Efficiencies and Effectiveness via Centralization Subcommittee

Purpose

To make recommendations on:

1. Whether a substantial improvement in University of Idaho functions (e.g., IT, HR, Finance, Development, Communications/Marketing, Research Support, etc.) can be achieved via a shift from highly distributed managerial oversight to a more centralized approach.
2. What functions to centralize (if any), whether it should be wholesale or partial centralization, and projected impact on the University of Idaho (i.e., what will change, who will be affected, and how would the transition best be handled).

Committee Members

Greg Fizzell (Chair), Andrew Kersten (Dean, CLASS), Ben Hunter (Associate Dean, Library), Kathy Canfield-Davis (Department Chair, Leadership and Counseling), Philip Scruggs (Department Chair, Movement Sciences), Bernhard Stumpf (Faculty, Physics), Patrick Wilson (Faculty, CNR), Deb Eisinger (Staff, Finance), Chad Neilson (Staff, Web Communications & Operations).

Scope

The subcommittee is approaching this as an informal, initial step towards understanding what different individuals and constituent groups across the institution perceive to be the relative advantages and disadvantages of distributed managerial oversight versus a more centralized approach. We will sample a broad cross-section of the University using various methods.

Methods and Constituent Groups

The methods and constituent groups identified below represent our initial strategy. As interviews and focus groups are conducted, additional methods, individuals and constituent groups might be identified as important supplements.

Personal Interviews

1. VP for Finance
2. VP for Infrastructure
3. VP for Advancement
4. VP for Research and Economic Development

Focus Groups

1. Provost’s Council
2. Faculty Senate
3. Staff Council
4. Marketing and Communications Team
5. Web Team
6. Affirmative Action Coordinators (AACs)
7. Council of the University Business Officers (CUIBO)
8. Distributed IT staff that do not report to central ITS
Deliverables

1. Identify advantages and disadvantages of centralizing certain University functions per various constituent groups across the institution.
2. Provide recommendations for centralization and potential impacts.
3. Qualitative summary of interview and focus group results

Definitions/Assumptions

**Improvement**: something that enhances value or excellence.

Assumption: What might be considered an improvement by one party or entity, may not be considered an improvement by another, even if money is saved, the function is more efficient etc.

**Centralization**: to bring to center: consolidate <centralize all the data in one file>. To concentrate by placing power and authority in a center or central organization <centralize several functions in a single agency>.

Assumption: Certain functions could be partially centralized. For example, IT professionals could be trained and managed by central ITS, but embedded in units to ensure a high level of service.

Timeline

**January & February 2017** - Data collection

As of 1/26 the committee has conducted personal interviews with the VPs. Focus groups begin the week of January 23 and continue into February.

**March 2017** - Data compilation and report preparation

**March 27, 2017** - Report submitted to Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee