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1. Introduction of Louise Morman and Clark Kelly

2. Briefing on Dean’s presentation for Academic/Student Affairs Committee of Miami’s Board of Trustees

3. Spring 2012: Priorities, challenges and opportunities
   a. Budget and financial planning (Diane Delisio)
   b. Recruitment and retention (Brian Kirkmeyer)
   c. Lockheed Martin Leadership Institute (Doug Troy)
   d. Advancement
   e. Public relations
   f. Information technology (Scott Campbell)
   g. Special announcement
Ms. Louise M. Morman
Executive Director of the Lockheed Martin Leadership Institute

- Systems Analysis alumna from Miami
- Thirty year career in the energy industry
- CEO, Insight Power, management consulting and executive coaching (2007 – present)
- Recently completed a graduate program in Leadership and Transformational Learning at New York University

Instructor
School of Engineering & Applied Science
Col (ret) Clark A. Kelly
Director of Development for SEAS

- 31 years of leadership experience in multiple organizations within DoD and USAF
- At Miami since 2007
- Commander Air Force ROTC and Chair in CAS (2007-10)
- Career Coach for STEM students with Career Services (2010-11)
School of Engineering and Applied Science
Oxford Faculty Meeting
February 1, 2012

Briefing on Dean’s presentation for Academic Affairs Committee of MU’s Board of Trustees
(Dec. 8, 2011)
Just a few recognitions of SEAS faculty and students

- E. Phillips Knox Teaching Award: 4 SEAS Faculty out of 17 recipients of the award

- 3 NSF Career Award winners (out of 5 at Miami University)

- Provost Student Academic Achievement Award: since its inception in 2007, 11 awards for SEAS students (out of 42 at Miami)

- US News & World Report 2012: SEAS tied at 21st in the category of Best Undergraduate Engineering Programs where the highest degree is a bachelor’s or master’s (out of over 320 programs)
## Recruitment and Enrollment (Oxford)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of 1st year SEAS students</th>
<th>Number of SEAS students (# of tenure – line faculty in parenthesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>799 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>856 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>923 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1036 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1125 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48% growth</td>
<td>41% growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment and Enrollment (Oxford)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of 1st year SEAS students</th>
<th>Number of SEAS students (# of tenure – line faculty in parenthesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>799 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 - anticipated</td>
<td>375 (60% growth)</td>
<td>1200 (50% growth) (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Fall 2013 - planned in 2005</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1200 (55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research productivity of SEAS Oxford faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th># of journal publications</th>
<th># of conf. proceedings publications</th>
<th>External grants ($)</th>
<th># of tenure-line faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,590,000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2,365,000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEAS Budgetary Challenges

SEAS budget

$9.5 million in FY 2009

$9.2 million in FY 2012

$8.5 million in FY 2015?
SEAS budgetary challenges

- Responsibility-center management (RCM) financial model
  - Challenge for SEAS: to educate an undergraduate in engineering (as well as, e.g., in fine arts and sciences) costs significantly more than, e.g., in a liberal arts program
SEAS budgetary opportunities

• New revenue opportunities

  o further explore university partnership opportunities, finalize SEAS revenue enhancing initiatives planning and start implementation phase in the summer of 2012

• Responsibility-center management (RCM) financial model

  o factoring the different instructional costs explicitly into RCM and/or introducing engineering fees
## Engineering Course and Program Fees Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>$360 per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>$336 per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>$65 per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>$17.50 per credit hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>$15 per credit hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Engineering, Computing, and Nursing in a student-centered, vibrant, interactive environment*
Spring 2012: Priorities, challenges, and opportunities
Budget and financial planning
Priorities, challenges, and opportunities

1. Budgets cuts in FY’13 and beyond – challenge

2. Engineering fee – opportunity

3. Revenue enhancing initiatives (to be discussed in Dean’s meetings with Oxford departments) - opportunity

4. Responsibility Center Management budgeting (Diane) - challenge or opportunity?
## Challenge: Budget cuts in FY ‘13 and beyond

### SEAS budget reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Reduction ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>285,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>282,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>141,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>710,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*not including potential reductions of decentralized IT budgets*
Engineering fee

needed to

1. partially offset upcoming budgetary reductions and

2. increase the size of our tenure-line faculty from 45 in 2013 to 50 in 2016
Responsibility Center Management
budgeting - Diane Delisio
What is Responsibility Centered Management?

“A decentralized managerial framework ... that makes **academic divisions** accountable for... control over revenue generated and costs incurred from their academic activities.” {From presentation to the committee by David Ellis, Assoc VP for Budgeting and Finance}

• Six Responsibility Centers at Miami: Each of the five academic divisions in Oxford and the regional campuses as one responsibility center
Why was a committee formed?

- In response to the Strategic Priorities Task Force report, Recommendation 7: 
  *Develop a new budget model that will result in the generation of new revenues, improved resource allocation and greater operating efficiencies.*
  - Move away from current process (incremental budgeting) to a performance-based model.
  - Should represent where revenues are generated and how resources are consumed.
  - In essence, to determine Miami’s form of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM).
RCM characteristics

• Revenue assigned to Responsibility Centers using a university-defined model
  – Usually some combination of number of majors and number of credit hours generated by the division (of instruction? of instructor?)
  – Probably different models for UG, Grad

• Responsibility Centers cover their own expenses and those of support units
  – Support Centers (e.g. President's office, Provost/Academic Affairs, Libraries, IT, Student Affairs)
  – Auxiliaries (e.g. Marcum, Res&Dining, Goggin, Rec Sports Center, ICA) {some are self-supporting}
Commonly Identified...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Issues/Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Incentivizes revenue generation</td>
<td>• All E&amp;G revenues and expenses must be assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic program decisions are more closely aligned with financial decisions</td>
<td>• Variety of models – need to balance precision with simplicity and predictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes transparency and accountability</td>
<td>• Maintain incentives for interdisciplinary activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centers realize the benefits of their entrepreneurial activity</td>
<td>• Can encourage “revenue poaching”; need governance structure to monitor, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminates incentives for negotiating</td>
<td>• Subvention fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major work – how revenues and costs will be assigned

- Considerable debate on models to assign UG revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% dept of instruction*</td>
<td>100% student head count by major</td>
<td>80% dept of instruction*; 20% dept of major</td>
<td>80% dept of instruction* (300/400 level classes weighted more); 20% major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Committee and Provost prefer dept of instructor; that is a goal but “data” at Miami does not yet support /allow this calculation.

- Graduate revenue easier – probably all assigned to dept of instruction or all to dept of major.

- Allocating costs of support centers – different formats for different support centers.

- A lot of discussion (mid-September through the end of January), but only asked to make “philosophical” recommendations.
Final comments

- RCM used at several major universities (e.g. OSU, UC, Kent, Delaware, Florida, Penn, New Hampshire)
- Differential costs of instruction are supposed to be accounted for by differences in state subsidy.
- Universal observation: whatever model/approach is selected will need to be refined in a few years.
- An Implementation committee will decide on specific models and how they will work (I am lobbying NOT to be on it).
- The goal is that FY 2012-2013 be a shadow RCM year with current budget process retained.
Recruitment and retention
Priorities, challenges, and opportunities

1. Retention – first year experience (to be discussed in Dean’s meetings with Oxford departments)

2. University / SEAS Scholars program

3. Class 2016 - recruitment and yield (Brian)
University Scholars Program

• university-wide recruitment and yield scholarship program for high-ability students

• enrollment management tool to recruit strategically (discipline- or division-specific and increase diversity)

• replaces Harrison program, compliments Honors program, effective with F’13 incoming class

• students select a designation regardless of declared major, as broad or as specific as academic divisions decide
SEAS Scholars program

- Engineering and/or Computing Scholar designation

- will offer, at a minimum, four guaranteed experiences, not available to all students (university-wide policy)

- a tool to increase **yield**: SEAS challenge!
Class 2016 - recruitment and yield
- Brian Kirkmeyer
Recruitment and Yield – Spring 2012

• Current application statistics from Admission

• Schedule of spring 2012 recruitment and yield events

• Call to Arms
  – Why you should get involved
  – How you can get involved
### Fall First Year Applicants By Residency (Domestic & International)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident (N)</td>
<td>9016</td>
<td>10482</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5069</td>
<td>5711</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic non-resident</td>
<td>7566</td>
<td>8522</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4817</td>
<td>5528</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International non-resident</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>-27.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident (R)</td>
<td>8256</td>
<td>8785</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5170</td>
<td>5590</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Determined (Z)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17360</td>
<td>19392</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10272</td>
<td>11366</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall First Year Applicants By Division (Domestic Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division (Dom Only)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yield Rate</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared (00)</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>-259</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>-111</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch Eng&amp;App Sci (AP)</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col of Arts/Sci (AS)</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>7403</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>3728</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>172.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch of Bus (BU)</td>
<td>4072</td>
<td>3908</td>
<td>-164</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed/Health/Soc (EA)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch Fine Arts (FA)</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15886</td>
<td>17415</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10011</td>
<td>11176</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall First Year Applicants By Division (International Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared (00)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch Eng&amp;App Sci (AP)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col of Arts/Sci (AS)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch of Bus (BU)</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-51.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed/Health/Soc (EA)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch Fine Arts (FA)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-88.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-27.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applicant Stats summary

• Applications are up
  – Primary reason = international students, but
  – Better presence being pushed by Admission (e.g. Open Houses)

• SEAS applicant profile is higher, so far
  – Average ACT = 30
  – Average GPA = 4.19/4.00

• Yield is lagging behind other divisions, as usual
Spring 2012 recruitment/yield schedule

• Make It Miami! university events
  – Mondays: 2/20, 4/2, 4/9, 4/16
  – 12:05-1:10PM in 102 Benton
  – Student-led tour of facilities, faculty/student panel

• Open House for high-ability HS juniors
  – Saturday, March 24th
  – Faculty panel @ 10AM, SEAS session from 1-2PM

• Opportunities to email, call, etc. these admitted students
Why get involved?

• Parents and students want to know...
  – ...that faculty care about their success
  – ...that students will have access to you and your expertise
  – ...that you are approachable when they seek this access

• We need these students!
  – We want more SEAS majors, esp. ECE and CSE
  – Our yield is poor compared to other divisions
  – Retention in SEAS majors is lower than in other divisions
  – The University wants 50 more students to enter SEAS this year
How to get involved?

• Directly
  – Volunteer for the Make It Miami! and other events
  – Set up demos for the tours
  – Email, call or write letters to our prospectives (and the parents)

• Indirectly
  – Contribute to our web presence, including social media
  – Upload pix/videos of classes, presentations or competitions
  – Encourage students to do the same (quality doesn’t matter)
Questions?

• Email me, stop by my office, call me, tweet me, etc.
School of Engineering and Applied Science
Oxford Faculty Meeting
February 1, 2012

Lockheed Martin Leadership Institute
- Doug Troy
School of Engineering and Applied Science

Leadership Institute
School of Engineering and Applied Science

Engineering, Computing, and Nursing in a student-centered, vibrant, interactive environment
Lockheed Martin Leadership Institute

• Dual mission: Provide an environment where our students can learn and exercise the leadership competencies AND establish SEAS, on the national scene, as a school where leadership is an integral part of the educational experience

• Vision is to build a comprehensive and sustainable leadership program for SEAS.
  ➢ 3-year intensive Leadership Certificate program for select students
  ➢ Leadership awareness for many SEAS students
  ➢ Leadership for faculty
What’s Happening Now

Engineering, Computing, and Nursing in a student-centered, vibrant, interactive environment
You’re Invited
Thursday, February 16 Launch Event

Please send your students and faculty (~ 400 needed):
9:45 – 10:30  *New Challenges for Innovation*
   Dr. Ray O. Johnson BEN 102

10:45 – 11:15  Leadership Institute Launch Event    BEN 102
   Reception in BEN 102 Lobby

For juniors and seniors (~70 needed):
1:30 – 2:15  LM Executive/Student Discussion
   270 EGB

Engineering, Computing, and Nursing in a student-centered, vibrant, interactive environment
Looking Ahead

• Recruit cohort #2 from current freshmen in March

• Faculty reading and discussion group
Advancement

Reinvigorate our efforts by capitalizing on:

• Clark Kelly’s joining MU Advancement and SEAS teams

• the establishment of Lockheed Martin Leadership Institute
Clark Kelly’s agenda

- Development of long-term strategies to increase philanthropic and volunteer support for SEAS
- Implementation of the strategies to increase the level of personal involvement and financial commitment of alumni and friends
- Solicitation and stewardship calls to alumni and friends alone and with SEAS administrators, faculty, and alumni volunteers
- Encouragement and coordination of involvement of alumni and friends through campus visits and regional events
Public relations arena

- Launching new SEAS web page
- Coordinate our efforts with renewed Miami-wide attempts in this arena
- Develop strategies to enhance our visibility through the use of social media
- Capitalize on the establishment of Lockheed Martin Leadership Institute
- New issue of “Distinctions and Directions”
Coordination
Information Technology

• Miami began the task of implementing the recommendations that resulted from the strategic assessment of Support Services analysis conducted in early 2011

• Accenture was engaged to assist with implementing the IT portion of the Support Services Implementation Program

• Goal: save $3.8M / year
School of Engineering and Applied Science
Oxford Faculty Meeting
February 1, 2012

Support Services Implementation Program (IT) – Scott Campbell
The project case for change identified $3.8 million targeted IT spend reductions equaling 14.5% of the FY10 IT spend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Stream</th>
<th>Savings Rationale</th>
<th>Savings area</th>
<th>Reduction Estimate**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Portfolio and Architecture Governance    | • Reduce project capacity by up to 10%  
• Leverage prioritization framework to reduce primarily low value and redundant projects | • Application Development  
• Software cost                             | Expense: $300K  
Personnel: 200K                           |
| Application Rationalization              | • Reduce application inventory by up to 20%  
• Consolidate applications with similar functionality | • Application Development  
• Hardware and Software cost  
• Infrastructure Development              | Expense: $600K  
Personnel: $1M                             |
| Data Center Consolidation                | • Consolidate up to 80% of distributed servers into the Hoyt data center.        | • Hardware cost                            
• Infrastructure Development              | Expense: $360K  
Personnel $260K                           |
| IT Support Organization                  | • Restructure the IT support organization and processes                          | • End User Support  
• Help Desk  
• IT Management                          | Personnel: $1.1M                           |

** Reduction estimate from Accenture modeling in April 2011.  
Total: $3.8M
There is no single “right” governance model, but rather a continuum of options.

- **Federated**
  - Capture the benefits of both extremes
  - Exclude the weaknesses of both extremes

- **Functional IT Leadership**
  - Enterprise Perspective

- **Unit Alignment**
  - Participative
  - Federated
  - Representative

- **Institution Alignment**

**Federated Model Benefits**
- Potentially more costly
- Wheel reinvention
- Limited synergy
- Variable IT competencies

**Federated Model Weaknesses**
- Unit ownership
- Users control priorities
- Responsiveness to needs

**Enterprise Perspective**
- Economies of scale
- Control of standards
- Critical mass of skills
- May not meet everyone’s needs

**Unit Alignment Benefits**
- Less responsive to end users
- Low unit ownership
- Costs managed centrally

**Unit Alignment Weaknesses**
- Potentially more costly
- Wheel reinvention
- Limited synergy
- Variable IT competencies
Proposed IT Governance Model can be tailored to university’s directional alternative

Executive Leadership Team
(Quarterly review meeting)

 Enterprise Architecture
Guides IT Portfolio board on technology decisions

 IT Portfolio Board
Cross-Unit committee, prioritizes and approves academic, administrative, shared services and student IT needs

 Portfolio Office
Collaborates with units to prioritize and manage the IT portfolio

 STRAW MODEL
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

- Key constituents/shareholders who manage IT priorities.
- Reviews, prioritizes, and approve initiatives
- Approves funding

Submit all approved IT Demand and prioritized unit-specific projects to project office; Performance Reporting

Academic IT Project Review Board
Cross academic units committee that prioritizes the academic needs

Administrative Project Review Board
Cross administrative units committee that prioritizes the administrative IT needs

Institutional Systems and IT Infrastructure Board
Committee that focuses on shared IT needs

Standard Initiative Proposal & Review Process

© 2011 Accenture. All Rights Reserved.
Organizational Structure Spectrum

Savings potential depends on degree of centralization.

Decentralized

Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CIO</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin IT</td>
<td>EHS</td>
<td>FINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Shared Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CIO</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin IT</td>
<td>EHS</td>
<td>FNSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Shared Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CIO</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin IT</td>
<td>EHS</td>
<td>FNSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Shared Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CIO</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Shared Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 3

Projected cost savings

Org Savings: $0 – $500k

$650k – $1.6M

$850k – $1.8M

$850k – $1.9M

1This is a preliminary high-level estimate which requires further analysis and validation, to be completed over the next month.

2An additional $600k in savings will not be realized from other SSIP projects due to this model.
SSIP-IT High-Level Recommendations

Academic and Administrative areas are facing significant budget challenges independent of Information Technology. The goal of these recommendations is to realize IT savings while minimizing the impact on unit mission/operations.

• Portfolio and Architecture Governance
  – Create governance structures for portfolio and architecture management
  – Establish university information technology architecture standards and principles

• Data Center Consolidation
  – Move servers into the Hoyt data center when physical proximity is not required
  – Migrate physical servers to virtual servers whenever practical

• Application Rationalization
  – Retire or consolidate redundant IT applications

• IT Support Organization and Process Design
  – Consolidate IT support for administrative staff and activities into a single organizational unit
  – Consolidate IT support for faculty and academic activities into a single organizational unit
Approval Timeline

• 2/1/2012: Final savings estimates for workstreams
• 2/9/2012: Review recommendations with SSIP-IT Advisory Group
• 2/21/2012: Review recommendations with IT Strategic Advisory Council
• 2/27/2012: Present recommendations to PEC
BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following recommendation(s) of the Committee on Naming of Campus Facilities:

Dr. James C. Garland Hall

The central section of the School of Engineering and Applied Science Building named in honor of

Dr. Garland (Miami President, 1996 – 2006)