Administrative Services Process Review

December 6, 2012

Prepared by:

College Brain Trust

Mike Brandy
Consultant

Dr. George R. Boggs
Team Leader

Executive Summary

OCC initiated a process to review major areas of the college for cost savings, revenue generation and work efficiencies. The accountability for preparing these reports fell along organizational lines. In the administrative services area, the responsibility was assigned to the Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services. The detailed preparation and implementation of this report was developed through the College Administrative Services Council (CASC), which completed its report in December 2010 and submitted it to the Chancellor's Cabinet for review. A follow-up report that provided detailed implementation plans was prepared a year later. At this point, many of the recommendations have been implemented, but CASC is concentrating on about 12 of the highest priority recommendations for full implementation.

While the reports have been shared with CASC and Cabinet members, there has not been wider communication to the college community summarizing progress.

Task Overview

The task as outlined in the CBT contract was stated as follows:

 Review the Administrative Services Process Report and assist the college to implement appropriate recommendations.

Findings and Observations

A summary of the key activities and dates for this project follows:

December 2010 : The "Systemic Planning Process Review of Work Efficiencies, Cost Reductions, Revenue Generation & Accountability" was prepared by the College Administrative Services Council (CASC), which is made up of 15 staff members under the leadership of Vice Chancellor Clarence Brantley.

 The development and analysis of ideas in this report represented a much broader participation than just the 15 members of CASC, as separate work groups were created under the CASC leadership both to develop ideas and to analyze recommendations for feasibility and cost savings. The recommendations were categorized as those needing Cabinet approval, those that CASC was already implementing, and those that were rejected for a variety of reasons. This final version of this report (100 pages) was

presented to the Cabinet in December 2010. This was a very comprehensive report that respected all suggestions considered by CASC and outlined the process for implementation and/or Cabinet/Chancellor decisions. See Table of Contents in appendix.

July 2011: "Recommendations and Project Information" status report was prepared.

In preparation for this report, managers and administrators filled out a one-page summary on each recommendation in their areas. ("Information Request on Recommendations in your Functional Area(s)).

This input was then summarized into the "Recommendations and Project Information" report prepared in July 2011.   This report was divided into three sections.

The first section was a comprehensive document that reviewed 209 separate recommendations and rated those on a variety of criteria, including benefit to students, operational efficiency, ease of acceptance and ease of implementation, resulting in a ranked aggregate priority of 1-5. This was a very comprehensive analysis and sophisticated ranking methodology. See excerpt in appendix.

The second section of this report included a worksheet (132 pages long) in narrative format that reflected CASC detailed notes on each recommendation as of July 2011. See excerpt in appendix.

The third section of this report assigned responsibility to key managers and administrators for all the high-priority items that fell under their area. See excerpt in appendix.

The completed report was distributed to the CASC committee.

May 2012: CASC retreat

CASC held a retreat in May 2012 to concentrate on about 12 of the high-priority projects. Project leaders shared with CASC the updated status of the recommendations they were working on.

Analysis

The effort that CASC put forward to identify cost savings and efficiencies was very thorough. Perhaps the level of detail contained in the reports was too extensive for the Cabinet and was certainly too detailed for college-wide sharing. While CBT was on site

interviewing different staff members, it was clear that at least some staff members felt that they never did hear the results of this extensive process.

It was clear that the task CASC took on was narrowly defined as cost-saving and efficiency measures; it was not defined to be a "re-design" process on any broad scale. There was no discussion about major departmental re-organization or broad changes in the way OCC does business. Having said that, there were many detailed recommendations that did improve efficiency for students and staff with commensurate cost savings from some recommendations.

Recommendations

CBT recommends that a summary of the implementation progress on major recommendations be shared with the Cabinet as well as the College staff.

CBT recommends that further updates occur every 6 months until the highest priority recommendations are implemented.

Appendix

Excerpt: "Table of Contents" December 2010 report

Excerpt: July 2011 "Recommendations Transformed into Projects"

Excerpt 2: July 2011 Narrative on each project

Excerpt 3: July 2011 " Information Request on Recommendations in your Functional Area(s)"