Administrative Excellence Advisory Committee

Date: Thursday, June 21, 2012  
Start/End Time: 10 am to 11:30 am  
Location: 260 Bascom Hall

Present: Members: Brad Barham (Chair), JoBeth Dudley, Irwin Goldman, Heather McFadden, Erik Paulson, Tamara Walker, Julie Underwood  
Ex Officio: Dorothy Steele, Martha Kerner, Mark Sweet (for Kim Moreland)  
Invited Guests: members of the IT Decision-making Team (current state), and Policy Framework Team  
Staff: Alice Gustafson (Project Manager), Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Dan Koetke  
Huron Consultants: Scott Friedman, Adam Fennel, Kurt Dorschel

Unable to attend: Mark Bugher, Anne Mekschun, Bethany Pluymers

Attachments: Policy team power point slides

----- MEETING NOTES-----

Welcome, Agenda Review, Announcements
Brad Barham welcomed Erik Paulson to the committee as the new student representative

Wave 2 - Updates – Team Presentations

Policy Team: Kurt Dorschel provided the background for this teams work, including the benchmarked results which indicated that many peer universities have already been working to develop policy frameworks. Patrick Sheehan walked through the proposed policy creation process and the template for initiating a policy. Brigid Daly described a current policy which was translated into the template for a future policy.

Jo Beth Dudley suggested that Kim Moreland might consider the policy development process in the research area to be quite robust and well maintained, possibly due to the regulated nature of the RSP’s work. Mark Sweet stated that overall he agreed with the policy team’s current state observations and that he has seen that the policy structure of some peer institutions look appealing. He also warned that the process should not be so “overbuilt” as to become cumbersome. Martha Kerner shared examples from her personal experience regarding the difficulty she has had “unearthing” policies, the sometimes arbitrary dissemination and documentation of policy, and differentiating “policy” from “strong oral tradition.”

Tamara Walker commented that the request template seemed better suited to handle requests for the implementation of new policy rather than requests to modify existing policies; suggested that the final template provide additional guidance on this. Heather McFadden asked about the
timeline of the request / modification process and whether or not there would be an expedited process available for urgent changes such as a new federal regulation. Irwin Goldman and Brad Barham stated it was important to create connections between a policy document and the office that is “expert” at interpreting the policy, citing a recent example in which a lack of such a connection caused great difficulty. Erik Paulson commented that while he was in agreement with the overall direction and the goals of the team, he was “not a fan” of the creation of a policy advisory committee, stating that the creation of a new decision-making body would conflict with existing governance groups; it was explained that this group would not be involved in decision-making regarding the content of policies, just the process.

Several participants raised questions regarding the scope of the team; it was confirmed that the chartered scope of the team is policy creation and management under the umbrella of Administrative Excellence.

**IT Decision-making Team:** Barb McPherson described the charge for this team’s work as the development of a comprehensive understanding the current IT decision-making process and the IT investment across campus. She described the approach used and the observations made by the team at its halfway point. The team met with MTAG, ITC and CTIG as well as Ed Van Gemert, Bobby Burrow, Bruce Maas and John Krogman. It has prepared standard worksheets and team members have interviewed the senior IT and financial officers in each division. The data from these interviews are being gathered and will be analyzed as the next step. The team will be invited back to share its completed work at a future meeting.

Julie Underwood stated she was hearing the team reference “research computing” and “administrative computing” but did not hear a reference to “instructional computing”. She was reassured by the team that their analysis fully incorporated instructional computing. Irwin Goldman asked if the team was only focused on 101 funds to which the team responded the full analysis includes many other fund types. Mark Sweet echoed the team’s remark that inconsistent use of account codes is a big problem on campus.

**NEXT MEETING WILL BE:**
10 a.m. Thursday, July 19, 2012 Room 260 Bascom