Connecticut State University

ntral • Eastern • Southern • Western

Office of the President

RESOLUTION

concerning

THE REPORT
OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE COST STUDY
COMMITTEE

January 19, 1995

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees determined the need to study the most efficient and effective ways to meet administrative and instructional objectives in its resolution BR#94-1 dated February 4, 1994, and

WHEREAS, A committee to conduct this study was established consisting of the Board Chair, four members of the Board and two university presidents, and

WHEREAS, The committee engaged in an extensive review of the role and function of the CSU system office and the four universities to identify administrative operations more appropriately performed in the system office and those more efficiently done by the universities, and

WHEREAS, The committee has reviewed the recommendations proposed by the system office President and the university presidents, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approve the findings and recommendations contained in the attachment to this resolution, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees directs the president of the CSU system to forward this resolution and report to the leadership of the Education Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly.

A Certified True Copy:

A. Searle Pinney
Chairman

Administrative Cost Study

Connecticut State University System

Accepted by the Board of Trustees

January 19, 1995

Administrative Cost Study

In response to concerns raised by members of a Task Force created by the Legislature to study the structure of higher education institutions in Connecticut, the Board of Trustees of Connecticut State University on February 4, 1994, authorized a study of administrative costs "in the interest of continuing to find ways to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in the Connecticut State University System in every way possible."

In its particulars, the purpose of the administrative cost study has been:

-- "to pursue the search for the most efficient and effective ways of meeting administrative and instructional objectives"

-- "to specifically include the identification of

   operations, if any, which may be more efficiently and effectively performed at the system level by consolidation of staff,

   operations which may be more efficiently and effectively performed at the campus level through the transfer of staff to the campuses, and

   to include an overall review of staffing levels throughout the CSU system."

That study has now been substantially completed.

Because the then-President of the Connecticut State University System retired early in 1994, and a new President was named, the Board's committee determined not to proceed with the study until the new system President, who had recent extensive experience in budgeting, management and performance evaluation, took office in early August.

Since that time, the Committee, composed of Trustees Pinney, Doyle, Hannah, Hoar and Hunter, and university Presidents Carter and Shumaker, has met to establish the methodology for the study, to review its progress as it moved forward, and to arrive at the conclusions and recommendations embodied in this report.

A necessary first step was the determination of the appropriate role of the system office in the university system, on the one hand, and the administrative functions which must necessarily be performed by each university, in support of the educational function, on the other.

Then, at the direction of the committee, the system President and each university President undertook a functional

1

review of every administrative position in the entire Connecticut State University System, as well as a review of the overall structure of administration. Within the system office, every staff member was involved in reviewing how the work of each position contributed to the system office and to the university system in general. At each university, top management conducted a similar review of each administrative position. The structure of administration -- the table of organization -- in the system office and at each university was also reviewed.

A summary of those reviews at the system office and at each university was submitted to the cost study committee. Recommended changes have also been reviewed by the committee.

Finally, the cost of administration at the system office was compared to similar costs within other university systems in the United States.

Conclusions:

The roles of the system office and the system President have been more clearly and carefully defined, and functions required by statute, Board policy, and expectations of the Board have been delineated for each division within the system office.

In large part because of continuing scrutiny of costs and staffing levels during the past decade, the committee has not found excessive numbers of administrative staff in the system office or at the universities. The committee has not found that there are major cost reductions to be found by cutting a number of staff positions which have been determined to be non-contributory to the advancement of the CSU system.

Instead, in both the system office and at the universities, the committee has identified areas where staff time can be -- and in several instances, already has been -- reallocated to activities which have been determined to be of higher priority.

In one area -- the appropriate degree of centralization or decentralization of administrative computing and telecommunications services -- the committee found that it did not possess sufficient expertise to come to a reasoned conclusion. Accordingly, at the recommendation of the committee, the Board of Trustees has authorized the employment of a consultant to make recommendations concerning alternative methods (either consolidated or distributed) of providing data processing, computing, information systems and telecommunications services to the universities.

In comparing the cost of administration within the system office to similar costs at system offices in other states, the committee has found that, as measured both by expenditures per full time equivalent student and by expenditures by headcount, the cost of the Connecticut State University system office is

below the average cost nationally. Also, expenditures by the CSU system office, as a percentage of the total system expenditures, are below the average percentage nationally.

Finally, the committee has found that the system President and the university Presidents are engaged in a continuing process of evaluation of administrative costs. Over the past several years, each university has undertaken a number of administrative changes to enhance the delivery of services. The committee recommends that each president continue to review administrative costs and structures in order to identify and implement needed process improvements.

Role and Functions

<u>System</u> <u>Office</u> <u>Role</u>

The statutes empower the Board of Trustees of Connecticut State University to "maintain" the four universities of the system, to "offer curricula" at those universities, and to administer the system by <u>inter</u> <u>alia</u> making rules for the government of the university system, determining the policies of the university system, and coordinating the programs and services of the universities. Each of the universities provide educational programs authorized by statute, the Board of Governors for Higher Education, and the Board of Trustees, and administer those programs according to policies established by the Board of Trustees.

After comprehensive self-examination by the system office staff, extensive analysis and revision by the Council of Presidents, and review and full discussion by the administrative cost study committee, there is wide consensus that

The role of the system <u>President</u> is to

    a. serve as staff to the Board of Trustees,

    b. on behalf of the Board of Trustees, directly perform certain functions authorized by statute and delegated by the Board of Trustees,

    c. on behalf of the Board of Trustees, coordinate and facilitate the educational programs provided by the four universities, and

    d. on behalf of the Board of Trustees, hold the universities accountable to Board policies.

The role of the system <u>Office</u> is to serve as staff to the President of the CSU System.

System Office Functions, Allocated by Office

President of the System

The functions and responsibilities of the President of the CSU System include, but are not necessarily limited to:

-- implementation of Board policy and procedures and other such duties as the Board may delegate or assign;

-- leadership responsibility for providing the Board with professional judgments on all matters affecting the system and its constituent universities;

-- responsibility for internal governance and administration of the university system in general, and administration of the system office in particular;

-- responsibility for seeking consultation and advice from the university presidents, both collectively and individually, on matters pertaining to the system and, as appropriate, to each university;

-- responsibility, in conjunction with the university presidents, for system-wide planning for academic affairs, student affairs, public service programs, financial operations, capital plans, and resource utilization;

-- responsibility for the preparation of options, including a recommended option, for consideration and adoption by the Board of Trustees, for all operating and capital budgets, appropriation requests, bond issues and statutory changes which affect the Connecticut State University system or its constituent universities;

-- implementation of programs for the professional development and annual performance review of university presidents and system office staff, and for assisting the Board of Trustees in its quadrennial performance assessment of each university president;

-- acting as the leading spokesperson for the Connecticut State University System and its mission of public higher education in the state of Connecticut;

-- the development of an effective state-wide public relations program in support of the Connecticut State University System.

System Office

Although the functions of the system office are assigned to different divisions in the following outline, trying to fulfill complex functions strictly within the "silos" of isolated divisions would be extremely dysfunctional. It is the duty of the President and the Division of the President to integrate the activities of the various division into a coherent whole, with extensive cross-divisional interchange of ideas. So although specific functions are said to be assigned to a particular division, in almost every case, other divisions will participate extensively in the acquisition of information, analysis of options, and achievement of goals.

Division of the President

A. In his role of serving as staff to the Board of Trustees, the President looks to the Division of the President to help him:

> coordinate committee activity of the Board
> coordinate Board meetings
> record Board actions
> keep Board records

B. In his role of directly performing certain functions delegated by the Board, the President looks to the Division of the President to help him:

> manage, coordinate and integrate activities of,
>   and information flow among, system office
>   divisions and personnel. This includes process
>   mapping, and process improvement (through quality
>   management techniques) of activities within the
>   system office as well as system-wide activities
>
> draft a proposed mission statement for the CSU system,
>   which includes elements relating to the
>   educational needs and constituencies served, and
>   the degrees offered
>
> speak for the CSU system as a whole to the public and
>   specific communities of interest
>   -- articulate a vision for the system based
>   on the mission approved by the Board
>   -- publicize the vision in speeches, op ed
>   pieces, communications, and editorial board
>   visits
>   -- develop relationships with business community

-- conduct public relations for the system as a
                        whole

            represent the CSU system in deliberations of the state
                Executive Branch
                -- monitor executive policy issues
                -- direct CSU response to executive policy issues

            represent the CSU system before the General Assembly
                -- integrate and develop legislative proposals
                -- monitor legislative policy issues
                -- direct CSU response to legislative policy
                    issues
                -- coordinate legislative activities by
                    members of the Board of Trustees

            represent the CSU system before Congress and to
                national agencies
                -- integrate and develop proposals
                -- monitor issues
                -- direct CSU response

            promote system-wide recognition of student achievement

C.   In his role of coordinating and facilitating the educational
programs provided by the four universities, the President looks
to the Division of the President to help him:

            coordinate the programs and services of the
                universities [with each system office division]
                                    [CGS Section 10a-89]

            coordinate the effort to "learn about and
                respond" to the needs of Connecticut [with
                Acad Affairs]

            coordinate system-wide activities and events, e.g.
                -- Committee on the Arts
                -- Conference on Teaching and Learning
                -- Global Majority Retreat
                -- Arts Calendar
                -- system wide publications
                    -- four campus brochure
                    -- CSU at a glance
                    -- Connecticut Review
                    -- transfer information
                    -- cost of attending CSU universities,
                        and information about financial aid
                            [all in cooperation with
                                other system offices]

8

coordinate fundraising activities of the universities
        from major corporations and major foundations and
        for major grants so as to avoid unseemly
        and counterproductive competition

develop and/or disperse information about grant
        opportunities

D.   The President of the Connecticut State University system
regularly evaluates the performance of each of the University
presidents in achieving the goals and objectives defined by the
Board of Trustees in its presidential assessment policy.   This
evaluation is the primary method of holding the universities
accountable to Board policies.

        In performing this aspect of his role, the President looks
to the staff in the Division of the President to provide data,
provide a conceptual framework, and raise questions and issues
which are useful to him in fulfilling the requirements of the
Board policy adopted November 4, 1994.

Division of Academic Affairs

A.   In his role of serving as staff to the Board of Trustees, the
President looks to the Division of Academic Affairs to help him:

        coordinate meetings of the Board Committees on
                Academic Affairs and Student Life
        record Committee actions
        keep Committee records

        develop policy options related to academic affairs
        develop policy options related to admissions
        develop policy options related to student life (e.g.,
                student conduct, student health insurance,
                intercollegiate athletics)
        review and evaluate proposals for new degree programs
                and new educational units
        evaluate proposals for consolidation or termination of
                academic programs
                                        [CGS Sections 10-6, 10a-87]
        review and evaluate a draft mission statement for
                each university which includes a statement of the
                role and scope of that university and a statement
                of that university's strengths and specialties

B. In his role of directly performing certain functions
delegated by the Board, the President looks to the Division of
Academic Affairs to help him:

plan for the future
-- develop long range strategic plans for
   the system, including e.g. plans for
   diversity of students, distance learning,
   and libraries
-- conduct institutional research (including
   the development and collection of data
   and outcome measures necessary for that
   research) for the system to support planning
   and decision-making
                                   [CGS Section 10a-9]
-- determine assumptions concerning planning
   parameters [with Finance and Mgt]
                                   [CGS Section 10a-9]

C. In his role of coordinating and facilitating the educational
programs provided by the four universities, the President looks
to the Division of Academic Affairs to help him:

coordinate institutional research relating to the
    system as a whole at the universities

coordinate the assessment of the performance of the
    universities as required by statute, including
    using measures of educational outcomes
                                   [CGS Section 10a-156]

D. In performing his role of assisting the Board in holding the
universities accountable to Board policies, the President of the
system looks to the Division of Academic Affairs to provide data,
provide a conceptual framework, and raise questions and issues
which are useful to him in fulfilling the requirements of the
Board policy adopted on November 4, 1994 which relate to academic
affairs.

Division of Finance and Management

A. In his role of serving as staff to the Board of Trustees, the
President looks to the Division of Finance and Management to help
him:

coordinate meetings of the Board Committee on Fiscal
    Affairs
record Committee actions
keep Committee records

10

develop policy options for budgets and spending plans
                              [CGS Section 10a-89]
develop policy options for tuition and fees
                              [CGS Section 10a-99]
develop policy options for accounting policies and
     administrative procedures throughout the system

review and evaluate budget reports concerning
     areas of interest to the Board, pursuant to
     Board policy (e.g. intercollegiate athletics,
     foundations) or statute (library media, library
     books, and equipment for research)
                              [CGS Section 10a-151a]

B.   In his role of directly performing certain functions
delegated by the Board, the President looks to the Division of
Finance and Management to help him:

plan for the future
     -- develop 5-year operating plans based on
          strategic plans [with Acad Affairs]
                              [CGS Section 10a-9]
     -- develop 5-year capital plans based on
          strategic plans [with Acad Affairs]
                              [CGS Section 10a-9]

develop options for the allocation of general fund
     appropriations and tuition funds among the
     universities
                              [CGS Sections 10a-8, 10a-99]

prepare the budget request for the CSU system
                              [CGS Section 10a-89]

transfer funds from the general fund and operating
     fund to the universities, retain funds for the
     system office, and administer reserves, in
     accordance with Board policy
                              [CGS Section 10a-99]

establish uniform (standardized) administrative
     practices and procedures for financial records
     and human resources systems [in consultation
     with other divisions]

provide administrative support services -- budgeting,
     accounting, purchasing, payroll, disbursing --
     for the system office

C. In his role of coordinating and facilitating the educational programs provided by the four universities, the President looks to the Division of Finance and Management to help him:

> coordinate the submission of operating and capital budget requests to the system office

> coordinate compliance with ADA, building code, and environmental safety requirements mandated by regulatory agencies

D. In performing his role of assisting the Board in holding the universities accountable to Board polices, the President looks to the staff of the Division of Finance and Management to provide data, provide a conceptual framework, and raise questions and issues which are useful to him in fulfilling the requirements of the Board policy adopted November 4, 1994, which are relevant to finance and management.

Division of Personnel and Labor Relations

A. In his role of serving as staff to the Board of Trustees, the President looks to the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations to help him:

> coordinate meetings of the Board Committee on Employee Relations
> record Committee actions
> keep Committee records

> develop policy options for management and confidential personnel salaries
> > [CGS Section 10a-89]

B. In his role of directly performing certain functions delegated to him by the Board, the President looks to the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations to help him:

> bargain collectively for unclassified units
> > -- develop proposals for negotiation
> > -- negotiation with all attendant responsibilities

> supervise the administration of the contracts for unclassified and classified units
> > -- represent CSU in interest and grievance arbitrations
> > -- represent CSU before State Board of Labor Relations

design, develop, maintain and insure the
correct update of personnel data base systems

develop a strategic plan for staff diversity
[CGS Section 10a-11]

provide administrative support services -- personnel,
affirmative action -- for the system office

C.   In his role of coordinating and facilitating the educational
programs offered by the four universities, the President looks to
the Division of Personnel and Labor Relations to help him:

coordinate actions on grievances

coordinate the CSU position in labor litigation

coordinate development of specialization of
personnel staff at the universities

coordinate all system relations with DAS and the
Retirement Division for personnel administration
and serve as consultant to the universities for
personnel-related questions

coordinate implementation of the new Human Resources
System and the Automated Personnel System

D.   In performing his role of assisting the Board of Trustees in
holding the universities accountable to Board policies, the
President looks to the staff of the Division of Personnel and
Labor Relations to provide data, provide a conceptual framework,
and raise questions and issues which are useful to him in
fulfilling the requirements of the Board policy adopted November
4, 1994 which are relevant to personnel and labor relations.

Administrative Functions Occurring at Universities

As distinguished from the role of the system office, the role of the universities is provide educational programs. The administrative functions which occur on university campuses are accordingly directly related to the operational role of the universities.

The basic administrative activities of a university are delineated here. The location of those functions and activities within the organization varies from university to university. Their direct operational character contrasts with the administrative functions and activities of the system office.

1.   Office of the University President.

Leadership/Direction/Inspiration
Coordination within the University
Dispute Resolution
Development of Budget Request
Allocation of Appropriated Funds
Fund Raising/Development
Public Relations
Planning for the Future of the University
Relating to System Office and Trustees
Alumni Relations
Planning and Institutional Research
Enrollment Management
Community Relations
Marketing
Educational Programs (Credit, non-credit)
Student Support Programs
Living On-Campus
Recruitment, Admission and Graduation of Students
Co-Curriculum
Athletics

2.   Academic Administration

Hiring
Promotion/Tenure
Program Development and Planning and Assessment
Student Advisement/Academic Support
Budget Administration
Provision of Support Services
        Library
        Computer Services
        Museums/Field Stations, Etc.
Remediation Services
Internship and Practica Services
Career Planning and Placement
Contract and Grant Preparation and Administration

Service Learning
Faculty Development/Teaching Enhancement

3. Admissions/Financial Aid

Recruitment
Selection
Enrollment
Veterans' Affairs
Job Match/Student Employment
Scholarships
Deferments

4. Registrar/Course Scheduling/Facilities Scheduling

5. Student Support Services

Student Orientation
Student Development
Counseling
Student Support
International Student Services
Student Exchanges
Special Populations (Commuters)
Housing
Career Planning and Placement and Co-op Education
Student Programs/Clubs
Athletics (Varsity and Club)
Student Center
Student Discipline
Police
Health Services
Recreation and Intramurals

6. Finance

Development of Operating Budget
Development and Management of Campus
Development of Financial Plan in Support of
      Institutional Planning Initiatives
Purchasing/Payments
Billing/Accounts Receivable
Contract and Grant Administration
Budget Administration

7. Personnel

Employee Development
Affirmative Action
Legal Compliance
Labor Relations
Conflict Resolution
Retirement
Benefits

Hiring
Promotion/Tenure
Payroll/Personnel Records
Participation in Collective Bargaining and
     Contract Administration

8.   Facilities Development, Support, and Maintenance

Development and Oversight of Facilities and Master Plan
Development of Capital Budget
Grounds Keeping/Custodial
Repair and Preventive Maintenance
Minor Capital Projects
Parking
Public and Environmental Safety
ADA Compliance

9.   Community Service

Business Outreach
Facilities Utilization
Community Service (Student, Staff, Faculty)
Cultural Events
Economic Development

10. Auxiliary Enterprises

Contract Development and Administration
Bookstore
Food Service

Recommendations for Change

Recommended Changes for SCSU

Southern Connecticut State University has undertaken a number of administrative procedural and structural changes that support a more effective operation of the University's programs. Following is a summary list of such recent changes:

Reorganization of Fiscal Operations. The advent of the Financial Records System has provided an opportunity to modify SCSU's systems for tracking budgeted funds and their disbursement, and for monitoring expenditures on a current basis.

Director of Development. As proposed in the current strategic plan, Southern created and filled the position of Director of Development to provide systematic coordination and a higher focus on obtaining external private contributions to the University.

Reorganization of Academic and Administrative Computer Operations. Given the increased importance of academic use of computer resources, Southern moved the academic computer center into the division of academic affairs and sharpened its mission to support faculty and student users.

Creation of an Enrollment Management Coordination Structure. All offices charged with recruitment, admissions, advisement, financial aid, housing, registration, record-keeping and career planning have been integrated into an Enrollment Management Committee to assure effective coordination of efforts. Representatives from the faculty are also members of this committee. The position of Director of Admissions has been redefined as a Director of Admissions and Enrollment Management.

Establishment of Joint Faculty/Administrative Consultative Committees. Several key processes and services have been bolstered by the creation of standing committees drawing on faculty, administrators (and in several cases, students) to monitor performance, articulate needs, and investigate options. Included are:

a. Assessment Committee: Charged to carry out the state mandates for assessment of student outcomes and departmental effectiveness, its work schedule has produced numerous reports to fulfill its mandate, as well as spread skills in self-assessment to departments and faculty across the campus.

b. The Budget Committee reviews and advises on budget plans and consults on how to effect budgetary changes when required during a fiscal year.

c.   Educational Technology Advisory Committee: Drawing together campus support offices for educational technology and faculty and students who wish to use technologies, this group assesses institutional needs for the long run, monitors developments in the field and recommends a realistic development path.

d.   The Information Systems Advisory Committee, which includes administrative and faculty users of the administrative computing and telecommunications systems, promotes coordination of CSU's information systems at SCSU.

e.   The Research Advisory Committee recommends how research activities can be supported and can be used to reinforce Southern's primary commitment to instruction, and to monitor the effectiveness of offices that support research functions.

f.   The University Library Committee assesses needs of library patrons, monitors services, and recommends directions for future development and growth.

g.   Marketing Committee: An administrative coordination body, it reviews the University's plan for marketing itself and its services, including the oversight of advertising efforts.

Increased Professional Support for the Office of Academic Affairs. Functions previously performed by the director of the former Experimental College have been integrated into the new position of Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, who continues to coordinate a growing program in distance education and special projects, while assuming responsibility for oversight of accreditations, the grants office, and the office of institutional research.

Center for Early Adolescent Education. Southern's School of Education became the home of the Center for Early Adolescent Education, a public service consultative agency for Connecticut's middle school community which will also support our preservice and inservice teacher education mission.

SCSU is continuously reviewing its organizational arrangements to become more responsive to its mission and strategic goals. In addition to the recent changes outlined above, President Adanti is currently considering the following structural changes for the near future:

1. Consolidating additional enrollment management functions under the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

19

2. Consolidating media and educational technology support functions within Academic Affairs.

These functions are currently divided among several small offices. As technologies (voice, data, video) are integrated in new products and processes, it makes sense to provide instructional users with a single multifunctional support entity that can serve diverse and changing instructional uses.

3. Consolidating all course scheduling functions in one office.

Current practice, which assigns day, evening, and summer scheduling to different offices, is no longer cost effective.

4. Developing inter-departmental coordination for a "case management" approach to student advisement and support services.

The intent is to ensure that students seek and obtain timely and appropriate assistance in program selection, counseling, and placement. Improved retention rates and more satisfied graduates should result.

5. Reviewing the need for a number of University Assistants.

There is a potential for eliminating some University Assistant positions, in order to use the funds to establish permanent, full-time positions to provide for better delivery of services. A case-by-case analysis is necessary to determine cost-effectiveness.

6. Establishing a School of Communications, Information and Library Sciences.

Relocation of several departments in the current Schools of Arts and Sciences and Library Science and Instructional Technology can reinforce a campus climate for collaboration in several fields that are rapidly growing together in the world of practice and research.

Recommended Changes for WCSU

Since President Roach's appointment two years ago, the university has undertaken a number of changes to provide for better service and more efficient use of funds. This is particularly true in the area of University Assistants. A number of UA positions have been eliminated, and the funds associated with those positions used to establish permanent, full time positions.

-- In Security, UA positions were coalesced into two police dispatcher positions to make more efficient use of the funds and provide for additional safety.

-- In Graphics, UA positions were eliminated to establish a secretarial position to provide much-needed support for operations.

-- In Admissions and in the Career Development Center, UA positions were converted into added full-time staff, to improve service to students and to provide for student needs in internships and employment.

In addition, the University has recently received two consultants reports, which will result in recommendations to:

1. Restructure development efforts.

The Committee for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) reviewed and analyzed the development structure at the University and made recommendations which the University is in the process of implementing. The University will establish the position of Director of Institutional Advancement to further its efforts in fund raising and development. It will also establish a team approach to the public relations function of the University.

2. Restructure academic and administrative computing services.

A consultant team from IBM worked in collaboration with a University Technology Study Committee to broaden the University's long-range plan for information and technology. The recommendations of this university wide committee, in conjunction with the consultants, are currently under review. The University is developing an implementation plan targeting and identifying problem areas such as management and organizational structure, institutional policies and procedures, and training support and service, along with institutional funding. It is hoped that these recommendations will assist the University to develop the infrastructure necessary to exploit the many benefits of technology and provide the full range of services needed to support the many facets of information transfer.

3. Change the existing organizational structure.

A review of the existing organizational structure is underway and changes to this structure will be reflected in the University's spending plan currently being formulated.

Recommended Changes for CCSU

Beginning in 1986 when the hiring of a chief student affairs officer led to the re-organization of a student affairs division (after many years when the functions were dispersed across academic and administrative divisions) CCSU has embarked upon a series of major organization changes. These changes, in aggregate,

-- respond to the needs of students and other customers, both internal and external;

-- reduce administrative time and costs by streamlining organizational and reporting structures;

-- increase effectiveness and efficiency by bringing together similar administrative services, including the reallocation of functions across divisions;

-- permit the University to embark on new projects despite steady-state and declining budgets.

In addition, through lateral reassignments, internal promotions, and entry level hiring of new staff, the University has been able to create effective career ladders while reducing training time and other direct costs of staff transitions. This has allowed it to capture real savings from the two Early Retirement programs and other staff turnover.

The following significant organizational changes have occurred during the past five years:

Office of the President. Between 1990 and the present, several reporting changes, new titles, and redesigned positions have led to a more rational and effective administrative structure. These include the new titles for the chief student affairs officer (Vice President for Student Affairs) and the chief development and external relations officer (Vice President for University Affairs), and three transfers: Personnel to the Administrative Vice President, Athletics to the Student Affairs VP, and Planning and Institutional Research (including institutional assessment) to the Academic VP. At the same time, the heads of two offices of particular significance to the University's mission (International Development and Human Relations/Affirmative Action) now report directly to the President, hold the title of executive assistant, and participate on the President's Executive Committee.

Student Development Center. Established by the Student Affairs division in 1990, SDC is the umbrella for an array of services designed to help students utilize the extensive resources of the University to their best advantage. Focusing on key transition points in the university

experience, the Center includes Advising Information Services, Educational Support Services, and Placement and Career Services (including cooperative education). In 1993, the Academic Center for Student Athletes, which had formerly reported to the Academic Vice President, joined EOP and CONNCAP as part of the array of programs provided by Educational Support Services to help students improve their thinking and study skills while enhancing their ability to enter and complete a collegiate education.

Enrollment Services Division. As of September, 1993, the two former positions of Dean of Continuing Education and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs were combined into a single management position, Dean of Enrollment Services/Associate Academic Vice President, to whom reports Continuing Education (now known as the Enrollment Center and serving both full and part-time students); Undergraduate Admissions; Registrar; and Financial Aid, formerly part of the administrative affairs division. Overall, the division now employs a larger number of lower level administrators and fewer upper level administrators. This provides more direct services to students at a lower relative cost. In addition, scheduling is now handled in a single office, and service hours have been expanded to include most hours when classes are in session.

University Affairs and external outreach. CCSU has made a strategic investment in this division based on the critical importance of bringing together and strengthening alumni relations, press/public relations, governmental relations and development. The initial investment of personnel dollars, which had resulted from savings, cuts, and transfers in other divisions of the university, has already helped to stabilize the University's financial outlook while expanding its external support.

Sponsored research and development. Using administrative overhead recovered from funding agencies, the University has been able to establish an Office of Sponsored Programs which has in turn allowed it to step up its proposal writing activities, obtain new grants, and improve services to successful faculty and staff. This process has a multiplier effect when salary savings can be captured and reinvested into new positions or used to help support the base operations of the University.

Converting University Assistant positions to permanent part-time and full-time positions. During the past several years, CCSU has endeavored to convert continuing UA positions to regular staff positions and/or to move UAs into staff vacancies as they occur. Examples of success include converting UA positions in Enrollment Services, a UA position in Sponsored Programs, the Women's Center

Directorship, and UA positions in developmental and alumni affairs.

Although most organizational changes contemplated in the Strategic Plan covering 1992-97 have now been accomplished, the following new priorities have emerged:

1. Privatization.

As its ability to pay for overtime and hazardous assignments continues to decline, the University intends to continue its move toward private providers for such tasks as snow removal, hazardous waste disposal, and gutter replacements. These and related activities require specialized equipment and skills, so the University is aggressively seeking new ways to reduce its exposure. The goal is not only a cost reduction but also an improvement in quality.

2. Cogeneration.

In its quest to reduce costs, the University has identified cogeneration as an improvement which both eliminates an entire set of administrative problems and saves money. The time devoted to turning the boilers on and off, scheduling repairs, and negotiating with Northeast Utilities and others is enormous, and the possibility of diverting some of this energy to other areas is very attractive.

3. Computer Operations.

At the present time only a portion of the campus is on the VAX network. The University's goal is to complete the network, which where fully operational has significantly cut down on the paper flow on campus. Among other things, this project involves an approach to computing which ignores the artificial distinction between academic and administrative computing, and which treats the entire operation as a utility.

4. Consider the merger of admissions and records functions within the Enrollment Services Division.

Staff changes and a director's level vacancy permit the University to study best practices nationwide so that it can further refine its enrollment services.

5. "Institutionalize" enrollment management.

With the establishment of nine cross-functional and cross-divisional subcommittees as advisory to TEAM, the enrollment management group, the University has begun to increase participation of colleagues in improving CCSU, solving problems near the sources, and get better at what it does by making better use of the talent that makes up the University community. The current subcommittees are: Admission/recruitment, Advising,

Retention, Data Collection/Research, Finance, Minority Recruitment/Retention/Graduation, Orientation/Registration, Publications, and International Students Recruitment/Retention/Graduation. Most include students and all cut across organizational and divisional lines. The structure is flexible and some subcommittees will emerge or complete their work as areas of concern change.

6. Establish an Office of Prevention and Counseling.

This office will merge Personal Counseling Services and the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention. Having successfully applied for a large federal grant, the University now finds it possible to merge these two offices, utilize salary savings to hire a second full-time counselor, and provide more services to students which focus on wellness.

7. Implement formal institutional assessment within administrative offices across the University.

Although the University has collected information about organizational effectiveness as part of its surveys of graduating seniors and during various TQM projects, it has not yet adopted a formal assessment model for its administrative processes.

8. Continue to review each staff vacancy.

The University will continue to review each vacancy as it emerges to confirm the need for the position, appropriate rank, reporting structure, and task assignments, and seek savings and/or process improvements whenever possible.

Recommended Changes for ECSU

As part of an ongoing examination of the administrative structure at the University, the following changes have been implemented during the Carter Presidency:

-- In Fall 1988, the graduate registration and cashiering functions, along with one employee, were transfereed to the registrar's office thus eliminating dual operations. In addition, one classified position was eliminated.

-- In Fall 1988, records of students in educational certification programs were transferred from the graduate office to the registrar's office.

-- In Fall 1988, Campus Police was transferred from the Office of Student Affairs to the Office of Finance and Administration.

-- In Spring 1989, President Carter approved a reorganization in academic affairs which consolidated the separate departments of art and music into a single Department of Fine Arts consisting of art, music, dance, and theater.

-- In Spring 1989, the admissions and records functions were separated under two different directors and the University began the process of developing a program, currently ongoing, in enrollment management.

-- In Summer 1990, guidelines were approved by President Carter which reorganized the administration of varsity athletics, club athletics, and recreational programs as separate entities apart from the Department of Health and Physical Education.

-- Between Fall 1993 and Spring 1994, the Day Care Training Operation was eliminated and existing personnel were transferred to cover vacant positions in the following areas:

Director	Graduate Office
Secretary	Registrar's Office
Trainer	Academic Advisement Center
Trainer	Student Support Services
Trainer	Position Eliminated

-- In Fall 1994, academic affairs was reorganized with two changes: (1) the single Department of Economics and Management Science was split into separate departments of Business and Economics, respectively, and (2) the School of Professional Studies was changed to the School of Education and Professional Studies.

-- Also in the same semester, the single Department of Health and Physical Education was split into separate departments of Health and Physical Education and Athletics, respectively.

27

While the 1990 action separated the control of athletics from the academic department, the 1994 separation accomplished the actual transfer of coaching personnel into a separate department.

The following changes are currently under consideration at this time:

1. Consolidate functions into a University Relations Division.

The University is currently searching for a Director of University Relations to head up a new division which will consolidate the currently separate functions of Public Relations (President's Office), Publications (Institutional Advancement), Sports Information (Athletic Office), Duplicating Services (Personnel Administration), Graphics (Media Services), and Marketing. The intention of this reorganization is to stabilize the University's marketing and image efforts, cut costs, and develop a more efficient and timely mechanism for projecting the University to its public.

2. Coordinate non-credit programs.

Currently, the University has a position in the Finance and Administrative Affairs area which coordinates off-campus facilities use along with summer camps. This position is being transferred to the Office of the Dean of Continuing Education and expanded greatly to include responsibilities in all non-credit programs offered by the University. The intention of this change is to increase those programs which attract funds for the University while also providing needed programs and services to the community.

3. Expand Academic Computing services.

A currently vacant position in the data center is being reclassified to provide evening services to students and faculty in academic computing, including the monitoring of laboratories. This change will increase from one to three the number of professionals assigned to direct academic computing services in the past 12 months.

4. Continue to monitor the use of University Assistants.

The University continues to monitor its use of University Assistants to insure that only needed services are being funded.

5. Expand admissions efforts.

The University is in the process of establishing an additional admissions recruiting position to assist in attracting more students particularly from out of state. A special emphasis of this position will be athletic recruiting.

6. Improve administrative support for Academic Deans.

The University has also set a goal of insuring that each academic dean be provided with a position at the assistant or associate dean level. Currently, only the Dean of Continuing Education has a filled position of this type. The purpose is to remove the deans from day-to-day office responsibilities and permit them to spend more time on policy formation, grant pursuit, fund raising, and expanding national and regional contacts.

Recommended Changes for the System Office

The system office has conducted a functional review of every position in the system office. It examined what every staff member does and how his or her work contributes to the system office and to the university system in general.

Since 1988, the number of positions in the system office which are devoted to staff work in support of the President of the system and the Board of Trustees has decreased from 30 to 26. In response to its concern for cost-effectiveness and efficiency, to the lack of growth in state appropriations since 1988, to the work of the Thomas and Harper-Hull commissions, to the continuing review of the General Assembly, and to the general public concern for careful stewardship of scarce resources, the system office has been prudent in its staffing patterns. This history is important background for the current study.

In its review of the system office study, the committee has NOT found that there is a surplus of staff in the system office. It has NOT found that there are staff members with nothing to do but busy work. In short, it has NOT found that there are major cost reductions to be found by cutting staff positions which do not contribute to the advancement of the CSU system.

Instead, the study has identified areas where staff time can be reallocated to more important activities that heretofore have not been possible to do. The overall result of the study which has been completed has been

(1) to rethink the duties of every position, and update the job descriptions to reflect new duties,

(2) to eliminate some functions, by prioritizing what activities the office had been engaged in, and eliminating those of lowest priority, and

(3) to redraw the table of organization, providing for more direct reporting responsibilities, and reallocating functions between divisions.

Recommended Changes

1. Transfer the collection of student loans back to the universities.

Because there is duplicate entry of data at the system office and at the universities, because there are other duplicated efforts and activities, and because there are other inefficiencies which are caused by lack of easy access in the system office to information available at each university, it seems appropriate to return this function to the universities,

where it could be combined with other functions in the university business office, working in coordination with the financial aid office and the registrar.

Staff members currently employed in this function would be transferred to appropriate locations at the universities in an orderly fashion. Probably one full-time and possibly one part-time position at each university would be required.

2. Merge "university relations" with the Division of the system office president.

Currently, two positions exist in a de facto office of university relations. In many respects, however, their activities overlap with the functions of governmental relations and board activities. It makes sense to integrate all of these functions together in the division of the president, responsible for public relations, governmental relations, board activities, and institutional advancement.

3. Create a position to be responsible for implementing quality management, and to help improve operations in the system office.

Members of the system office staff have observed the need of an "in-house administrator" at a high level to manage the day-to-day office operations. Part of the duties of this position will involve changing processes and procedures of interaction: in the jargon of quality management, to supervise process improvement. This person will also help to review processes to determine if they continue to be needed. In an age of global competitiveness, it is essential that there be demonstrated commitment to the principles of quality achievement at the core of any organization. Unless there is such a sustained commitment in this university administration, CSU will have difficulty in persuading private donors and public funders alike that it deserves financial support.

The position can be funded for the remainder of Fiscal Year 1994-95 through grant funds, which GTE Corporation has recently agreed to provide, and savings generated by turnover. In addition, Xerox Corporation will provide mentoring services for benchmarking best administrative practices nationwide by a team of system office staff, to be coordinated through this position.

4. Devote more time and emphasis to strategic planning.

Strategic planning should be integrated with accountability and assessment studies and institutional research, as well as with benchmarking best practices.

5. Eliminate activities which produce little or no added value, and/or are perfunctory in nature.

Among those activities are the drafting of resolutions for the Board of Trustees which accept gifts to the universities of comparatively small amounts, as well as the development of media reports for the Board of Trustees.

6. Study the appropriate model [centralized or decentralized] for administrative data processing.

The RFP for the outside consultant has been released (copy attached). The study should be completed by April or May.

7. Reserve a designated amount for training each year.

Higher quality work will result if staff members receive up-to-date training.

8. Continue reviewing the procedures of the system office to identify and implement needed process improvements.

This recommendation is not meant to suggest that formal "cost studies" continue _ad_ _infinitum_. Rather, it reflects the fact that the system office is always striving to enhance its quality of service. As the system plans for the future, particularly in a world which is constantly changing, good management requires that it will continue to evaluate and implement ways in which it can improve, and to analyze whether all of its activities in fact provide value to its customers.

Comparison of System Office Expenditures

for

All System Offices in the U.S.

	1993 Headcount	1993 FTE	System Office	$/Headcount	$/FTE	
U. of Alabama System	43,625	34,046	$ 5,400,000	$ 123.78	$ 158.61	
U. of Alaska System	33,087	16,555	$ 21,002,000	$ 634.75	$ 1,268.62	
Arizona Bd of Regents	99,841	85,807	$ 11,400,000	$ 114.18	$ 132.86	
U. of Arkansas System	34,007	27,541	$ 1,873,760	$ 55.10	$ 68.04	
Cal. State Univ System	325,639	247,512	$ 165,397,035	$ 507.92	$ 668.24	
U. of Cal System	165,804	154,189	$ 256,889,000	$ 1,549.35	$ 1,666.07	
U. of Colo System	43,719	14,171	$ 4,179,000	$ 95.59	$ 294.90	
State Colleges in Colo	26,429	9,914	$ 892,377	$ 33.77	$ 90.01	
Conn State Univ System	35,111	23,110	$ 3,079,050	$ 87.69	$ 133.23	FY 1994-95
State Univ System of Fla	188,928	132,666	$ 12,886,955	$ 68.21	$ 97.14	
Univ System of Georgia	203,369	163,962	$ 5,153,000	$ 25.34	$ 31.43	
U of Hawaii System	50,229	34,011	$ 14,900,000	$ 296.64	$ 438.09	
Idaho State Bd of Ed	40,846	30,172	$ 158,400	$ 3.88	$ 5.25	
Ill Bd of Govs Univs	49,638	36,206	$ 2,346,800	$ 47.28	$ 64.82	
Ill Bd. of Regents	48,238	38,417	$ 1,359,400	$ 28.18	$ 35.39	
Southern Ill Univ System	35,144	28,121	$ 13,972,359	$ 397.57	$ 496.87	
U. of Ill System	61,606	60,763	$ 102,855,000	$ 1,669.56	$ 1,692.72	
Iowa Bd of Regents	64,880	56,771	$ 1,149,429	$ 17.72	$ 20.25	
Kansas Bd of Regents	82,909	68,193	$ 1,201,703	$ 14.49	$ 17.62	
Louisiana State U System	54,711	42,685	$ 1,520,047	$ 27.78	$ 35.63	
Louisiana State Coll & Un	100,254	81,956	$ 908,158	$ 9.06	$ 11.08	
Southern Univ System	15,041	13,290	$ 851,870	$ 56.64	$ 64.10	
U of Maine System	31,661	21,504	$ 6,306,349	$ 199.18	$ 293.26	
U of Maryland System	105,935	76,014	$ 8,753,076	$ 82.63	$ 115.15	
U. of Mass System	157,172	45,228	$ 10,779,200	$ 68.58	$ 238.33	
Mass Higher Ed Coord Co	176,982	121,259	$ 1,756,314	$ 9.92	$ 14.48	See Note Below
Minn State Univ System	57,354	47,636	$ 9,267,543	$ 161.58	$ 194.55	
Miss Pub Univ System	53,649	48,681	$ 2,975,868	$ 55.47	$ 61.13	
U. of Missouri System	53,175	38,033	$ 16,644,352	$ 313.01	$ 437.63	
Montana Univ System	33,056	28,434	$ 10,774,449	$ 325.95	$ 378.93	
Univ of Nebraska System	51,138	40,919	$ 3,601,951	$ 70.44	$ 88.03	
Nebraska State Coll Sys	8,930	6,564	$ 420,661	$ 47.11	$ 64.09	
Univ & CC System of Nev	65,124	35,619	$ 1,863,053	$ 28.61	$ 52.31	
Univ System of New Hamp	26,124	22,225	$ 3,891,000	$ 148.94	$ 175.07	See Note Below
CUNY	207,567	151,628		$ -	$ -	
SUNY	397,637	297,134	$ 86,690,000	$ 218.01	$ 291.75	
U of No Carolina System	150,199	132,099		$ -	$ -	
No Dakota Univ System	35,453	29,555		$ -	$ -	
Oreg State System	59,545	50,413	$ 17,134,692	$ 287.76	$ 339.89	
State System of Penn	95,962	85,724	$ 5,787,220	$ 60.31	$ 67.51	
South Dakota Bd of Regen	29,398	23,960	$ 977,094	$ 33.24	$ 40.78	
Tenn Bd of Regents	150,959	104,697	$ 5,192,300	$ 34.40	$ 49.59	
U of Tenn System	42,383	35,433		$ -	$ -	
Lamar Univ System	14,631	9,505	$ 1,051,422	$ 71.86	$ 110.62	
Texas A&M System	75,593	59,093	$ 19,745,153	$ 261.20	$ 334.14	
U. of Houston System	47,916	33,974	$ 15,300,000	$ 319.31	$ 450.34	
Texas State Univ System	46,694	33,043	$ 749,722	$ 16.06	$ 22.69	
U of Texas System	151,829	114,189	$ 26,653,386	$ 175.55	$ 233.41	
Utah Higher Ed System	103,633	75,805		$ -	$ -	
Vermont State Colleges	10,384	6,622	$ 3,205,000	$ 308.65	$ 483.99	
State Coll System of WVa	33,598	26,308	$ 411,356	$ 12.24	$ 15.64	
U System of WVa	43,890	34,425	$ 492,116	$ 11.21	$ 14.30	
U of Wisc System	154,620	127,056	$ 16,224,887	$ 104.93	$ 127.70	See Note Below

Expenditures for the Connecticut State University system office are actual figures for 1994-95.

Note: System office expenditures for the designated systems taken from DHE report of Feb. 3, 1994.

The source of all other data is:

National Association of System Heads, Multi-Campus Systems of Public Higher Education in the United States:1994, September, 1994.

	1993 Headcount	1993 FTE	System Office	$/Headcount	$/FTE	
U. of Ill System	61,606	60,763	$ 102,855,000	$ 1,669.56	$ 1,692.72	
U. of Cal System	165,804	154,189	$ 256,889,000	$ 1,549.35	$ 1,666.07	
U. of Alaska System	33,087	16,555	$ 21,002,000	$ 634.75	$ 1,268.62	
Cal. State Univ System	325,639	247,512	$ 165,397,035	$ 507.92	$ 668.24	
Southern Ill Univ System	35,144	28,121	$ 13,972,359	$ 397.57	$ 496.87	
Vermont State Colleges	10,384	6,622	$ 3,205,000	$ 308.65	$ 483.99	
U. of Houston System	47,916	33,974	$ 15,300,000	$ 319.31	$ 450.34	
U of Hawaii System	50,229	34,011	$ 14,900,000	$ 296.64	$ 438.09	
U. of Missouri System	53,175	38,033	$ 16,644,352	$ 313.01	$ 437.63	
Montana Univ System	33,056	28,434	$ 10,774,449	$ 325.95	$ 378.93	
Oreg State System	59,545	50,413	$ 17,134,692	$ 287.76	$ 339.89	
Texas A&M System	75,593	59,093	$ 19,745,153	$ 261.20	$ 334.14	
U. of Colo System	43,719	14,171	$ 4,179,000	$ 95.59	$ 294.90	
U of Maine System	31,661	21,504	$ 6,306,349	$ 199.18	$ 293.26	
SUNY	397,637	297,134	$ 86,690,000	$ 218.01	$ 291.75	
U. of Mass System	157,172	45,228	$ 10,779,200	$ 68.58	$ 238.33	
U of Texas System	151,829	114,189	$ 26,653,386	$ 175.55	$ 233.41	
Minn State Univ System	57,354	47,636	$ 9,267,543	$ 161.58	$ 194.55	
Univ System of New Hamp	26,124	22,225	$ 3,891,000	$ 148.94	$ 175.07	See Note Page 34
U. of Alabama System	43,625	34,046	$ 5,400,000	$ 123.78	$ 158.61	
Conn State Univ System	35,111	23,110	$ 3,079,050	$ 87.69	$ 133.23	FY 1994-95
Arizona Bd of Regents	99,841	85,807	$ 11,400,000	$ 114.18	$ 132.86	
U of Wisc System	154,620	127,056	$ 16,224,887	$ 104.93	$ 127.70	See Note Page 34
U of Maryland System	105,935	76,014	$ 8,753,076	$ 82.63	$ 115.15	
Lamar Univ System	14,631	9,505	$ 1,051,422	$ 71.86	$ 110.62	
State Univ System of Fla	188,928	132,666	$ 12,886,955	$ 68.21	$ 97.14	
State Colleges in Colo	26,429	9,914	$ 892,377	$ 33.77	$ 90.01	
Univ of Nebraska System	51,138	40,919	$ 3,601,951	$ 70.44	$ 88.03	
U. of Arkansas System	34,007	27,541	$ 1,873,760	$ 55.10	$ 68.04	
State System of Penn	95,962	85,724	$ 5,787,220	$ 60.31	$ 67.51	
Ill Bd of Govs Univs	49,638	36,206	$ 2,346,800	$ 47.28	$ 64.82	
Southern Univ System	15,041	13,290	$ 851,870	$ 56.64	$ 64.10	
Nebraska State Coll Sys	8,930	6,564	$ 420,661	$ 47.11	$ 64.09	
Miss Pub Univ System	53,649	48,681	$ 2,975,868	$ 55.47	$ 61.13	
Univ & CC System of Nev	65,124	35,619	$ 1,863,053	$ 28.61	$ 52.31	
Tenn Bd of Regents	150,959	104,697	$ 5,192,300	$ 34.40	$ 49.59	
South Dakota Bd of Regen	29,398	23,960	$ 977,094	$ 33.24	$ 40.78	
Louisiana State U System	54,711	42,665	$ 1,520,047	$ 27.78	$ 35.63	
Ill Bd. of Regents	48,238	38,417	$ 1,359,400	$ 28.18	$ 35.39	
Univ System of Georgia	203,369	163,962	$ 5,153,000	$ 25.34	$ 31.43	
Texas State Univ System	46,694	33,043	$ 749,722	$ 16.06	$ 22.69	
Iowa Bd of Regents	64,880	56,771	$ 1,149,429	$ 17.72	$ 20.25	
Kansas Bd of Regents	82,909	68,193	$ 1,201,703	$ 14.49	$ 17.62	
State Coll System of WVa	33,598	26,308	$ 411,356	$ 12.24	$ 15.64	
Mass Higher Ed Coord Co	176,982	121,259	$ 1,756,314	$ 9.92	$ 14.48	See Note Page 34
U System of WVa	43,890	34,425	$ 492,116	$ 11.21	$ 14.30	
Louisiana State Coll & Un	100,254	81,956	$ 908,158	$ 9.06	$ 11.08	
Idaho State Bd of Ed	40,846	30,172	$ 158,400	$ 3.88	$ 5.25	
CUNY	207,567	151,628		$ -	$ -	
U of No Carolina System	150,199	132,099		$ -	$ -	
No Dakota Univ System	35,453	29,555		$ -	$ -	
U of Tenn System	42,383	35,433		$ -	$ -	
Utah Higher Ed System	103,633	75,805		$ -	$ -	
			Avg. $/FTE where data exist:		$ 253.88	
			Avg. $/FTE excluding top 5 & bottom 5:		$ 166.66	
			Avg. $/FTE excluding top 10 & bottom 10:		$ 143.45	

	1993 Headcount	1993 FTE	System Office	$/Headcount	$/FTE	
U. of Ill System	61,606	60,763	$ 102,855,000	$ 1,669.56	$ 1,692.72	
U. of Cal System	165,804	154,189	$ 256,889,000	$ 1,549.35	$ 1,666.07	
U. of Alaska System	33,087	16,555	$ 21,002,000	$ 634.75	$ 1,268.62	
Cal. State Univ System	325,639	247,512	$ 165,397,035	$ 507.92	$ 668.24	
Southern Ill Univ System	35,144	28,121	$ 13,972,359	$ 397.57	$ 496.87	
Montana Univ System	33,056	28,434	$ 10,774,449	$ 325.95	$ 378.93	
U. of Houston System	47,916	33,974	$ 15,300,000	$ 319.31	$ 450.34	
U. of Missouri System	53,175	38,033	$ 16,644,352	$ 313.01	$ 437.63	
Vermont State Colleges	10,384	6,622	$ 3,205,000	$ 308.65	$ 483.99	
U of Hawaii System	50,229	34,011	$ 14,900,000	$ 296.64	$ 438.09	
Oreg State System	59,545	50,413	$ 17,134,692	$ 287.76	$ 339.89	
Texas A&M System	75,593	59,093	$ 19,745,153	$ 261.20	$ 334.14	
SUNY	397,637	297,134	$ 86,690,000	$ 218.01	$ 291.75	
U of Maine System	31,661	21,504	$ 6,306,349	$ 199.18	$ 293.26	
U of Texas System	151,829	114,189	$ 26,653,386	$ 175.55	$ 233.41	
Minn State Univ System	57,354	47,636	$ 9,267,543	$ 161.58	$ 194.55	
Univ System of New Hamp	26,124	22,225	$ 3,891,000	$ 148.94	$ 175.07	See Note Page 34
U. of Alabama System	43,625	34,046	$ 5,400,000	$ 123.78	$ 158.61	
Arizona Bd of Regents	99,841	85,807	$ 11,400,000	$ 114.18	$ 132.86	
U of Wisc System	154,620	127,056	$ 16,224,887	$ 104.93	$ 127.70	See Note Page 34
U. of Colo System	43,719	14,171	$ 4,179,000	$ 95.59	$ 294.90	
Conn State Univ System	**35,111**	**23,110**	**$ 3,079,050**	**$ 87.69**	**$ 133.23**	**FY 1994-95**
U of Maryland System	105,935	76,014	$ 8,753,076	$ 82.63	$ 115.15	
Lamar Univ System	14,631	9,505	$ 1,051,422	$ 71.86	$ 110.62	
Univ of Nebraska System	51,138	40,919	$ 3,601,951	$ 70.44	$ 88.03	
U. of Mass System	157,172	45,228	$ 10,779,200	$ 68.58	$ 238.33	
State Univ System of Fla	188,928	132,666	$ 12,886,955	$ 68.21	$ 97.14	
State System of Penn	95,962	85,724	$ 5,787,220	$ 60.31	$ 67.51	
Southern Univ System	15,041	13,290	$ 851,870	$ 56.64	$ 64.10	
Miss Pub Univ System	53,649	48,681	$ 2,975,868	$ 55.47	$ 61.13	
U. of Arkansas System	34,007	27,541	$ 1,873,760	$ 55.10	$ 68.04	
Ill Bd of Govs Univs	49,638	36,206	$ 2,346,800	$ 47.28	$ 64.82	
Nebraska State Coll Sys	8,930	6,564	$ 420,661	$ 47.11	$ 64.09	
Tenn Bd of Regents	150,959	104,697	$ 5,192,300	$ 34.40	$ 49.59	
State Colleges in Colo	26,429	9,914	$ 892,377	$ 33.77	$ 90.01	
South Dakota Bd of Regent	29,398	23,960	$ 977,094	$ 33.24	$ 40.78	
Univ & CC System of Nev	65,124	35,619	$ 1,863,053	$ 28.61	$ 52.31	
Ill Bd. of Regents	48,238	38,417	$ 1,359,400	$ 28.18	$ 35.39	
Louisiana State U System	54,711	42,665	$ 1,520,047	$ 27.78	$ 35.63	
Univ System of Georgia	203,369	163,962	$ 5,153,000	$ 25.34	$ 31.43	
Iowa Bd of Regents	64,880	56,771	$ 1,149,429	$ 17.72	$ 20.25	
Texas State Univ System	46,694	33,043	$ 749,722	$ 16.06	$ 22.69	
Kansas Bd of Regents	82,909	68,193	$ 1,201,703	$ 14.49	$ 17.62	
State Coll System of WVa	33,598	26,308	$ 411,356	$ 12.24	$ 15.64	
U System of WVa	43,890	34,425	$ 492,116	$ 11.21	$ 14.30	
Mass Higher Ed Coord Co	176,982	121,259	$ 1,756,314	$ 9.92	$ 14.48	See Note Page 34
Louisiana State Coll & Un	100,254	81,956	$ 908,158	$ 9.06	$ 11.08	
Idaho State Bd of Ed	40,846	30,172	$ 158,400	$ 3.88	$ 5.25	
CUNY	207,567	151,628		$ -	$ -	
U of No Carolina System	150,199	132,099		$ -	$ -	
No Dakota Univ System	35,453	29,555		$ -	$ -	
U of Tenn System	42,383	35,433		$ -	$ -	
Utah Higher Ed System	103,633	75,805		$ -	$ -	
		Avg. $/Headcount where data exist:		$ 193.55		
		Avg. $/Headcount excluding top 5 & bottom 5:		$ 118.03		
		Avg. $/Headcount excluding top 10 & bottom 10:		$ 100.72		

	1993 Headcount	1993 FTE	System Office	Total System Exps. (excl. hospitals)	System Office % of Total System Exps.	
Cal. State Univ System	325,639	247,512	$ 165,397,035	$ 2,208,488,091	7.49%	
U. of Ill System	61,606	60,763	$ 102,855,000	$ 1,658,529,000	6.20%	
U. of Alaska System	33,087	16,555	$ 21,002,000	$ 386,079,000	5.44%	
U. of Cal System	165,804	154,189	$ 256,889,000	$ 5,253,006,000	4.89%	(excl. hosps)
Vermont State Colleges	10,384	6,622	$ 3,205,000	$ 72,763,200	4.40%	
Minn State Univ System	57,354	47,636	$ 9,267,543	$ 280,815,593	3.30%	
U. of Houston System	47,916	33,974	$ 15,300,000	$ 468,500,000	3.27%	
U of Hawaii System	50,229	34,011	$ 14,900,000	$ 476,688,883	3.13%	
Southern Ill Univ System	35,144	28,121	$ 13,972,359	$ 472,662,687	2.96%	
Montana Univ System	33,056	28,434	$ 10,774,449	$ 426,330,660	2.53%	
SUNY	397,637	297,134	$ 86,690,000	$ 4,043,820,000	2.14%	(excl. hosps)
Oreg State System	59,545	50,413	$ 17,134,692	$ 828,126,637	2.07%	(excl. hosps)
U. of Missouri System	53,175	38,033	$ 16,644,352	$ 830,038,922	2.01%	(excl. hosps)
Univ System of New Hamp	26,124	22,225	$ 3,891,000	$ 197,273,887	1.97%	**
U of Texas System	151,829	114,189	$ 26,653,386	$ 1,380,124,988	1.93%	(excl. hosps)
U of Maine System	31,661	21,504	$ 6,306,349	$ 334,879,558	1.88%	
Texas A&M System	75,593	59,093	$ 19,745,153	$ 1,199,216,965	1.65%	
U. of Mass System	157,172	45,228	$ 10,779,200	$ 737,494,135	1.46%	(excl. hosps)
U. of Colo System	43,719	14,171	$ 4,179,000	$ 301,919,000	1.38%	(excl. hosps)
Conn State Univ System	35,111	23,110	$ 3,079,050	$ 234,779,222	1.31%	FY 1994-95
Lamar Univ System	14,631	9,505	$ 1,051,422	$ 84,661,750	1.24%	
Southern Univ System	15,041	13,290	$ 851,870	$ 84,360,359	1.01%	
State Colleges in Colo	26,429	9,914	$ 892,377	$ 90,837,094	0.98%	
Nebraska State Coll Sys	8,930	6,564	$ 420,661	$ 45,848,776	0.92%	
Arizona Bd of Regents	99,841	85,807	$ 11,400,000	$ 1,345,000,000	0.85%	
State System of Penn	95,962	85,724	$ 5,787,220	$ 713,450,922	0.81%	
U of Wisc System	154,620	127,056	$ 16,224,887	$ 2,163,673,688	0.75%	** (excl. hosps)
Univ & CC System of Nev	65,124	35,619	$ 1,863,053	$ 254,799,510	0.73%	
U. of Alabama System	43,625	34,046	$ 5,400,000	$ 764,155,763	0.71%	(excl. hosps)
Ill Bd of Govs Univs	49,638	36,206	$ 2,346,800	$ 361,045,300	0.65%	
Univ of Nebraska System	51,138	40,919	$ 3,601,951	$ 605,365,128	0.60%	(excl. hosps)
U. of Arkansas System	34,007	27,541	$ 1,873,760	$ 314,960,487	0.59%	(excl. hosps)
U of Maryland System	105,935	76,014	$ 8,753,076	$ 1,475,057,078	0.59%	
Tenn Bd of Regents	150,959	104,697	$ 5,192,300	$ 977,417,522	0.53%	
State Univ System of Fla	188,928	132,666	$ 12,886,955	$ 2,466,218,920	0.52%	
Miss Pub Univ System	53,649	48,681	$ 2,975,868	$ 791,510,362	0.38%	(excl. hosps)
South Dakota Bd of Regent	29,398	23,960	$ 977,094	$ 277,422,860	0.35%	
Ill Bd. of Regents	48,238	38,417	$ 1,359,400	$ 413,346,700	0.33%	
Univ System of Georgia	203,369	163,962	$ 5,153,000	$ 1,775,833,000	0.29%	(excl. hosps)
Texas State Univ System	46,694	33,043	$ 749,722	$ 260,551,411	0.29%	
Louisiana State U System	54,711	42,665	$ 1,520,047	$ 597,261,454	0.25%	(excl. hosps)
Mass Higher Ed Coord Co	176,982	121,259	$ 1,756,314	$ 764,185,788	0.23%	**
State Coll System of WVa	33,598	26,308	$ 411,356	$ 184,821,667	0.22%	
Louisiana State Coll & Un	100,254	81,956	$ 908,158	$ 486,459,911	0.19%	
Kansas Bd of Regents	82,909	68,193	$ 1,201,703	$ 775,472,285	0.15%	(excl. hosps)
U System of WVa	43,890	34,425	$ 492,116	$ 549,344,917	0.09%	
Idaho State Bd of Ed	40,846	30,172	$ 158,400	$ 193,373,300	0.08%	
Iowa Bd of Regents	64,880	56,771	$ 1,149,429	$ 1,446,143,727	0.08%	(excl. hosps)
CUNY	207,567	151,628		$ 1,115,217,700	0.00%	
U of No Carolina System	150,199	132,099		$ 2,377,602,000	0.00%	(excl. hosps)
No Dakota Univ System	35,453	29,555		$ 421,775,972	0.00%	
U of Tenn System	42,383	35,433		$ 522,145,808	0.00%	
Utah Higher Ed System	103,633	75,805		$ 1,101,057,000	0.00%	
				Avg. % where data exist:	1.58%	
** System Office Exps. from DHE Report of February 3, 1994						
				Avg. % excluding top 5 and bottom 5:	1.23%	
				Avg. % excluding top 10 and bottom 10:	1.08%	