Comprehensive Administrative Review Update: August 9, 2017

The Comprehensive Administrative Review Steering Committee met on Aug. 9, 2017 and collectively discussed key focus areas and next steps for this review. Key takeaways include:

Focus Areas

The committee discussed feedback from campus representatives and:

- Keeping the focus on the Chancellor’s charge to the committee
- Creating a visionary rather than a predetermined approach to administration in higher education
- Reviewing manual processes (e.g., billing process – allocating budget, paperwork routing)
- Obtaining the student perspective through the USG Student Advisory Council
- Defining the method for the review and being transparent with key constituencies
- Determining what data we already have at the USG to limit data request workload at campuses
- Planning for communications to reach faculty, staff and students to explain the review process, what to expect and determining the best way to reach each audience (e.g., staff and faculty councils)
- Including institutes and centers established at our institutions with a focus on administration versus core research or service work
- Recognizing and incorporating institutional missions such as military, liberal arts, etc.
- Determining who to send survey documents to – directly to supervisors, directly to staff, or directly to staff with validation by supervisors, or a sampling approach. Likely will not use sampling approach.
- Reviewing cost drivers and ratios (e.g., student FTE, square foot of space) for meaningful comparisons, benchmarking and metrics cost drivers, ratios, etc.

External Assistance

- Huron was selected as the consulting company to assist with the project. Mike Phillips attended the meeting and provided background information about the company and its experience in the areas of healthcare and education. Huron will help inform and further define our methodology.

Methodology

The committee will receive more feedback from campuses once variables for review are determined. Examples of methodology deliverables include:

- IPEDS – selective in what we use – peer and aspirational institutions – start with peer comparisons and institutions as already determined.
- EDUCAUSE data, plus national standards – what do national benchmarks mean?
• Potential sources of data include Academic Benchmark consortium data – admin labor costs, APPA: Leadership in Educational Facilities; College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, National Association of College & University Business Officers, etc.
• Creating opportunities for sustainable administrative approaches, i.e., one-time changes are not very useful. What is relevancy of benchmarks?
• Pulling data at system level and sending to campuses for verification.
• Reviewing existing efforts at USG level – easily adapted into initiative.

Timeline and Phases
The timeline for the project can be found on the Comprehensive Administrative Review website.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any input, questions, or other guidance.
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