

Service Portfolio Review

Summary of Activity to Date

- Developed Summary of Services and Associated Costs
- Developed Themes for Teams
- Configured Team Leadership and Participants, derived from a cross-section of faculty and classified and non-classified staff
- Project Kickoff 5/16/14
- Quick Response - 90-day timeline
- Draft report delivered to the President on 9/2/14
- President hosted a celebration at his residence to thank the teams

Six Sub-teams

- Duplication of Effort - Denise Hogsett
- Leveraging Technology - Brian Morgan
- Facilities (Management and Utilization) - Joyce Harrah
- Auxiliary Services - Karla Murphy
- Vendors/Contracts - Allen Taylor
- Procurement Card/Travel – Cammy Holley
- Steering Team: Gayle Ormiston, Layton Cottrill, Ginny Painter, Jan Fox, Karen Kirtley, Brandi Jacobs-Jones, John Maher, Mike Hamrick, Joe Shapiro, Beth Hammers

Goal

- Recommend \$7-10 MM of net revenue enhancement for FY 16

Results

- Steering Team recommended a total of \$9.9M of findings to the President, prioritized by ease of implementation and impact

Next Steps

- Conduct a Campus Conversation session to acquaint the broader campus community with the details of the recommendations on October 6
- Develop a holistic implementation strategy at the October 17 retreat, beginning with items identified as being achievable in the short term

Budget Process

Summary of Activity

- During Fiscal Year 2014
 - Sources and uses budgeting introduced
 - Moved to Approved Budget spending authority
 - Position control management initiated
 - Implement structure to enable management reporting
- Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Process
 - Began with \$14 million deficit in operating budget
 - The Budget Work Group, Deans and other campus leaders worked to reduce deficit to zero
 - Provided more than \$2.3 million for raises
 - Utilized \$5.5 million in one-time sources
- Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Process
 - Budget Work Group explored various budget models
 - Budget Work Group and senior leadership determined a hybrid model would be best for Marshall.
 - A prototype budget model was developed and shared with the Budget Work Group, Deans and senior leadership
 - The Deans and Provost began discussions about the development of the allocation methodology for the Academic Pool
 - Budget Units working on initial submission of Fiscal Year 2016 revenues

Proposed Next Steps

- Budget Office will drive the mechanics of developing the Fiscal Year 2016 budget
- Budget Units will provide the data for developing the Fiscal Year 2016 budget
- Budget Work Group will continue in their advisory role throughout the budget process
- Service and Academic Portfolio recommendations will be taken into consideration in the Fiscal Year 2016 budget
- University will transition to the revised budget model with full implementation for the Fiscal Year 2018 budget

Communications

Workgroup Members

Ginny Painter (current)/Matt Turner (previous); Tiffany Bajus; and Susan Tams

Summary of Activity to Date

- Established a listserv for communicating to all retreat participants
- Established a strategic planning name (Marshall 20/20) and logotype
- Established a website www.marshall.edu/2020 to share information about the strategic planning process and progress
- Provided regular updates of Budget Work Group, Services Portfolio Review and Academic Portfolio Review processes on the 20/20 website and through Marshall's internal newsletter, "We Are ... Marshall"
- Article on the 20/20 strategic planning process and the new vision statement in the Spring 2014 edition of Marshall Magazine
- Two sets of FAQs—Service Portfolio Review process and Rapid Response Teams—developed and distributed via the "We Are ... Marshall" newsletter and the 20/20 website
- Campus Conversations presentations—one each focusing on Budget Reform, Service Portfolio Review and Academic Portfolio Review

Current Challenges

- Lack of participation in discussion list and follow-up on postings to the 20/20 website
- Lack of ability to attend all workgroup meetings to gather information to communicate
- Limited staff resources to develop more robust communications materials and update website

Proposed Next Steps

- More robust website experience that is better organized and updated at least monthly
- Continue to add "news of interest" posts to the 20/20 website (Consider a weekly roundup of news clips specific to university organizational change, budget management issues and reorganization trends across the country.)
- Continued regular updates in the weekly "We Are ... Marshall" e-newsletter
- Herald-Dispatch story about the strategic planning process at Marshall and its progress
- Follow-up article in Summer 2015 Marshall Magazine—this time focusing on the outcomes of the Service Portfolio and Academic Portfolio reviews
- Monthly "Coffee and Chat" open-house sessions for members of the campus community to visit informally with team members who have been working on the 20/20 projects, ask questions, discuss concerns and get updates
- Integration of progress updates during existing forums with the campus community, including at each Faculty Senate and Classified Staff Council meeting, and at the South Charleston campus

Vision Statement

Workgroup Members:

Co-Chairs: Tracy Christofero
Stephen Kopp

VISION TEAM UNITS:

<u>Unit X Members</u>	<u>Unit Y Members</u>	<u>Unit z Members</u>
Umran Al Abd Alrazzak	Ron Area	Glenn Anderson
Mohammed Alkhaldi	Joshua Hagen	Matt Cook
Cam Brammer	Denise Hogsett	Dan Holbrook
Maurice Cooley	Yu Kang	Ramakrishna Kasetty
Jan Fox	John Maher	
Wael Zatar	Tom Pinkerton	Mariah Young
	Harlan Smith	

Summary of Activity to Date

The second action plan objective was the development of a “Shared Future Vision Statement.” The charge to the Vision Statement Team was to create a Shared Future Vision that would address the question, “What does Marshall University aspire to become in 2018 and beyond?”

- a. Organizer(s)/Convener(s): - President Kopp/Dr. Tracy Christofero, Co-Chairs
- b. Draft Statement Deadline: January 10, 2014

The Vision Statement Team comprised of six (6) academic department chairs/faculty members (of whom two serve on Faculty Senate), six (6) students, one (1) academic dean, two (2) senior VP’s, two (2) non-classified staff members, one person each from Classified Staff Council, MURC, and the Foundation began its work during its first meeting on November 11, 2013. Three work teams of five members were organized as identified above and the Team members met every Monday morning from 8:30-9:30 am November 11th through December 9th to complete the charter for this action team. A fourth Team Unit consisting of Drs. Kopp, Christofero and Area also worked on a proposed vision statement.

During the December 9th meeting, each Vision Team Unit shared their proposed vision statement for consideration by the greater Marshall University community. The process adopted was an open voting process in which all constituents served by Marshall University (*e.g.*, faculty, staff, students, alumni, friends, community members, *etc.*) were invited to vote for the “vision statement” deemed by the voter to be the best for guiding the future of Marshall University.

The proposed statements, in no particular order, were:

- “We are the most student-focused university in our region, united in realizing our students’ potential through learning and service.”
- “Marshall University . . . where you want to be.”
- “The vision of Marshall University: “To inspire learning and creativity that ignites the mind, nurtures the spirit and fulfills the promise of a better future.”
- Marshall University's vision: “Every student succeeds.”

The process for soliciting feedback (via voting) from across Marshall’s global constituent base commenced on December 12, 2013 and continued through January 10, 2014. Voting for the Vision Statement took place on Marshall’s strategic planning website, <http://www.marshall.edu/2020/2020-vision-statement-selection/>.

The final tally of votes (863 votes cast) for the proposed Vision Statements appears to be as follows:

- *“We are the most student-focused university in our region, united in realizing our students’ potential through learning and service.”* **84 votes (9.7%)**
- *“Marshall University . . . where you want to be.”* **113 votes (13.1%)**
- *“The vision of Marshall University: “To inspire learning and creativity that ignites the mind, nurtures the spirit and fulfills the promise of a better future.”* **576 votes (66.7%)**
- Marshall University's vision: “Every student succeeds.” **90 votes (10.4%)**

Overwhelmingly, the choice of the voters was, *“The vision of Marshall University: “To inspire learning and creativity that ignites the mind, nurtures the spirit and fulfills the promise of a better future.”*

The final step in the process adopted by the Vision Statement Team is to bring this vision statement to the MUBOG for adoption.

Current Challenges

None, unless the MUBOG declines to adopt the recommended Vision Statement.

Proposed Next Steps

At the behest of the Vision Statement Team, work commenced in January to review and propose a revised/updated mission statement for adoption by Marshall University.

The Vision/Mission Team meetings will commence the end of October after the 20/20 Retreat to assure we are on track for proposing a new Marshall mission statement after the HLC Accreditation visit in October 2015.

Pro Forma

Workgroup Members

- Michael McGuffey
- Mary Ellen Heuton
- Mark Robinson
- TBD (academic chair)
- TBD (deans office representative)
- TBD (academic affairs representative)

Summary of Activity to Date

- After discussions with key principals, it was determined that the completion of the pro formas should wait until after the Academic Portfolio Review is further along its timeline. Not only are chairs and deans busy with the APR, but also the product of the APR is necessary to accurately populate the pro forma worksheets. As a result, actual completion of pro forma worksheets has not started. Current workgroup members have discussed both the timing of the pro forma activities and the expected outputs with the consultant.
- **Update: Now that the APR is nearing completion, the pro forma development process can begin. A rudimentary template has been developed, but further development is needed.**

Current Challenges

- None at this time.

Proposed Next Steps

- Next steps are to develop a pro forma model based on the few that have been created for specific programs over the last several years, then trial it on small number of programs. The initial plan would be to begin with pro forma models for graduate programs. Since graduate programs tend to not utilize service classes nor provide them, this allows for a self-contained model with little outside influences and makes the iterative process for development easier at first.
- **Update: Discuss the preliminary template with key shareholders and develop it in concert with the actions resulting from the APR process.**

Academic Portfolio Review

Workgroup Members

- Provost and Associate Vice Presidents
- Academic Deans—Colleges and Student Affairs
- Department Chairs/School Directors

Summary of Activity to Date

The goal of this component is to prepare recommendations for degree program enhancement and development.

In March, academic departments and schools submitted niche statements for each degree program. Over the summer, the provost and deans met to review and discuss the niche statements.

Five basic performance indicators were identified for this initial phase of the academic portfolio review:

- 5-Year Degree Program Student Headcount
- 5-Year Degree Program FTE Student Major Count
- 5-Year Degree Program Annual Graduation Count
- 5-Year Enrollment Trends: SCH Production for Degree and Service Courses
- 5-Year SCH Productivity per FTE Faculty Member

Niche Statements responded to three questions, using the data sets as reference points:

- What is the role and function of the department, and its degree programs, within the respective mission of the college and the university?
- What is the set of current curricular conditions that promote sustaining the program? How are degree learning outcomes aligned with and supportive of the University's degree profile learning outcomes?
- What are some of the emerging factors or considerations in the evolution of the discipline, e.g., external factors, that may influence program development (the curriculum and the practice of the curriculum), and that may require attention to ensure growth and sustainability of a degree program?

The deans were asked to submit planning documents that identify three priorities in each of two areas:

- Current degree program development or restructuring
- New degree program development

The provost and deans held a series of meetings in August for in-depth review of these planning documents and to establish provisional priorities in those two areas.

The priorities were finalized and presented to university administration: <http://tinyurl.com/oyl7o67>.

Current Challenges

- TBD based upon analysis of niche statements and follow-up response.

Proposed Next Steps

- Act on deans' planning priorities.