practices (capacities) and external markets are essential to realize revenue growth potential.

R15. Evaluate the feasibility of, and the resources needed to engage in, select cluster hires to improve funded research. Clusters should span units and be clearly tied to mission-driven research agenda.

R16. Use quantitative analytics in the process of awarding financial aid to increase yields as well as the academic profile of the student body. This should be accompanied by a greater sharing of information across Admissions, Financial Aid, the Honors College, the Foundations, and the Colleges to use our financial aid and other student support in the most efficient and effective manner.
OC – Operational Cost

OC1. Numerous common operational tasks and workflows have large volumes in which individual operating units each perform a relatively small number of these tasks independently, which contributes to operational redundancy and inefficiency. Examples may include travel, electronic personnel action forms (EPAF), purchasing, grants & contracts, and budgeting. ECU will evaluate and implement consolidation and centralization of these activities at the university- or college-level. Staff the centralized activities with current staff from across the university. As shared services operations are implemented, examine remaining staff allocations across campus and adjust accordingly. Over 3-5 years and through attrition, reduce some types of staffing levels by 20%. Provide temporary funds to appropriately renovate physical space to provide for the centralization of selected services.

OC2. Examine consolidation of grant and contract administration across colleges/departments with low grant and contract volume.

OC3. Review and, as appropriate, implement efficiencies in operational and administrative components of Human Resources among Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and central Human Resources offices. Review should be completed within the next six months with applicable implementation over the following year.

OC4. Review the appropriate levels of central and distributed IT positions and workload with goals of staffing at levels appropriate to fulfilling university priorities and maintaining service levels.

OC5. Evaluate the combination of the operational and administrative components of undergraduate and graduate admissions while providing appropriate levels of service.

OC6. Study the allocation of administrative staff across academic units for the possibility to consolidate and share staff support, particularly across departments. Departmental workload and staffing needs are materially different than in the past.

OC7. Examine academic support services offices (e.g., Office of Faculty Excellence, student support services, Financial Aid, Admissions, etc.) to determine if any functions can be eliminated, streamlined, or consolidated.

OC8. Evaluate additional consolidation and coordination of administrative and operational functions across related ECU Advancement entities (ECU Foundation, Pirate Club, Health Sciences Foundation, and Alumni Association).

OC9. Examine business processes to increase transition to paperless workflow including
  - Online processes for signatures (bills, journal entries, direct payments, etc.)
  - Invoicing and bill payments
  - Increased Procard usage
  - Use of electronic documents across the university including in program reviews, the tenure process including PADs, the graduate and undergraduate admissions process, course transfer and equivalency process, graduate assistant contracts, student records, personnel records, documents distributed at meetings, etc.
OC10. Find ways to increase environmental efficiency, including, but not limited to:
- Mandate, and enforce, temperature settings in all buildings.
- Reduce hourly air turnover in research buildings, consistent with safety.
- Evaluate adding solar panels to buildings where payback is less than 7 years.
- Mandate a 20% reduction in copier usage in three years at the college and division level.
- Establish page print limits in student computer labs.
- Aggressively consolidate summer classes and summer dorm use to take buildings offline.
- Invest in appropriate technology to retrofit or replace building systems to maximize water and energy efficiency.
- Reduce desktop printers and route printing jobs to larger centralized printers. Reduces capital and per-page cost.
- Across all divisions, review vehicle use and need with goal of reducing the number of vehicles and increasing average usage. Increase efficiency of trips to reduce vehicle miles traveled by 10% over two years.

OC11. Each unit (academic and non-academic) shall devise and publish appropriate and applicable performance metrics no later than December 31, 2014. While the units are to determine the metrics, data and tracking/reporting over time will be a joint effort of IPAR and the units. Metrics will include, but not be limited to, metrics established by the UNC System. Academic metrics may include graduation rates, departmental and college retention rates, time to completion of degree, etc. Non-academic metrics may include response times, accuracy of work, timeliness of actions, reduction of cost per action, etc. Metrics should be established at the college level for academic units or at the division level for non-academic units. Performance will be monitored against benchmarks to be established.

OC12. Evaluate units and operations within Student Affairs and determine functions which can be eliminated, streamlined, or consolidated. Ensure that Student Affairs support activities are not duplicative of other support activities in the university. Areas for study may include marketing and information technology.

OC13. Evaluate units and operations within Athletics and determine functions which can be eliminated, streamlined, or consolidated. Ensure that support activities in Athletics are not duplicative of other support activities in the university. Areas for study may include marketing and information technology.

OC14. Recommend the Faculty Senate evaluate code-related matters to increase efficiency and effectiveness, including:
- For colleges with departmental or school-level unit codes (College of Fine Arts & Communication, College of Human Ecology, Harriot College of Arts & Sciences) re-evaluate codes to identify the governance and operational activities that should be at the college level.
- Evaluate creation and implementation of college-level Promotion and Tenure committees (in addition to existing committees at the departmental level).
- Explore the possibility of developing college-level codes that permit departments to maintain local operating procedures that reflect disciplinary differences and scale of operation.

OC15. Over the last nine months the Hunter Partners has been examining the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations of ECU Physicians (ECUP). The findings of the evaluation are intended to increase the profitability and long-term operational viability of ECUP. Strongly support timely implementation of the findings of the Hunter Partners.
CR – Consolidation and Reorganization

Organizational changes are often the most difficult and time-consuming. The recommendations in this section are to be implemented over the long-term, say 3-5 years. The recommendations will require thoughtful consideration and implementation by other standing or ad hoc committees. We recommend that work on these items begin expeditiously yet we expect that completion will take three years or more.

Divisional

CR1. Evaluate merger of Research and Graduate Studies as a support unit into the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Health Sciences. Examine the appropriate roles of Provost and Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences in promoting research and creative activities at ECU.

CR2. Consider movement of the Office of Public Service and Community Relations from the Chancellor’s Division to the Office of Innovation and Economic Development.

CR3. Evaluate the re-integration of the Division of Student Affairs into the Office of the Provost.

CR4. Evaluate reorganization of offices and initiatives related to international matters (students, study, and faculty) to increase efficiency (coordination and collaboration), enrollment, and student participation.

College

CR5. Evaluate consolidation or combination of colleges to reduce the number by at least one.

CR6. Examine the structure of the Harriot College of Arts and Sciences in order to assess a reduction in the number of departments.

CR7. The Brody School of Medicine should study the possible combination or consolidation of departments to decrease the number of basic science departments.

CR8. The College of Allied Health Sciences should study the possible combination or consolidation of departments to decrease the number of departments.

Other

CR9. Examine consolidation of student-related military activities and programs. Currently, Veteran’s Admissions is in Academic Affairs-Admissions, the Veteran’s Office is in Student Affairs, and a Military Affairs office is in Administration and Finance. The intent should be to increase collaboration and coordination of processes and programs to provide an inviting educational environment for military personnel, veterans, and their families.

CR10. Academic Library Services (Joyner) and Health Sciences Library (Laupus) continue to operate as separate, collaborative libraries. It is recommended that continued collaboration should examine consolidation of selected back-office and service/patron operations between the two libraries to achieve maximum efficiency and coordination. In order to assure that these efficiencies are achieved,
UCFS also recommends development of a joint strategic plan that specifically lays out areas of improved efficiency and projected savings. Maintenance of the quality of core services in both libraries is an essential value and integral to this collaboration.

CR11. Recommend and continue planning for creation of a School of the Coast as an effective aggregation of existing instructional and research assets and as a non-coded unit. In the short run, no new resources are requested to support this reorganization of existing assets. The intent is to improve existing investments through increasing visibility of coastal capacities, enhancing synergy among potential collaborators, increasing accessibility to external coastal stakeholders, achievement of improved complementarity with the UNC Coastal Studies Institute as ECU’s primary coastal partner, the promotion of interdisciplinary coastal research to enhance scholarship and compete more effectively for external grant support and sharpening the focus of future coastal program development, all without increasing administrative costs.

**AP – Academic Programming**

AP1. The Office of the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee will work together to create a plan, no later than December 31, 2014, to reduce the number of undergraduate degree programs by 20 programs with implementation over the following three calendar years. Among other factors, consideration should be given to combining low-productivity programs with a natural affinity for one another.

AP2. The Office of the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, the Graduate School, and the Educational Policies and Planning Committee will work together to create a plan, no later than December 31, 2014, to reduce the number of master degree programs by 10 programs with implementation over the following three calendar years. Among other factors, consideration should be given to combining low-productivity programs with a natural affinity for one another.

AP3. Re-examine and update the departmental-level “reduce and eliminate” recommendations of the Program Prioritization Committee (PPC) contained in Table 1 of the PPC final report. Updated recommendations should be implemented over the next 3-5 academic years.

AP4. Evaluate and, where appropriate, revise the Foundations Curriculum for effectiveness and efficiency. Fundamental questions are: what should it do?, is it doing what is intended?, and is it delivered in a cost-effective manner?

AP5. Evaluate the content of all undergraduate degree programs that exceed 120 credit hours for possible reductions and/or reconfiguration. Among other items, consideration should be given to whether some academic work is more-appropriately taught at the graduate level.

AP6. Pending the outcomes contained in AP1 (above), postpone any call for new degree program development at ECU. This does not suspend activity associated with ECU’s existing degree program development plan at UNC General Administration. A call for new degree program development should be expected within the next 18 months.
W – Workload

Section Enrollment
W1. By the end of Academic Year 2016, reduce by half the number of (a) lower division undergraduate lecture sections with enrollments of less than 20 students, (b) upper division undergraduate lecture sections with enrollments of less than 10 students, and (c) graduate sections with enrollments of less than 5.

W2. No later than Academic Year 2015-16, require introductory lab sections to be filled at 90% of physical capacity, on average.

Faculty Workload
W3. By September 1, 2014 each college must finalize and publish a faculty workload plan that maximizes productivity of all faculty and which provides for a quantifiable and meaningful return to the department, college, and university. The plans must be approved by the applicable Vice Chancellor or Provost. Faculty workload is comprised of instructional activities, research/creative activity, and service (plus clinical in the Health Sciences). There are many ways in which a faculty member can be a productive member of a department. Thus, not all faculty will have identical allocations to each of those categories.

W4. Each department must produce student credit hours of no less than 125 percent of the SCH expected from the Board of Governors funding formula. It is recognized that this target will be difficult to achieve by a few units but demonstrable progress toward this target is expected of all units over the next three years. Recommend careful analysis of baseline SCH productivity and unit-level plans to achieve progress.

W5. The workload plan should contain various components which include, but are not limited to:
- Recognize and account for differential allocation of time into the teaching/research/service categories at the level of the faculty member. Workload should be aligned with qualifications and ability as well as where a faculty member is in his/her career.
- Consideration should be given to permit faculty members to have significant flexibility in weighting schemes between teaching, research/creative activity, service, and clinical.
- Provide a clear process by which a faculty member can receive a release from teaching.
- Provide a clear method of evaluating the return on release time as appropriate to the task and the department (research/creative activity output, internal and external research funding, service output, etc.). Such evaluation will include a clear process for adjusting future reassigned time.
- Provide an expectation for faculty to obtain external funding in support of teaching, research, and service especially in departments in which there is opportunity to obtain such.
- Provide that an expectation of faculty work includes responsibilities which do not clearly fit into a teaching/research/service category, e.g., participation at faculty meetings, participation with departmental or college governance.
- Reduce internally-funded reassigned time at the department level over time.
W6. Encourage development and use of innovative models for increasing class sizes without sacrificing student learning. As a component of this effort, departments should evaluate and implement greater use of teaching associates, graduate assistants, or other qualified personnel for teaching and/or teaching administration duties. The creative use of advanced learning technologies is also encouraged.

W7. Provide temporary funds to appropriately renovate physical space to provide for larger classrooms to allow for increased average class size.

W8. The Faculty Senate and other university bodies should review and revise the Faculty Manual and university Policies, Rules, and Regulations to accommodate recommendations which are accepted and implemented.

**O – Other**

O1. Develop and establish stronger metrics and benchmarks for the performance of centers and institutes and evaluate them accordingly. Emphasis should be placed on linking these metrics of performance to externally funded research and sponsored programs.

O2. Conduct an external review of campus legal services (University Counsel) to make recommendations on capacity, staffing, project management, and efficiencies.

O3. Evaluate whether excess patient load on the Student Counseling Center can be shared by other existing mental health clinics on campus. Review possibility for shifting funding for additional student counselors from state funding to student fee funding.

O4. Target our advertising dollars in a coordinated manner across the university. This should involve improved coordination and collaboration of marketing activities campus wide.

O5. Plan for an annual competition, with a cash prize, to generate ideas to save money or increase revenue.
Appendix

List of Board-of-Governors-approved peer institutions.

East Tennessee State University
Florida International University
Northern Illinois University
Ohio University – Main Campus
Old Dominion University
Southern Illinois University – Carbondale
Texas Tech University
University at Buffalo (aspirational)
University of Louisville (aspirational)
University of Missouri – Kansas City
University of Nevada – Reno
University of North Dakota
University of South Carolina – Columbia (aspirational)
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
Virginia Commonwealth University
Western Michigan University
Wright State University – Main Campus