



Minnesota State Colleges & Universities

Functional Assessment of the Office of the Chancellor

Report and Recommendations

Presented by

The Leadership Council Human Resources Committee

Co-Chairs

Colleen Thompson, President
Ridgewater College

William L. Tschida, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Office of the Chancellor

May 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	5
Background	7
Focus of Review	9
Results	12
Discussion	13
Academic and Student Affairs	13
Board of Trustees Support.....	15
Equal Opportunity and Diversity	16
Finance	16
Government Relations.....	17
Human Resources.....	17
Information Technology.....	18
Office of General Counsel.....	19
Public Affairs	19
Recommendations	21
Academic and Student Affairs	22
Board of Trustees Support.....	22
Equal Opportunity and Diversity	22
Government Relations.....	23
Information Technology.....	23
Public Affairs	23
Deputy to the Chancellor.....	23
Bibliography	24

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Work Plan Goal I-5

Appendix B – Functional Assignment Chart

Appendix C – Functional Survey to Presidents

Appendix D – Summary: Description of Functions by Division

Appendix E – Results

Appendix F – Recommendations for Redesign of Administrative Titles

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To meet the goals of the Work Plan for 2001-2002, the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee has conducted an assessment of the structure and work performed by the Minnesota State Colleges and the Universities' Office of the Chancellor.

The Committee's charge was to seek ways to consolidate or reorganize functions to improve services and program delivery, not to cut basic structures or personnel. The Committee sought to examine options that would bring about substantive rather than mere cosmetic change.

Chancellor, Office of the Chancellor and institutional accountability are a basic premise of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities annual Work Plan and proposed strategic plan. Therefore, it is critical for the Office of the Chancellor to address this issue by re-organizing itself—structurally or procedurally—to be more timely and responsive to campus needs.

Beginning in December 2001, executive staff in the Office of the Chancellor were asked to identify the work performed by their division by job function. The Leadership Council Human Resources Committee, including Vice Chancellor Bill Tschida and his staff, reviewed this information in order to begin the process of sorting job functions into two divisions: either the Office of the Chancellor or a Services Division.

The focus of the Committee's review of the Office of the Chancellor was centered on the functions and purpose of work units and divisions rather than on the work performance of individuals. A survey was designed and distributed to the 34 MnSCU presidents in March 2002. Presidents were strongly encouraged to involve their administrative staff in preparing a response to the survey and reassured that comments would remain confidential and would not be identified by campus or president in the final analysis. The survey was only one facet of gathering information. The Leadership Council Human Resources Committee weighed feedback from the survey—the return rate was 91%—and extended discussions with division leaders and their presidential colleagues in developing the recommendations of this report.

The major recommendation is a basic restructuring of the Office of the Chancellor into two components, a governance division that retains the Office of the Chancellor title and a shared services division. Committee discussion focused on the goal of greater accountability (i.e., clients own, pay for and direct the services they receive) and improved effectiveness.

The details on service unit oversight and funding will be addressed in the first six months of the next year with specific recommendations forthcoming in January 2003.

Seventeen additional recommendations, specific to units within the Office of the Chancellor, are made. These recommendations can be found on pages 21-23.

INTRODUCTION

To meet the goals of the Work Plan for 2001-2002, the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee has conducted an assessment of the structure and work performed by the Minnesota State Colleges and the Universities' Office of the Chancellor.

In collaboration with Office of the Chancellor senior staff, the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee examined the functions performed by the Office of the Chancellor to promote understanding of its role in system governance and oversight and to improve service and responsiveness to campus needs. The Committee's charge was to seek ways to consolidate or reorganize functions to improve services and program delivery, not to cut basic structures or personnel. The Committee sought to examine options that would bring about substantive rather than mere cosmetic change.

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities has gone through significant change since James H. McCormick assumed the chancellorship on July 1, 2001. In the course of the Chancellor's travels across Minnesota and his visits with legislators, businesspersons, and campus faculty, staff and administrators, a fairly common sentiment has been that the Office of the Chancellor has become too large to be efficient. The recommendations of this report aim at making the Office of the Chancellor reflect its priority of a central focus on learners with all other functions supporting that core value. As reflected in the first quarterly report on Work Plan progress, one of the major goals of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities is to provide students excellent, affordable higher education opportunities. The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities recognize that teaching and learning dimensions are essential to our ability to adequately serve students and provide the citizens of Minnesota with the flexible, state-of-the-art higher education they have come to expect and deserve. Thus, the Office of the Chancellor should reflect the premiere value of learning in everything it does.

One of the major challenges faced by higher education systems in the United States is the balance between campus autonomy and system office oversight. In consulting with campus presidential leaders in the months prior to his appointment, the Chancellor found a recurring theme to be confusion of roles between the institutions and the system office, and a perceived silo mentality within the Office of the Chancellor itself. Duplication of effort seemed to exist between many Office of the Chancellor and campus functions and services.

A part of the earlier presidential criticism was based on either a perceived lack of responsiveness or slowness in responding, and a tendency toward bureaucratic processes. The Chancellor's statewide visits to campuses, communities, business leaders and legislators appear to have confirmed this perception. Chancellor, Office of the Chancellor and institutional accountability are a basic premise of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities annual Work Plan and proposed strategic plan. Therefore, it is critical for the Office of the Chancellor to address this issue by re-organizing itself—structurally or procedurally—to be more timely and responsive to campus needs. Recent management and organizational literature on the concept of "shared services" very clearly indicates that successful initiatives in efficiency and effectiveness are characterized by a separation of the governance functions, particularly the oversight or regulatory functions of a central administration, from the service functions. If the service or

governance functions are embodied in the same office/individuals, roles and responsibilities become confused and sometimes conflicted.

Beginning in December 2001, executive staff in the Office of the Chancellor were asked to identify the work performed by their division by job function. They were then asked whether the function fell into one of four areas: service, policy development, accountability or advocacy. The Leadership Council Human Resources Committee, comprised of seven college and university presidents, along with Vice Chancellor Bill Tschida, Associate Vice Chancellor Manuel Lopez and Personnel Director Margaret Johnson, reviewed this information in order to begin the process of sorting job functions into two divisions: either the Office of the Chancellor or a Services Division.

A survey was designed and distributed to the 34 MnSCU presidents in March 2002. The survey was only one facet of gathering information. For instance, the System Office Quality Steering (SOQS) Committee report also makes recommendations of relevance to the reorganization process. The survey results were shared with division leaders and presidents serving on all committees of the Leadership Council. Comments and feedback from these discussions were weighed by the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee in developing the recommendations of this report. Reorganization is intended to change reporting lines and some job functions if it leads to improved efficiency and effectiveness. There is clearly no mandate to either downgrade positions or physically relocate employees to a new office location at this time. This report is intended to summarize the review process, the collection of data, and recommend to the Chancellor how certain divisions and/or units should be reorganized for greater effectiveness. Some complex functional areas, which cross divisions may require further in-depth review for change to occur. Issues of funding will be addressed in the next fiscal year when careful attention can be given to the consequences of different models.

BACKGROUND

In today's business environment, change is the norm, not the exception. Increasingly, organizations are cutting back to save money and remain competitive. For several years now there has been a strong tendency to adopt a downsizing strategy to deal with the economic pressures in the environment. First witnessed in the private sector, this approach has now spread to all levels of government and knows no sector or geographic bounds. This phenomenon has taken on a life of its own (Gosselin, 1994). The hidden cost of this strategy is enormous and, more often than not, under-estimated. According to a Wyatt Company survey, 89 percent of organizations that engaged in downsizing reported expense reduction as their primary goal, while only 42 percent actually reduced expenses. In fact, some business analysts think this strategy often nullifies all of the anticipated benefits. Thus, analysts believe this approach is counter-productive. Massive downsizing seems to generate more problems than it solves, and only rarely does it achieve its original financial objectives (Bourque, 1995; Gosselin, 1994).

Large-scale cutbacks can result in a decimated organization where long-term working relationships are severed and people are expected to take on new roles. Employee uncertainty and fear can paralyze operations and lead to a significant decline in trust and motivation, affecting the organization's overall productivity (Ziegler, 1995). John Dorfman, a well-known Boston-based money manager, analyzed the post-layoff performance of a sampling of companies over an 11 to 34 month period. He found an average performance gain by the companies that had announced job cuts at 0.4 percent while the performance for the S&P 500 during the comparable time period was significantly higher—the gain was 29.3 percent. The literature suggests very strongly that the internal turmoil caused by layoffs reduces the performance of everyone involved, from the employees who have to pick up the workload of the laid off employees to the Human Resources staff that has to work with them. Thus, it is argued that downsizing should be a last resort, not a first choice for a skilled chief executive officer.

One of the most effective and immediate alternatives to across-the-board layoffs is restructuring. Often, when job cuts are undertaken in order to pacify the key stakeholders—investors, legislators, trustees—the announcements talk about the cuts as part of a "streamlining" or "restructuring." There are, however, aspects of an organization other than the number of employees that need to be addressed. In the corporate world, restructuring often includes things such as the closing of obsolete plants or branches, administrative overhauls, selling of non-core operations, or improving internal processes. Some of these strategies may have relevance to efforts within the MnSCU system.

How an organization introduces change has a profound impact on its future health. The challenge is to restructure the organization to make it better, to find and fix the problems. The "solution" is not to just cut jobs to look good to the stakeholders—trustees, legislators, and college/university presidents. We need to make changes that will improve the organization. If a job function is not contributing to the organization's success, it should be eliminated or reshaped to meet organizational needs. In a ten-year study of downsizing in 250 life insurance industry companies, researchers at the Harvard Business School found the ultimate differentiation in improving effectiveness was a company's approach to downsizing. The best approach involved a

careful trimming of administrative, managerial, and professional staff alike, combined with reshaping the workforce in a way consistent with a clear strategic vision.

The Committee's deliberations were informed by two earlier studies of the Office of the Chancellor: the Shellito report of January 2000 and the Kerschner study of April 2000.

FOCUS OF REVIEW

The focus of the Committee's review of the Office of the Chancellor was centered on the functions and purpose of work units and divisions rather than on the work performance of individuals. Major divisions under review included Academic and Student Affairs, Finance, Human Resources, Technology, Public Affairs, Government Relations, Equal Opportunity and Diversity, Office of the Board of Trustees and the Office of General Counsel. The charge before the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee was to seek ways to consolidate or reorganize functions within the Office of the Chancellor to improve services and program delivery. Guiding principles established by the Committee at the beginning of the review process reflected the following values:

- A focus on student learning should drive reorganization.
- A system orientation is needed.
- Campus autonomy is valued.
- Reorganization should preserve and create high agility and responsiveness at both system and campus levels.
- Reorganization should reflect clear accountability for services and governance.
- The governance (including policy) and service functions should be separated.

Beginning with a list of job functions provided by each division, administrators were asked to sort the responsibilities by four functional organization codes:

- Services to Campus (S) – Provision of a wide spectrum of quality professional assistance with specific administrative or technical functions/tasks for several campuses of one or more types.
- Policy Development (P) – Formation, implementation and oversight of high-level plans, goals, and/or procedures for the management of the system.
- Accountability (A) – Ensure that MnSCU institutions and Office of the Chancellor will be accountable for achieving statewide higher education objectives, maintaining fiscal integrity and improving student success.
- Advocacy (ADV) – Advocate for and secure resources to enhance educational excellence through the MnSCU system consistent with the needs of students and the State of Minnesota.

While not definitive, this exercise resulted in a summary chart (Appendix B) which helped the Committee identify and separate governance functions of the Office of the Chancellor from the service functions which would be assigned to a new division. To clarify what is meant by Office of the Chancellor and Service Division, keep in mind that Office of the Chancellor is responsible for system wide governance and oversight; Service Division is responsible for providing specific services to campuses and the system.

A Possible Structural Realignment

Many corporations are moving away from separately run operations for different units/plants toward more efficient, customer-focused functions. This approach is referred to as "shared services." Almost half of Fortune 500 companies have some form of shared services, compared to less than 25 percent just three years ago (KPMG Consulting). In a shared service environment, separate operations are pulled together into service centers to serve all corporate units. The critical factor in the **shared service center** is that a commonly used service is provided by a single organizational entity for two or more units. The underlying concept is that units can be combined to deliver highly valued services at a lower cost to internal customers.

The separation of governance and service functions is a key component of a marketplace model of shared services. The separation of governance activities from the delivery of services to clients is what enables the move to an internal marketplace and a profoundly different strategy from what we have seen before (Quinn, Cooke and Kris, 2000). Applying a shared service model to the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities would result in the creation of a separate support organization that "sells" its services to other operating units—Office of the Chancellor, colleges and universities. Such a separate organization would be designed to provide lower costs and one-stop services to all other participating Minnesota State Colleges and Universities institutions. The method of charging out the costs of shared services to users—critical to a focus on cost reduction and a long-term commitment to performance improvement—would require further discussion.

The question of "why?" will undoubtedly be raised. From a "political" perspective, what differentiates shared services leadership from centralized staff leadership are the responses to two key questions—"Whose perceptions and expectations are the leaders most concerned about? Whose needs are most important to meet?"

The concept of a dynamic internal marketplace is the cornerstone of shared services. Everything else about shared services is derived from this basic attribute. The shared service leader looks first to the customer or client, because the customer represents the future success of the enterprise. On the other hand, traditional organizations/bureaucracies look inward and to those—e.g., legislature and Board of Trustees—who provide the resources to the managed function. The motivating forces for core decisions are significantly different. In a centralized bureaucracy, the needs of the organization are met and operating budgets determined by addressing management's perceived needs. By contrast, in a shared service environment, the clients—who are seen as owning, paying for and directing the services they receive (Quinn, Cooke and Kris)—have their needs addressed. With the power of the purse strings in the hands of the operating unit/internal customers, the menu of services offered reflects the clients core needs.

As a result, in the corporate environment, a shared services arrangement is viewed as a key enabler of a quantum leap in reducing operating costs and improving overall performance. Shared service is not a simple consolidation of services; shared services is a customer-focused "independent business" where users are considered customers and the shared service is high quality, cost-effective, and timely.

The Committee brought in Dr. Paul Elsner, Chancellor Emeritus of the Maricopa County Community College Division and recognized leader and consultant in higher education administration, to discuss the assessment and offer suggestions on methods of collecting campus opinion and feedback on the restructuring of the Office of the Chancellor. The resulting Functional Survey (Appendix C) and Summary: Descriptions of Functions by Division (Appendix D) was distributed to campus presidents on March 6, 2002, with instructions to review each function of each division, assign functions to the Office of the Chancellor or to a division dedicated to providing services to campuses, and to include value judgments and comments on functions assigned to the Services Division. Presidents were strongly encouraged to involve their administrative staff in preparing a response to the survey and reassured that comments would remain confidential and would not be identified by campus or president in the final analysis.

RESULTS

Responses to the survey were received from 31 institutions, a 91% return rate. As might be expected, unanimity of placement—governance or service unit—did not result. However, there was agreement of response across many of the functions. For instance 84% felt the planning function belonged with the Office of the Chancellor/governance unit while 89% felt faculty/professional development was a services unit function. As a preliminary tool, we used a 60% categorization rate to assign functions to the proposed governance and service organizations; a 60% or better assignment to governance made a function governance, a 60% or better assignment to service made a function service. This method determined, for instance, that all information technology functions were perceived as being service unit functions.

Those functions which fell below these percentage guidelines were discussed with the senior leaders in the Office of the Chancellor and presidents on the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee [please see Discussion section below]. All functions are now assigned to either a governance or service organization.

The presidents/institutions were also asked to determine the relevance of the items they assigned to the service division; that is, were the functions performing adequately, should they be eliminated or should they be transformed. These results identified functions that required further discussion with the senior leadership in the Office of the Chancellor and the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee.

Several presidents elaborated on their concerns in response to our invitation for open-ended observations, especially as they pertained to functions they thought should be either transformed or eliminated.

DISCUSSION

Extended discussion between the Committee members and the head of each division focused on assigning undecided functions to either the Office of the Chancellor or the Service Division, transformational issues raised by the survey comments, and recurring themes and topics which survey participants identified as needing special attention. Following is an abbreviated account of these discussions by division.

Office of the Chancellor and Services Division

The earlier clarification of the shared services model represents the basic premise for the restructuring of the Office of the Chancellor into two components, a governance division that retains the Office of the Chancellor title and a shared services division. Committee discussion focused on the goal of greater accountability (i.e., clients own, pay for and direct the services they receive) and improved effectiveness. In the absence of details on how the shared services division would be governed and funded, Vice Chancellor Tschida proposed that the first six months of the next year be dedicated to an in-depth exploration of the options. A recommendation would be forthcoming in January 2003.

I. Academic and Student Affairs

- A. The survey did not clearly assign the collaboration/partnership function or the curriculum function (Appendix D, Items IC and 1F) of Academic and Student Affairs to either the Office of the Chancellor or the Service Division. Given the lack of clarity, Senior Vice Chancellor Linda Baer explained more fully the activities performed in the collaboration/partnership and curriculum areas. As a result, the oversight of both functions will be placed in the Office of the Chancellor, while coordination of the functions belongs in the service division.
- B. Several areas of concern arose as transformational issues. The suggestion was made to create an organizational structure within Academic and Student Affairs resembling the Leadership Council which could draw campus leaders into a different relationship with the Senior Vice Chancellor and her associates and improve instructional and student service policies, direction and initiatives. Dr. Baer pointed out that under her leadership, an Academic Advisory Council, which discusses and provides guidance on all academic and student affairs policies, drafts reports and recommendations, and helps establish accountability measures responsive to legislative directives which are referred to the Leadership Council, has been meeting quarterly for several years. The suggestion to create such a group, therefore, would appear to indicate imperfect communication with or a lack of awareness by the commentator.
- C. Another perception was that the Academic and Student Affairs division appears to have too many reporting lines to the Senior Vice Chancellor that make oversight of the division difficult and cumbersome. Currently five associate vice chancellors report to the Senior Vice Chancellor. This resulted in a suggestion to

concentrate the division in two predominant areas: Academic Advancement and Student Services. It was perceived by some presidents that Continuous Improvement, Research and Planning, Academic Resources, Strategic Partnerships, and Grants and Innovations may appropriately reside elsewhere or report differently.

- D. Campuses also expressed the need for a rapid response program or unit which can respond rapidly to implement innovative academic programs, services and collaborative ideas.
- E. The survey results showed that the administration of collaboration and partnerships is an area of serious concern to the presidents and their institutions. Campuses feels they should be able to pursue their own versions of collaboration without unnecessary control and direction from the Office of the Chancellor. This may be one of those areas which requires greater attention to the balance between campus autonomy and system wide oversight in order to nurture rather than stifle the entrepreneurial spirit. Common themes were that positions of oversight in collaborations and partnerships need to be on campuses with strong support from the central office on contractual issues and that articulation agreements are best reached between campuses.
- F. Another transformational issue arising from the survey was curriculum development and the need for a central clearing point that allows for shared information and discussion. It was suggested that for this to occur, the current number and level of staff in the Office of the Chancellor are not necessary. Again, some communication breakdown is apparent. A central clearing point in terms of an ongoing list serve and the availability of consultation services from program approval staff have been in place for some time. The presidential concerns might indicate the need to assess the efficacy of existing processes. Recent action by the Board of Trustees, significantly streamlining the program approval process should address some other concerns.
- G. In a similar fashion, survey responses in the area of customized training indicated a perception of excessive oversight. Committee discussion spoke to intersecting of campus and Office of the Chancellor initiatives in a manner counterproductive to campus efforts. Once again, this perception must be balanced against the need for broad policies, operating procedures and assistance with coordination between regions on strategic training efforts to reside in the Office of the Chancellor in order to achieve system wide initiatives and/or goals. However, each region must be allowed to move forward independently to maintain the entrepreneurial enterprise which characterizes continuing education and customized training. In essence, we have another instance where autonomy and centralization require careful balancing.

- H. In both the campus survey responses and the Leadership Council committee discussions, the existence of the Center for Teaching and Learning, the FIRE/EMS/Safety Center and the International Education units, in their current forms, were questioned. According to the survey results, professional development is valued but sorely lacking for administrators and staff. The Center for Teaching and Learning provides opportunities exclusively for faculty development. The question was raised whether faculty development and its funds should be redirected to the campuses or broadened to include non-teaching staff. Further discussion centered on provisions for faculty development in the bargaining contracts, raising the issue of whether a structure dedicated strictly to faculty development is necessary for or beneficial to the system. Sentiment seemed to favor the view that faculty professional development is a function of the campuses rather than the Office of the Chancellor. The Committee did agree, however, that faculty development is valued differently by two and four year institutions. The function is closely associated with student learning, and therefore, is deserving of more careful attention and study before changes are made.
- I. The research and data management functions of Academic and Student Affairs were identified by the survey as needing transformation. Several ideas were put forth: that the academic and student assessment function work with assessment of the system, student learning, institutional effectiveness, quality initiatives and for strategic and academic planning, that research and coordination of research are critical needs that must be addressed. Additionally, a limited number of respondents argued that only one research unit is needed to serve the needs of the Office of the Chancellor and campuses, that there should be a corresponding research function at each college and university.

II. Board of Trustees Support

- A. Most survey respondents agree that Office of the Board of Trustees is clearly a function belonging to the Office of the Chancellor. Some campuses questioned the need for an Executive Director/Board Secretary position and why it does not report directly to the Chancellor. Campuses were unclear whether the function of the Board office is administrative support or policy development.
- B. In discussing these issues with the Committee, Executive Director Penny Harris Reynen indicated that her position has been reporting to Chancellor McCormick since shortly after his arrival, and that if the Executive Director/Board Secretary position was abolished, the unit would need an additional staff person to carry the workload. The Committee agreed that the function of the Board office is really up to the trustees and the decision to eliminate the director position is not up to campus presidents. The restructuring of the Office of the Board of Trustees has been discussed, in-depth, with the trustee leadership and the Chancellor.

III. Equal Opportunity and Diversity

On both the survey comments and in the Leader Council discussions, campuses questioned the value of a centralized Equal Opportunity and Diversity function. It was made clear that campuses object to student recruitment at the system level and expressed the opinion that Equal Opportunity and Diversity outreach has been largely unrelated to increasing campus enrollment. Equal Opportunity and Diversity is regarded as a legal, policy function of the Office of the Chancellor.

- A. Survey responses indicate that campuses question the value of community outreach and partnerships for diversity being done at the Office of the Chancellor level. After discussions with Associate Vice Chancellor Dolores Fridge, it was clear that Minnesota State Colleges and Universities is establishing its identity within minority communities in the seven-county metropolitan area, and that this function extends to the state and national levels and works cooperatively with the Public Affairs division. Direct retention and recruitment efforts are not a function of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.
- B. The compliance/enforcement function of Equal Opportunity and Diversity was not clearly a function of either the Office of the Chancellor or a Service Division. The Committee noted that various options exist to outsource this function or reassign it to another division. A more careful review of legal compliance requirements would produce greater insight of the Office of the Chancellor role in this function.
- C. Training and investigative service functions are still needed, but should they remain in the Equal Opportunity and Diversity division or be aligned with the Office of General Counsel?

III. Finance

- A. The system wide, consolidated and institutional financial reporting function (Appendix D, Section 4I) of the Finance division was not clearly assigned to the Office of the Chancellor or the Service Division by survey results. After discussion before the Committee, it was decided that a shared service is still a service function. While governance and oversight by the Chief Financial Officer belongs in the Office of the Chancellor, the work of the financial reporting/campus assistance unit belongs in the Service Division.
- B. Some survey comments indicated no need for a loan collections service at the Office of the Chancellor level. Associate Vice Chancellor Rosalie Greeman explained that for several years the Loan Collections unit has been funded entirely by those campuses which value the service and elect to use it. It was suggested that perhaps those who feel it is not needed are not fully informed. Comments from the Leadership Council committees indicated a split between those who wanted the function eliminated and those who want it untouched.

- C. If the Financial Reporting/Campus Assistance function (Appendix D, Item 4-K) is not transformed, should it be eliminated? Discussion with the Committee and Associate Vice Chancellor Greeman indicated that these functions have recently been merged under the leadership of one director. Eventually, campuses will be directly responsible for providing their own standard, consistent and accurate financial statements to the Office of the Chancellor and those campuses which continue to rely on Office of the Chancellor financial staff will be charged.
- D. The question of whether the Capital Budget function (Appendix D, Item 4-M) should apply only to system wide projects was discussed before the Committee by Associate Vice Chancellor Allan Johnson. For bonding purposes, the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities has strength before the legislature as a whole system. Campuses must participate in the collective process for capital budget requests. This remains a function of the Office of the Chancellor.

IV. Government Relations

- A. Survey respondents were unclear whether constituent services; campus and student advocacy functions in Government Relations belong in the Office of the Chancellor or the Service Division. John Ostrem, Deputy to the Chancellor for Legislative Policy and Analysis, explained to the Committee that these functions include assisting all manner of MnSCU constituents with requests involving legislative-related affairs, assisting campuses by advocating on their behalf and assisting them in becoming their own advocate. While the student advocacy function may be regarded as a duplication of effort with Academic and Student Affairs division, the Committee was assured that it depends on the problem and the area of expertise needed to resolve the problem. While all three functions perform a service for the MnSCU System, they are more closely aligned with the Office of the Chancellor than with the Service Division.
- B. A strong recommendation was made to create a Federal Relations manager position in order to improve the presence and effectiveness of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities by developing and implementing an effective federal relations plan in accordance with the Chancellor's Work Plan Goal 3.2. Agreement was expressed that MnSCU is missing out on substantial funding sources because of the lack of presence in federal affairs.

V. Human Resources

- A. Survey respondents were unsure whether retirement plan coordination and labor negotiations, grievance training, and labor relations advice functions of the Human Resource division should be assigned to the Office of the Chancellor or the Service Division. Vice Chancellor Bill Tschida addressed these issues before the Committee. Vice Chancellor Tschida maintained that retirement plan coordination is clearly a service function and that most of labor relations' advice and training is also a service function. The Vice Chancellor considers those who

lead the negotiating teams for unclassified and classified MnSCU collective bargaining agreements as likely to be included in the Office of the Chancellor.

- B. The survey raised concerns about the way in which contract negotiations are handled. The suggestion was made to outsource labor negotiations to provide a stronger bargaining position that is communicated in a timely, service-oriented manner with a team of college representatives advising the negotiator. There is a perception on the campuses that Labor Relations staff lack the incentive to take the hard line with unions in the negotiation process when they must work in collaboration with union representatives to resolve grievances and other campus labor issues. For some, communications regarding contract negotiations and labor agreement interpretation are inconsistent, incomplete and untimely.
- C. A question of why the Human Resources division is divided into two units, personnel and labor relations, was raised in the open-ended comments. Vice Chancellor Tschida responded that historically the two units were separated under two vice chancellors. After the MnSCU merger, the two departments were merged under one vice chancellor. Combining the two units would probably not result in any greater efficiency or cost saving and might lead to lessened effectiveness.
- D. Survey comments suggested that more autonomy be given to campus human resource offices for job classification decisions. Vice Chancellor Tschida explained that under state statute the Department of Employee Relations delegates the authority for determining classification issues to the MnSCU staffing unit. How much authority is delegated at the campus level is subject to statute and whether the campus has requested expanded authority and received appropriate training.

VI. Information Technology

At the present time, the Technology division is conducting its own IT Customer Satisfaction Survey which is intended to assess the effectiveness of its services and products. Most survey respondents agree, aside from the leadership and policy function, that Technology belongs in the Service Division and needs to be a strong, centralized function in order to maintain system and data integrity. The survey indicated that transformation is needed in the areas of software development, network services, and management information.

- A. Technology is one area that must be adequately funded to keep pace with improvement needs and rapid change. System wide volume purchasing is valued, but there is a need for significant, continued improvement in the functionality of core systems and the ability to get accurate, reliable data.

- B. Instructional technology should remain primarily a campus responsibility, but system wide coordination, development of system wide standards, and aggregated demand purchases are a valued centralized role. Movement towards a single instructional management system should be encouraged.
- C. The Minnesota Satellite and Technology (MnSAT), an area of presidential concern or lack of knowledge, should be entirely self-supporting within the next few years. Future consideration should be given to whether or not it belongs in the Office of the Chancellor or even to the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

VII. Office of General Counsel

- A. Survey responses indicate misunderstanding of where the Legal Services function (Appendix D, Item 8-A) and the Litigation function (Appendix D, Item 8-C) belong. Following discussion with the Committee, it was determined that campuses are not fully aware of how authority is delegated to the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Office of the Chancellor by the Office of the Attorney General and how these two functions are served at the system level. A legal affairs institute being planned for the summer of 2002 for campus presidents which will help distinguish levels of authority and services which may appear duplicative.
- B. As a governance function, the position of the General Counsel will most likely report directly to the Chancellor and legal support staff will likely remain in the Office of the Chancellor.

VIII. Public Affairs

Special events planning, marketing and development are key areas of Public Affairs that came before the Committee for discussion. Linda Kohl, Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs, addressed concerns in these three areas of her division based on survey comments that strongly suggested that these functions should be transformed or eliminated.

- A. Most controversial is the development function of Public Affairs. Campuses feel strongly that development and fundraising should be done at the campus level and that the system would be better served if positions which support that function in the Office of the Chancellor were a stand alone entity working closely with campus foundation officers. Campus leaders indicated that development at the Office of the Chancellor level should shift away from funding scholarships and focus on supporting college projects, programs and even endowed chairs or faculty positions that would otherwise go unfunded.

- B. Similarly, campuses expressed a strong view that marketing should be a campus function which seems to reflect the idea that if the Office of the Chancellor is not marketing *my* campus, it is not needed. Linda Kohl explained the number of requests made to the Office of the Chancellor for general information. Her division does not market individual colleges but publishes the Go Places reference guide as well as other informational materials that are shared with the campuses.
- C. The two major events planned by the Office of the Chancellor are the MnSCU booth at the Minnesota State Fair and the Friends of MnSCU dinner. The good will and visibility gained from these events is justified and fully supported by the Chancellor. Committee members agreed that marketing efforts that benefit the system as a whole are the function of the Office of the Chancellor. Accordingly, Public Affairs should spend less time recruiting and more time on informing the public of the value of MnSCU as a post-secondary system. Linda Kohl pointed out that neither the State Fair nor the Friends of MnSCU events are held expressly for the purpose of recruiting students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Office of the Chancellor have been generated by a number of different methods and sources. Campus presidents and Office of the Chancellor administrators represented on the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee have been deeply committed to gathering honest and open feedback and bringing the best suggestions forward. At each level of assessment, Committee members and incumbent administrators were respectful and thoughtful in weighing facts against perceptions and campus needs against the need for system wide governance. Recommendations, which addressed the perceived top-heaviness and inefficiency of the system office, were not unanimously welcome. It follows that those recommendations which best serve to improve the effectiveness of the Office of the Chancellor do not necessarily satisfy all interested parties.

As expected, there has been a wide divergence of opinion. The Committee has struggled with the charge to restructure the Office of the Chancellor in the absence of a completed strategic plan. The following recommendations have not been reached with one voice. However, members of Leadership Council Human Resources Committee agree that it is possible to expect that greater efficiency will be achieved in the Office of the Chancellor if oversight is maintained within the bounds of statutory and fiduciary obligation while increased delegation of authority and autonomy is granted to the campuses for program innovation and implementation. The separation of the Office of the Chancellor into two divisions is considered a major step in this direction.

With this in mind, the Leadership Council Human Resources Committee offers the following recommendations:

Office of the Chancellor

1. Separate the administrative/governance function and the services function of the Office of the Chancellor into two divisions, making a shared services division directly responsive to campus needs.
2. Study and prepare a report by January 2003 recommending an operational model for funding and oversight of a campus services division.
3. Revise the Office of the Chancellor administrative titles in accordance with the recommendations outlined in Appendix F, Redesign of Administrative Titles.

Academic and Student Affairs

1. Restructure the leadership of Academic and Student Affairs to enable the Senior Vice Chancellor to function primarily at the strategic level.
2. Eliminate the position of System Director for International Education to coincide with the closure of the Akita program. The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities continues to recognize and support international and global education within the campus context.
3. Create a rapid response team (without creating new positions) to implement collaborative ideas and programs. Whenever possible, transfer innovative programs to campus authority as soon as they are functioning.
4. Centralize staff and administrative professional development activities under one coordinator in the Office of the Chancellor.
5. Convene focus groups of presidents, chief academic officers, faculty, students and Center for Teaching and Learning coordinators to recommend ways of delegating the coordination and delivery of faculty development programs and resources to the campuses by fall semester 2003.

Board of Trustees Support

1. Eliminate the Executive Director/Board Secretary title/position.
2. Clarify the administrative support function of this unit and conduct a position audit to determine accurate staffing needs.

Equal Opportunity and Diversity

1. Conduct a careful review of the state and federal compliance/enforcement function required of this office in conjunction with a position audit to determine whether alternate methods of delivery would result in greater efficiency.

Government Relations

1. Create a two-year appointment in Government Relations responsible for representing campus and system wide interests at the federal level, including increased resources for international education. If possible, reallocate an existing position within the Office of the Chancellor to fill this position.

Information Technology

1. Increase funding and positions to improve customer service and responsiveness of the current information technology systems. This is considered a critical need which directly affects students, campuses and the system as a whole.
2. Develop and implement a plan for making Minnesota Satellite and Technology (MnSAT) entirely self-sustaining by the end of Fiscal Year 2004. This will include having an exit strategy in place for abolishing or transferring the function out of the Office of the Chancellor by July 2005.

Public Affairs

1. Redirect the focus of the development director position to become an executive director whose primary responsibility will be raising funds for the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities and the Northstar Foundation from funding sources that are not available to the campuses.
2. Discontinue or significantly reduce technical assistance and training provided by the Office of the Chancellor to college and university development offices.

Deputy to the Chancellor

1. Simplify the reporting lines to the Chancellor. The following direct reports to the Chancellor will be retitled and will report to the Chancellor through the Deputy position.
 - Government Relations
 - Public Affairs
 - Equal Opportunity and Diversity
 - Continuous Improvement
 - Board of Trustees Support

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bourque, Jean-Jacques. 1995. "Le syndrome du survivant dans les organisations." Gestion, 20 (September): 114-118.

Dorfman, John. nd. "Job Cuts Often Fail to Bolster Stocks" available at <http://www.afgen.com/layoffs3.html>

Gosselin, Alain. 1994. "*La face caché des rationalisations d'effectifs.*" INFO Ressources Humaines (February/March): 7-8.

Quinn, Barbara, Andrew Kris, Robert S. Cooke, 2000. Shared Services: Mining for Corporate Gold. Prentice Hall, Financial Times.

Ziegler, Rod. 1995. "In Downsizing We Don't Always Trust." *Edmonton Journal*, 27 May, sec C3.

APPENDIX A

WORK PLAN GOAL I-5

GOAL I-5

Assess institutional and Office of the Chancellor roles and make adjustments as necessary to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

- Products:**
- An assessment of the MnSCU Office of the Chancellor's role and scope, including alternative models for the delivery and cost assessment of services to the campuses.
 - An assessment of MnSCU as a statewide or regionalized operating system, including an examination of differing and/or distinctive institutional missions.
 - An Office of the Chancellor budget reflecting MnSCU System principles and priorities.

- Timeline:**
- Charge a System-level Quality Steering Committee (comprised of representatives of all constituent groups) in October 2001 with an assessment of the System's organization and configuration to be completed by May 2002.
 - Charge an Office of the Chancellor Organizational Assessment Task Force comprised of Leadership Council, the System Office Quality Steering Committee (SOQS) and select campus administrators, in October 2001 with assessing the current and future role and scope of the Office of the Chancellor by March 2002. This work will build on previous studies (e.g. the System Office Study Task Force of January 2000), suggestions presented in compiling this work plan and testimony to the Citizens' Advisory Commission.
 - Review the MnSCU Office of the Chancellor budget for FY03 by April 2002.
 - Present Chancellor's recommendations on System and Office of the Chancellor organization and processes to the Board of Trustees, April 2002.

- WHO:**
- Bill Tschida
 - Manuel López
 - Margaret Johnson
 - Laura King

APPENDIX B

FUNCTIONAL ASSIGNMENT CHART

Office of the Chancellor		Services Division	
ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS			
Collaboration/Partnerships Function		Initiatives and Service Function	
Curriculum Function		Data Management Function	
Leadership and Policy Function		Faculty/Professional Development Function	
Labor Negotiations Function		Federal/State Funded Programs Function	
Budget Function		Customized Training Function	
Planning Function		Research and Analysis Function	
BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUPPORT			
All functions			
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY			
Compliance Enforcement Function		Community Outreach and Partnerships Function	
Leadership/Policy Development Function		Education and Training Function	
FINANCE DIVISION			
Leadership and Policy Function		Chief Financial and Facilities Officers/Campus Assistance Function	
Board Fiduciary Function		Reporting and Analysis Function	
Administration Function		Systemwide Financial Reporting Function	
Biennial Operating Budget Development and Support Function		Financial Reporting/Campus Assistance Function	
System Operating Budget and Allocations Function		Loan Collection Services Function	
Labor Negotiations Support Function		Facilities Management/Campus Assistance Function	
Capital Budget Function		Office Services Function	
Policy and Standards and Operating Strategies Function		Systemwide, Consolidated, and Institutional Level Financial Information Function	
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS DIVISION			
Constituent Services Function		Development Function	
Campus Advocacy Function			
Student Advocacy Function			
Legislative Advocacy Function			
Bill Drafting and Tracking Function			
Policy Drafting Function			
Research Function			
Legislative Hearing Management Function			
Special Events Function			
Federal Advocacy Function			
HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION			
Office of the Chancellor Personnel Function		Classification Function	
Labor Relations/Negotiations Function		Compensation Function	
Legislation Function		Research and Data Analysis Function	
Personnel Plan for MnSCU Administrators		Retirement Plan Coordination Function	
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION			
		All functions	
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL			
Legal Services Function		Training Function	
Litigation Function			
PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION			
Policy Function		Research Function	
Media Relations Function		Public Information Function	
Speech Writing Function		Special Events Function	
		Marketing Function	
		Development Function	

APPENDIX C

FUNCTIONAL SURVEY TO PRESIDENTS

FUNCTIONAL SURVEY

March 2002

		Indicate whether this function belongs in the Office of the Chancellor or in a Services Division.		For those functions identified in a Services Division, indicate your value preference.		
		Office of the Chancellor ✓	Services Division ✓	Do Not Need ✓	Must Have ✓	Needs To Be Transformed ✓
1. ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION						
1A	Leadership and Policy Function					
1B	Initiatives and Service Function					
1C	Collaboration/Partnerships Function					
1D	Labor Negotiations Function					
1E	Budget Function					
1F	Curriculum Function					
1G	Data Management Function					
1H	Faculty and Professional Development Function					
1I	Federal/State Funded Programs Function					
1J	Customized Training Function					
1K	Research and Analysis Function					
1L	Planning Function					
2. BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUPPORT DIVISION						
2A	Communications Function					
2B	Board Meetings Function					
2C	Record Management Function					
2D	Research Function					
2E	Special Events Function					
2F	Budget Function					
2G	Collaboration and Partnerships Function					
2H	Policies and Procedures Function					
3. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY DIVISION						
3A	Community Outreach and Partnerships Function					
3B	Compliance Enforcement Function					
3C	Education and Training Function					
3D	Leadership/Policy Development Function					

FUNCTIONAL SURVEY

March 2002

		Indicate whether this function belongs in the Office of the Chancellor or in a Services Division.		For those functions identified in a Services Division, indicate your value preference.		
		Office of the Chancellor ✓	Services Division ✓	Do Not Need ✓	Must Have ✓	Needs To Be Transformed ✓
4. FINANCE DIVISION						
4A	Leadership and Policy Function					
4B	Board Fiduciary Function					
4C	Administration Function					
4D	Chief Financial and Facilities Officers/Campus Assistance Function					
4E	Biennial Operating Budget Development and Support Function					
4F	System Operating Budget and Allocations Function					
4G	Labor Negotiations Support Function					
4H	Reporting and Analysis Function					
4I	Systemwide, Consolidated, and Institutional Level Financial Information Function					
4J	Systemwide Financial Reporting Function					
4K	Financial Reporting/Campus Assistance Function					
4L	Loan Collection Services Function					
4M	Capital Budget Function					
4N	Policy and Standards and Operating Strategies Function					
4O	Facilities Management/Campus Assistance Function					
4P	Office Services Function					
5. GOVERNMENT RELATIONS DIVISION						
5A	Legislative Advocacy Function					
5B	Constituent Services Function					
5C	Bill Drafting and Tracking Function					
5D	Campus Advocacy Function					
5E	Development Function					
5F	Policy Drafting Function					
5G	Student Advocacy Function					
5H	Research Function					
5I	Legislative Hearing Management Function					
5J	Special Events Function					
5K	Federal Advocacy Function					

FUNCTIONAL SURVEY

March 2002

		Indicate whether this function belongs in the Office of the Chancellor or in a Services Division.		For those functions identified in a Services Division, indicate your value preference.		
		Office of the Chancellor ✓	Services Division ✓	Do Not Need ✓	Must Have ✓	Needs To Be Transformed ✓
6. HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION						
6A	Classification Function					
6B	Compensation Function					
6C	Retirement Plan Coordination Function					
6D	Research and Data Analysis Function					
6E	Labor Relations/Negotiations Function					
6F	Office of the Chancellor Personnel Function					
6G	Legislation Function					
6H	Personnel Plan for MnSCU Administrators Function					
7. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION						
7A	Infrastructure Function					
7B	Software Development Function					
7C	Network Services Function					
7D	Security and Administration Function					
7E	Management Information Function					
7F	Instructional Technology Function					
7G	Satellite Technology Function					
8. OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL						
8A	Legal Services Function					
8B	Training Function					
8C	Litigation Function					
9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION						
9A	Policy Function					
9B	Media Relations Function					
9C	Speech Writing Function					
9D	Research Function					
9E	Public Information Function					
9F	Special Events Function					
9G	Marketing Function					
9H	Development Function					

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY: DESCRIPTION OF FUNCTIONS BY DIVISION

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

1. ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION		
1A	Leadership and Policy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads the academic and student service mission of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities that includes the research, development, advocacy and accountability of all academic and student affairs policies and procedures for the system Serve as primary liaison to internal and external stakeholders, i.e. State Legislature, University of Minnesota, Private Colleges/Universities, national higher education associations and accreditation organizations
1B	Initiatives and Service Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult with MnSCU Colleges and Universities and other higher education stakeholders Facilitate the development of specific initiatives administered at the campus level to better serve Minnesota students and citizens, i.e. leveraged equipment, faculty development Provide services that support in strategic areas, i.e. research, planning, academic programs/resources, coordinating activities, establishing, partnerships, student services and accountability
1C	Collaboration/Partnerships Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinates the development of strategic system and/or select clustered collaborations or partnerships to carry out the primary missions of 34 unique colleges and universities working with internal and external stakeholders
1D	Labor Negotiations Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides primary support to the Office of the Chancellor Labor Relations Division and the negotiations process Provides the primary policy direction that informs the substantive content in the collective bargaining agreement
1E	Budget Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops the primary academic strategy that supports the legislative budget strategy for MnSCU working in collaboration and consultation with MnSCU colleges and universities and other Office of the Chancellor divisions
1F	Curriculum Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manages the process for the approval of awards offered at MnSCU Colleges and Universities Works in collaboration with campuses to identify new and emerging curricular opportunities to better serve students including identifying new funding sources to support faculty in the research and development of curriculum
1G	Data Management Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manages the research, entry, compilation, coordination and integrity of data to support the teaching learning mission of MnSCU Colleges and Universities
1H	Faculty and Professional Development Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes and supports collaborative professional development for all MnSCU faculty in order to improve student learning through enhanced teaching effectiveness
1I	Federal/State Funded Programs Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serves as the funding agent for the State Of Minnesota for a major collaborative federal grant program working closely with the Department of Children, Families and Learning

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION		
1J	Customized Training Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinates and facilitates the Customized Training Network, a strategy MnSCU institutions use to market, coordinate, and deliver industry-specific training and education and related services to the state's incumbent workforce at the request of employers, focusing primarily on firms and organizations from targeted customer groups with the greatest economic impact in each region of the state
1K	Research and Analysis Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generates data for a wide variety of internal and external customers, including the Board of Trustees, legislature, campuses, media, federal government and other Office of the Chancellor Units
1L	Planning Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manages the strategic planning processes and general planning to support the implementation of the system's mission including the MnSCU Board of Trustees policies/procedures, the Office of the Chancellor's Academic and Student Affairs Division and other Office of the Chancellor divisions, and MnSCU Colleges and Universities as requested or required

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

2. BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUPPORT DIVISION		
2A	Communications Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute all correspondence to trustees • Manage master planning for board materials, initiate agendas, set deadlines for submission of materials, print and distribute board packets • Write and distribute board meeting summaries
2B	Board Meetings Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice meetings • Prepare all print materials • Handle all logistics for board meetings at the World Trade Center and other locations • Coordinate all out of state travel for trustees and connections with national higher education organizations • Develop and implement orientation sessions for trustees • Staff all meetings and record either in writing or on tape all discussion and actions taken
2C	Record Management Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee permanent record of board and committee meetings • Maintain board calendar • Maintain attendance and human resource records for current and past board members • Oversee permanent collection of audio recordings and packets of meetings • Archive permanent records as necessary
2D	Research Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and provide reports on matters related to board policies and procedures • Investigate and compose communications • Manage and ensure the integrity of the database information • Prepare consultant contracts
2E	Special Events Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan all special events hosted by the Board • Work with other divisions on the details pertaining to external groups associated with MnSCU • Coordinate trustee attendance at commencements and campus visits
2F	Budget Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and administer the Board of Trustees' budget for board operations • Prepare quarterly reports • Monitor and verify trustee expenses • Reconcile cost-centers for year-end financial reports
2G	Collaboration and Partnerships Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with external agencies to fill all requests and to respond to all inquiries • Work with senior staff on special assignments required of the Board • Schedule all meetings with trustees and staff meetings upon request • Serve on Leadership Council and senior staff • Support the Board and Chancellor by serving as a liaison to external constituencies
2H	Policies and Procedures Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor compliance with state statutes • Interpret open meeting law and notice meetings as required by law • Serve as a liaison with MnSCU counsel on matters affecting and deriving from policies

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

3. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY DIVISION		
3A	Community Outreach and Partnerships Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops networks and partnerships with Minnesota community organizations, companies, K-12 and private colleges • Represents MnSCU to state, local and national higher education organizations that collaborate with targeted student, faculty and administrative populations • Markets MnSCU institutions at local, state and national conferences, job fairs, community celebrations, High School Counselor Association, etc. • Manages the 3M MECA program and works collaboratively with them to expand it to other Minnesota Corporations • Allows extensive local and national networking on partnerships on behalf of all MnSCU institutions, and assists in creating an image that we are the educator of choice and acknowledge and support the needs of all communities, as well as new immigrants and under-served, under-represented persons
3B	Compliance Enforcement Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the full scope of investigation, compliance, enforcement and consultative services to the campuses to insure that all state, federal, local and Board policies are adhered to
3C	Education and Training Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends, develops, and delivers training and seminars in the areas of equal opportunity, Affirmative Action Plan Development and implementation, discrimination/harassment, investigations/decisionmaking, sexual violence/assault, Campus Security Act, Title IV, VI and IX, diversity and workplace violence, as well as other issue-specific training programs as requested • Provides system level support to the campuses in collaboration with the Attorney General's Office and the Department of Employee Relations
3D	Leadership/Policy Development Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides recommendations to revise or recommend additional policies that insure compliance with all state, federal, local and Board laws and regulations • Provides leadership in the creation of an equitable, diverse, respectful environment on our campuses and in the Office of the Chancellor • Works with the Chancellor, presidents, Board of Trustees, vice chancellors, and external stakeholders to fulfill MnSCU's EOD goals and objectives • Assist in developing Recruitment and Retention and Cultural Diversity Plans. Act as a resource for best practices in related areas.

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

4. FINANCE DIVISION		
4A	Leadership and Policy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct, manage, and provide policy guidance and oversight of financial and facilities management activities relating to the programs and operations of MnSCU • Strengthen financial and facilities information of MnSCU • Develop, recommend, and implement operating and capital budgets • Design, develop, recommend, and implement reliable financial information systems and reporting procedures • Contribute to the development of policy and legislation, participate in the legislative lobbying process, serve as financial and facilities management issues liaison to legislative committees, respond to legislative initiatives • Develop, administer, and interpret finance and facilities procedures, policies, statutes, and laws in such areas as financial management, purchasing and contract management, facilities management, real estate management, delegation of authority, and travel management • Serve as liaison to local, state, and national finance and facilities organizations and associations
4B	Board Fiduciary Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Board Finance/Facilities Policy Committee • Consult with the Board on key initiatives • Design, participate and implement Board of Trustees planning activities • Conduct orientation sessions with new Board of Trustee members
4C	Administration Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze data for strategic planning purposes; develop materials to support strategic planning • Conduct special projects and research on behalf of the system to address major policy questions • Support collaboration among and within higher education institutions • Promote and represent the interests of MnSCU and Minnesota with various constituent groups • Staff ad hoc contractually mandated committees/task forces, ad hoc legislatively mandated committees/task forces (e.g., State Use Task Force, State Travel Office Study Group), ad hoc system committees/task forces (e.g., Akita Work Group)
4D	Chief Financial and Facilities Officers/Campus Assistance Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct workshops on policies, procedures, and processes • Conduct orientation sessions for new Presidents and Chief Financial and Facilities Officers • Provide assistance and information, develop and update forms and instruction manuals and guidelines • Provide systemwide consultation processes and communications mechanisms • Provide assistance to campus CFFOs for compliance with state statutes, Board policies, and System procedures and provide interpretations of policy as requested • Provide professional development opportunities for CFFOs • Oversee a variety of RFPs related to systemwide initiatives (e.g., planning, construction) • Maintain and support Finance Division web page

FINANCE DIVISION		
4E	Biennial Operating Budget Development and Support Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate development of operating budget requests • Prepare fiscal notes for proposed legislation
4F	System Operating Budget and Allocations Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a new allocation methodology • Prepare and distribute systemwide allocations • Prepare and present to the Board yearly tuition and fees rates • Report actual and projected FYE enrollment • Oversee Office of the Chancellor budget development and monitoring
4G	Labor Negotiations Support Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare financial forecast of collective bargaining proposals and final settlements
4H	Reporting and Analysis Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present annual instructional cost study • Prepare required and requested financial reports and analysis • Establish financial resource indicator reporting
4I	Systemwide, Consolidated, and Institutional Level Financial Information Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement chart of accounts • Develop reliability practices to ensure data accuracy and consistency • Facilitate systems administration identification and development of specifications and documentation and training on systems and business processes
4J	Systemwide Financial Reporting Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare financial statements and audits • Assure tax compliance • Assure State and federal reporting • Monitor and provide assistance to the Revenue Fund
4K	Financial Reporting/Campus Assistance Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide assistance in areas such as financial reporting, bank reconciliations, accounts receivable, MAPS, payroll, and on-campus help (one time and short term)
4L	Loan Collection Services Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide loan collection services
4M	Capital Budget Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate development of capital budget requests • Provide long-term capital budget planning • Capital budget; long- and short-term facilities planning
4N	Policy and Standards and Operating Strategies Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide systemwide facilities planning through implementation of policies and procedures, master plan standards, academic coordination, and campus level specific plans • Develop and implement space utilization standards • Prepare and present various reports to the Board • Manage statewide facilities repair and construction program; report status to Board • Develop and implement facilities design and construction standards • Develop, implement, monitor, and report on facilities utilization strategies/outcomes • Develop, implement, monitor, and report on facilities maintenance/repair strategies/outcomes

FINANCE DIVISION		
4O	Facilities Management/Campus Assistance Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master planning oversight • Utilization monitoring • Construction and major repair execution, monitoring, and reporting • Oversee statewide management of Revenue Fund, monitor and report, recommend annual budgets and rates • Project management • Assist in all phases of real estate activities; report to Board on sales and acquisitions • Assist with risk management
4P	Office Services Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US, inter-office, and inter-agency mail, bank deposits, office supplies, motor pool and MnSCU fleet cars • Reception services, scheduling and maintaining conference rooms, master calendar • Security, telephone service, copiers and fax machines, employee parking • Furniture purchases and office moves

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

5. GOVERNMENT RELATIONS DIVISION		
5A	Legislative Advocacy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet with legislators in order to promote the MnSCU legislative agenda Assisting legislators with support for a wide variety of interests
5B	Constituent Services Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist and problem solve with members of the MnSCU community or the public at their request involving legislative-related matters
5C	Bill Drafting and Tracking Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide all MnSCU constituencies with up-to-date information on legislative activities
5D	Campus Advocacy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support campus needs and requests that normally have a core in the legislative process
5E	Development Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sponsoring and undertake programs designed to give Board members, MnSCU staff and presidents the tools they need to be effective advocates for MnSCU and system positions on a wide variety of politically-related functions
5F	Policy Drafting Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compose board policy language and amendments for the Government Relations Division and others on request
5G	Student Advocacy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support MnSCU student groups and assist on request with various legislative positions and priorities
5H	Research Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to inquiries designed to support either Government Relations or other Office of the Chancellor or System questions
5I	Legislative Hearing Management Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare testimony for presentation at legislative hearings Prepare materials for distribution at hearings and post-hearing de-briefing of hearing participants
5J	Special Events Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversee events such as the Friends of MnSCU Dinner, participation in campus and Office of the Chancellor events in collaboration with Public Affairs or other MnSCU divisions
5K	Federal Advocacy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit with the Minnesota Congressional delegation in order to promote a wide range of federally-related positions that may support the MnSCU mission

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

6. HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION		
6A	Classification Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and approve classification decisions and handle exams for MnSCU's classified staff Make classification and range assignment decisions for unclassified staff
6B	Compensation Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve hiring or salary decisions outside normal parameters for classified staff Develop and implement a comprehensive compensation program for unclassified staff including administrators and presidents
6C	Retirement Plan Coordination Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design the retirement plans unique to MnSCU, supervise the third party administrative services provider, coordinate with the Defined Benefit Plans, monitor and propose retirement related legislation, and provide sufficient opportunities for communication and input from staff including the advisory committees
6D	Research and Data Analysis Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides regular and ad hoc reports Work on data integrity issues and coordinate with other research staff in MnSCU
6E	Labor Relations/Negotiations Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiates collective bargaining agreements for the three (3) faculty bargaining units Represents MnSCU on statewide contract negotiation teams Represents MnSCU on unit determination issues and arbitrations Provides contract training to the campuses and grievance administration Advises and consults with the campuses on contract issues Provides training on discipline, grievance processes and adherence to other issues that effect supervisory actions
6F	Office of the Chancellor Personnel Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions similarly to a campus Human Resources Office Leadership is provided to executive management and employees in the areas of staffing, job classification, compensation and benefits administration, recruitment and selection, performance management, labor relations, records retention and personnel/payroll transactions Works closely with the Chancellor and senior staff to accomplish goals and projects which affect the overall morale and climate of the Office of the Chancellor
6G	Legislation Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare a legislative agenda in the areas of retirement, labor relations, and miscellaneous personnel issues such as employment contracts for presidents Draft proposed legislation, meet with legislators on an individual basis, and testify before legislative committees Monitor other legislation, which impacts MnSCU Human Resources, and prepare responses
6H	Personnel Plan for MnSCU Administrators Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct a process for reviewing and making modifications to the Personnel Plan Secure approval from the MnSCU Board of Trustees and legislature for the Plan

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

7. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION		
7A	Infrastructure Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operates the four Regional Data Centers, which run computer hardware and software providing core administrative services to all of MnSCU
7B	Software Development Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides ISRS and other system application design and development services for MnSCU campuses, including user group support, project management, database management, and business and project economic analysis
7C	Network Services Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides Local Area Network support to the ETC and WTC buildings. Assist campuses through the User Help Desk, ISRS user training, and technical writing and documentation of MnSCU systems and procedures for their operation and use
7D	Security and Administration Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides MnSCU system-wide information security oversight and policy development Provides internal administration for ITS, such as budget, human resources and planning; and other system-wide focused activities, such as telecommunications consulting, disaster recovery and business resumption planning, and IT strategic planning
7E	Management Information Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Builds and maintains the MnSCU Data Warehouse, a repository of replicated and summary data which is used by campus and Office of the Chancellor staff for management reporting and planning purposes Assists campus staff in developing custom reports and provides technical support for the development of a number of required federal and state reports, as well as working to improve data integrity within the database systems
7F	Instructional Technology Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides leadership and works collaboratively with Academic and Student Affairs division and campus staff to develop and promote the use of technology to enhance the teaching and learning process Negotiates and manages system-wide software contracts to assist campuses in controlling costs and maximizing the utility of these packages Manage and operate Instructional Management Systems utilized by a number of campuses
7G	Satellite Technology Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manages and operates the MnSAT digital satellite network, which has receiving dishes at all MnSCU institutions, and a number of other statewide sites Provides video services to a number of outside customers, including the Minnesota Legislature (a major customer) Provide video production services and coordinate and manage video conferencing activities for the Office of the Chancellor

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

8. OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL DIVISION		
8A	Legal Services Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides oversight and coordination for MnSCU legal services• Provides legal services to Board of Trustees, Chancellor's Office and other Office of the Chancellor personnel• Provides advice and assistance with contracts, real estate transactions and other legal matters• Negotiates with Attorney General's Office for outside legal counsel
8B	Training Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides systemwide training for decisionmakers and investigators
8C	Litigation Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Handles all litigation for the Office of the Chancellor and MnSCU system

SUMMARY

Descriptions of Functions by Division

9. PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION		
9A	Policy Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in policy discussions and provide advice to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees and senior staff about legislative matters • Advise the Chancellor, key staff and Board of Trustees of policy options • Provide coaching and technical assistance to the Board, the Office of the Chancellor and individual campuses in media relations, public relations, crisis communications, development and advancement
9B	Media Relations Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to media inquiries • Issue news releases about the system and board actions • Cultivate relationships with reporters who cover Minnesota State Colleges and Universities • Monitor news coverage of the system • Compile news coverage of the system • Distribute copies daily to Office of the Chancellor staff and weekly to campuses
9C	Speech Writing Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare speeches and talking points for the Chancellor and Board of Trustees
9D	Research Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct market research for the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
9E	Public Information Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, maintain and update the system's public Web site
9F	Special Events Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrange and conduct special events to advance the system, such as Chancellor campus visits, news conferences, the State Fair booth, the National College Fair, the high school counselor's spring conference and others
9G	Marketing Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement marketing plans and campaigns to advance the system
9H	Development Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist the Northstar Foundation • Provide oversight for campus foundations on behalf of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees

APPENDIX E

RESULTS

Functional survey: Presidential responses as of 3/25/02		Office of the Chancellor	Percentage	Services Division	Percentage	Do Not Need	Percentage	Must Have	Percentage	Needs To Be Transformed	Percentage	Did Not Mark	Percentage
1 ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION													
1A	Leadership and Policy Function	31	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	19.4%	0	0.0%	25	80.6%
1B	Initiatives and Service Function	13	40.6%	19	59.4%	4	12.5%	8	25.0%	9	28.1%	11	34.4%
1C	Collaboration/Partnerships Function	16	51.6%	15	48.4%	3	9.7%	2	6.5%	12	38.7%	14	45.2%
1D	Labor Negotiations Function	20	66.7%	10	33.3%	2	6.7%	10	33.3%	5	16.7%	13	43.3%
1E	Budget Function	23	74.2%	8	25.8%	1	3.2%	6	19.4%	3	9.7%	21	67.7%
1F	Curriculum Function	14	45.2%	17	54.8%	2	6.5%	9	29.0%	14	45.2%	6	19.4%
1G	Data Management Function	9	29.0%	22	71.0%	0	0.0%	14	45.2%	8	25.8%	9	29.0%
1H	Faculty and Professional Development Function	3	10.7%	25	89.3%	11	39.3%	8	28.6%	12	42.9%		
1I	Federal/State Funded Programs Function	11	35.5%	20	64.5%	0	0.0%	12	38.7%	8	25.8%	11	35.5%
1J	Customized Training Function	4	13.8%	25	86.2%	8	27.6%	8	27.6%	11	37.9%	2	6.9%
1K	Research and Analysis Function	11	35.5%	20	64.5%	0	0.0%	14	45.2%	9	29.0%	8	25.8%
1L	Planning Function	27	84.4%	5	15.6%	1	3.1%	4	12.5%	8	25.0%	19	59.4%
2 BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUPPORT DIVISION													
2A	Communications Function	30	96.8%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	5	16.1%	0	0.0%	26	83.9%
2B	Board Meetings Function	28	90.3%	3	9.7%	0	0.0%	6	19.4%	0	0.0%	25	80.6%
2C	Record Management Function	24	77.4%	7	22.6%	0	0.0%	8	25.8%	1	3.2%	22	71.0%
2D	Research Function	21	67.7%	10	32.3%	3	9.7%	9	29.0%	0	0.0%	19	61.3%
2E	Special Events Function	23	74.2%	8	25.8%	2	6.5%	6	19.4%	1	3.2%	22	71.0%
2F	Budget Function	27	87.1%	4	12.9%	0	0.0%	6	19.4%	1	3.2%	24	77.4%
2G	Collaboration and Partnerships Function	24	77.4%	7	22.6%	2	6.5%	5	16.1%	2	6.5%	22	71.0%
2H	Policies and Procedures Function	25	83.3%	5	16.7%	0	0.0%	7	23.3%	0	0.0%	23	76.7%
3 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY DIVISION													
3A	Community Outreach and Partnerships Function	6	20.7%	23	79.3%	12	41.4%	5	17.2%	8	27.6%	4	13.8%
3B	Compliance Enforcement Function	12	41.4%	17	58.6%	1	3.4%	13	44.8%	6	20.7%	9	31.0%
3C	Education and Training Function	2	6.5%	29	93.5%	6	19.4%	18	58.1%	6	19.4%	1	3.2%
3D	Leadership/Policy Development Function	24	77.4%	7	22.6%	3	9.7%	4	12.9%	7	22.6%	17	54.8%

4 FINANCE DIVISION													
4A	Leadership and Policy Function	29	96.7%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	8	26.7%	1	3.3%	21	70.0%
4B	Board Fiduciary Function	29	93.5%	2	6.5%	0	0.0%	7	22.6%	2	6.5%	22	71.0%
4C	Administration Function	26	81.3%	6	18.8%	0	0.0%	9	28.1%	4	12.5%	19	59.4%
4D	Chief Financial and Facilities Officers/Campus Assistance Function	7	22.6%	24	77.4%	1	3.2%	16	51.6%	9	29.0%	5	16.1%
4E	Biennial Operating Budget Development and Support Function	26	83.9%	5	16.1%	0	0.0%	10	32.3%	1	3.2%	20	64.5%
4F	System Operating Budget and Allocations Function	26	81.3%	6	18.8%	0	0.0%	9	28.1%	3	9.4%	20	62.5%
4G	Labor Negotiations Support Function	20	64.5%	11	35.5%	1	3.2%	10	32.3%	2	6.5%	18	58.1%
4H	Reporting and Analysis Function	8	25.8%	23	74.2%	0	0.0%	20	64.5%	4	12.9%	7	22.6%
4I	Systemwide, Consolidated, and Institutional Level Financial Information Function	13	41.9%	18	58.1%	2	6.5%	14	45.2%	5	16.1%	10	32.3%
4J	Systemwide Financial Reporting Function	12	38.7%	19	61.3%	0	0.0%	15	48.4%	5	16.1%	11	35.5%
4K	Financial Reporting/Campus Assistance Function	2	6.5%	29	93.5%	1	3.2%	15	48.4%	9	29.0%	6	19.4%
4L	Loan Collection Services Function	1	3.2%	30	96.8%	11	35.5%	15	48.4%	3	9.7%	2	6.5%
4M	Capital Budget Function	22	68.8%	10	31.3%	1	3.1%	10	31.3%	3	9.4%	18	56.3%
4N	Policy and Standards and Operating Strategies Function	23	69.7%	10	30.3%	1	3.0%	7	21.2%	5	15.2%	20	60.6%
4O	Facilities Management/Campus Assistance Function	5	16.1%	26	83.9%	4	12.9%	18	58.1%	5	16.1%	4	12.9%
4P	Office Services Function	7	24.1%	22	75.9%	8	27.6%	15	51.7%	3	10.3%	3	10.3%
5 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS DIVISION													
5A	Legislative Advocacy Function	31	96.9%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	5	15.6%	0	0.0%	27	84.4%
5B	Constituent Services Function	18	54.5%	15	45.5%	4	12.1%	8	24.2%	4	12.1%	17	51.5%
5C	Bill Drafting and Tracking Function	20	66.7%	10	33.3%	0	0.0%	10	33.3%	2	6.7%	18	60.0%
5D	Campus Advocacy Function	17	56.7%	13	43.3%	2	6.7%	10	33.3%	3	10.0%	15	50.0%
5E	Development Function	13	43.3%	17	56.7%	4	13.3%	8	26.7%	6	20.0%	12	40.0%
5F	Policy Drafting Function	23	74.2%	8	25.8%	2	6.5%	8	25.8%	0	0.0%	21	67.7%
5G	Student Advocacy Function	17	56.7%	13	43.3%	1	3.3%	9	30.0%	6	20.0%	14	46.7%
5H	Research Function	19	63.3%	11	36.7%	3	10.0%	9	30.0%	2	6.7%	16	53.3%
5I	Legislative Hearing Management Function	25	78.1%	7	21.9%	0	0.0%	8	25.0%	2	6.3%	22	68.8%
5J	Special Events Function	19	63.3%	11	36.7%	3	10.0%	6	20.0%	5	16.7%	16	53.3%
5K	Federal Advocacy Function	26	81.3%	6	18.8%	2	6.3%	6	18.8%	1	3.1%	23	71.9%

6 HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION													
6A	Classification Function	9	30.0%	21	70.0%	4	13.3%	13	43.3%	6	20.0%	7	23.3%
6B	Compensation Function	11	35.5%	20	64.5%	4	12.9%	12	38.7%	7	22.6%	8	25.8%
6C	Retirement Plan Coordination Function	14	46.7%	16	53.3%	1	3.3%	16	53.3%	1	3.3%	12	40.0%
6D	Research and Data Analysis Function	10	33.3%	20	66.7%	4	13.3%	14	46.7%	5	16.7%	7	23.3%
6E	Labor Relations/Negotiations Function	18	56.3%	14	43.8%	0	0.0%	12	37.5%	6	18.8%	14	43.8%
6F	Office of the Chancellor Personnel Function	23	76.7%	7	23.3%	0	0.0%	6	20.0%	2	6.7%	22	73.3%
6G	Legislation Function	27	90.0%	3	10.0%	0	0.0%	7	23.3%	1	3.3%	22	73.3%
6H	Personnel Plan for MnSCU Administrators Function	27	84.4%	5	15.6%	0	0.0%	11	34.4%	1	3.1%	20	62.5%
7 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION													
7A	Infrastructure Function	7	23.3%	23	76.7%	0	0.0%	17	56.7%	5	16.7%	8	26.7%
7B	Software Development Function	4	12.9%	27	87.1%	0	0.0%	14	45.2%	13	41.9%	4	12.9%
7C	Network Services Function	3	9.7%	28	90.3%	0	0.0%	18	58.1%	9	29.0%	4	12.9%
7D	Security and Administration Function	12	36.4%	21	63.6%	1	3.0%	12	36.4%	9	27.3%	11	33.3%
7E	Management Information Function	8	25.0%	24	75.0%	0	0.0%	13	40.6%	13	40.6%	6	18.8%
7F	Instructional Technology Function	5	15.6%	27	84.4%	1	3.1%	13	40.6%	11	34.4%	7	21.9%
7G	Satellite Technology Function	1	3.4%	28	96.6%	8	27.6%	11	37.9%	7	24.1%	3	10.3%
8 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL													
8A	Legal Services Function	18	58.1%	13	41.9%	1	3.2%	9	29.0%	2	6.5%	19	61.3%
8B	Training Function	8	26.7%	22	73.3%	3	10.0%	13	43.3%	4	13.3%	10	33.3%
8C	Litigation Function	18	60.0%	12	40.0%	1	3.3%	10	33.3%	1	3.3%	18	60.0%
9 PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION													
9A	Policy Function	24	80.0%	6	20.0%	2	6.7%	5	16.7%	4	13.3%	19	63.3%
9B	Media Relations Function	21	63.6%	12	36.4%	0	0.0%	10	30.3%	4	12.1%	19	57.6%
9C	Speech Writing Function	19	61.3%	12	38.7%	2	6.5%	7	22.6%	2	6.5%	20	64.5%
9D	Research Function	7	21.9%	25	78.1%	2	6.3%	14	43.8%	9	28.1%	7	21.9%
9E	Public Information Function	10	33.3%	20	66.7%	0	0.0%	11	36.7%	9	30.0%	10	33.3%
9F	Special Events Function	10	34.5%	19	65.5%	2	6.9%	8	27.6%	11	37.9%	8	27.6%
9G	Marketing Function	7	23.3%	23	76.7%	4	13.3%	5	16.7%	14	46.7%	7	23.3%
9H	Development Function	10	32.3%	21	67.7%	8	25.8%	7	22.6%	8	25.8%	8	25.8%

Office of Chancellor-Services split

chose 60% as cut-off clearly
indicating preference of presidentsNot Need-
Transformarbitrarily chose 30% as an
indicator of significant negativity

APPENDIX F

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDESIGN OF ADMINISTRATIVE TITLES

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
REDESIGN OF ADMINISTRATIVE TITLES**

Current:	Recommendation:
Senior Vice Chancellor	No change
Vice Chancellor	No change
General Counsel	No change
Deputy to the Chancellor, Chief of Staff	No change
Deputy to the Chancellor for Legislative Affairs	Director of Government Relations
Associate Vice Chancellor for Continuous Improvement	Director of Continuous Improvement
Associate Vice Chancellor for Equal Opportunity and Diversity	Director of Equal Opportunity and Diversity
Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs	Director of Public Affairs
Associate Vice Chancellor, Chief Information Officer	Chief Information Officer
Executive Director, Board Secretary	Board Secretary
Executive Director, Office of Internal Audit	No change
Associate VCs reporting to Vice Chancellors	No change
Deputy Chief Information Officer	Director of Information Technology
Associate Vice Chancellor for Instructional Technology	Director of Instructional Technology
System Directors reporting to Directors	Assistant Directors
System Directors reporting to Associate Vice Chancellors	Assistant Directors

Visual Representation of the Redesign of Administrative Titles

