Administrative Excellence Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Thursday, April 18, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start/End Time:</td>
<td>10 am to 11:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>260 Bascom Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present:

- Members: Brad Barham (Chair), Irwin Goldman, Heather McFadden, Anne Mekschun, Erik Paulson, Bethany Pluymers, Julie Underwood
- Ex Officio: Bill Elvey, Martha Kerner, John Krogman, Bruce Maas, Bob Andresen (for Kim Moreland)
- Invited Guests: Members of Instructional Space Inventory Data Team (Laura Ingram, Ed McGlinn, Jeff Stevens, Kim Todd, Julie Ngo); Melissa Amos-Landgraf, Instructional Space Utilization Review Process Team Leader
- Staff: Alice Gustafson (Project Manager), Scott Hildebrand, Maury Cotter, Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Tim Wiora, Nevin Olson

Unable to attend:

- Mark Bugher, Tamara Walker, Bob Lavigna

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

Welcome, Agenda Review, Announcements

Brad Barham welcomed the Advisory Committee. He said the committee will hear reports today from the Instructional Space Teams and an update on the Enterprise IT Decision-making Future State initiative.

Reports from Instructional Space Teams

Laura Ingram (Division of Continuing Studies), team leader of the Instructional Space Inventory Data Project Team, presented the team’s final report and recommendations. The team was charged with defining and implementing a data collection plan. The team inventoried rooms used for scheduled instruction and space-related attributes of those rooms. The team found that room attributes will change over time as technology and campus needs changes. There needs to be a regular process for campus stakeholders to review the list of defined attributes that are recorded as well as attribute definitions to ensure inventory data remains complete and accurate. The team recommended that the Office of the Registrar be designated as the custodian for the instructional space inventory data. The Registrar’s Office is responsible for developing the schedule of classes so it follows that it would prefer to maintain a consistent list of instructional space and list of data attributes that inform scheduling decisions. Next steps include finalizing the data set, establishing data custodian duties and processes and communicating with campus stakeholders. Erik Paulson said the campus should share the team’s findings with peer institutions. He said an extra set of eyes on the data could bring new ideas. Erik also said sharing the information would be proactive and would send a message to other institutions that “this would work for you.” In response to a question about the benefit of collecting the data, Laura said the goals was to capture attributes that the campus community
could view and use to help make decisions about locations for instruction.

The Advisory Committee then received the final report of the Instructional Space Utilization Review Process Project Team from team leader Melissa Amos-Landgraf (School of Education). The team’s charge included goals of defining and implementing a process to measure instructional space capacity and utilization, and developing criteria to identify and evaluate patterns of underutilization. Melissa said the team found that the campus has more instructional space than it needs, although it may not always feel that way. She said space utilization is well below campus standards. The team also found that General Assignment instructional room use is higher than Department room use. Scheduling policies and practices create inefficient space utilization, she said. Melissa said room characteristics – technology, seating and location – may contribute to underutilization. Room location proximity to departments is the primary driver of scheduling decisions. The team is recommending a revised process to review individual space and utilization. The process should include a campus-wide review of all instructional space with scheduled instruction utilization below 67% to determine the best use of instructional rooms and existing buildings. The revised review process will require a new Campus Review Team with members from the Space Management Office and the Office of the Registrar. The Campus Review Team would be able to offer advice on space utilization to the campus and play a larger role in the management and scheduling processes.

### EITDM – next steps

Bruce Maas, vice provost for information technology and campus CIO, updated the Advisory Committee on the Enterprise IT Decision-making Future State initiative. He said the AE Steering Committee responded favorably to the EITDM team’s recommendations. The recommendations call for a Uniform Process model (Bruce described it as a “Wisconsin approach” to IT decision-making). The approach will clearly delineate ownership and decision points and will require effective outreach, communication and ability to assess. It will include the creation of three decision-making boards. As for next steps, Bruce, Alice Gustafson and team leader Steve Hahn need to create a staff function and delineate positions and roles. The role of the boards and length of members’ terms will have to determined. There will be much more communication – including campus forums – and more time for campus interactivity and socialization.

### Prep for final meeting

Alice Gustafson said the May 2 meeting will be the final official meeting of the Advisory Committee. The meeting will focus on questions about the status of projects and next steps. Vice Chancellor Bazzell is expected to attend the meeting. Erik Paulson said he would like information about successor teams so he can report to ASM. Brad Barham said the committee will do a “quick sweep” of issues that are in the implementation phase.

### NEXT MEETING WILL BE:

10 a.m. Thursday, May 2, 2013 Room 260 Bascom (final meeting)