September 22, 2011

To: Dr. Barbara Couture, President
    New Mexico State University

From: Garrey Carruthers, Ph.D.
      Chairman
      Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee

Subject: Second Report

The attached is the Second Report of the Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee, representing the work of the committee for the spring semester of 2011. I am tardy with this report in that we had asked for but did not receive the recent peer review of Library operations but we have reason to believe that many of our recommendations were also covered in that report.

The major projects selected by the Committee for this report include:

- Institutional Research
- Funding Athletics
- The Research Process
- Library Operations, and
- Sustainable Purchasing Practices

The recommendations of each of the subcommittees are included in the attachment and are highlighted in Aggie Crimson. The major recommendations that we would call your attention to include:

- Establish Institutional Research as a priority for NMSU with "strong support and clear direction from executive administration." Several more specific recommendations for realizing this aspiration are included in the report.
- Recognizing that a consultant has been hired and a task force formed to address athletics financial issues, the subcommittee recommends revisiting this issue in the spring of 2012, to assess the consultant/task force recommendations and establish timelines for implementation. One specific recommendation which should be advanced through the appropriate process is that "NMSU should take steps necessary to sell beer and wine at certain athletic events". The subcommittee advocates that NMSU acquire a beer and wine license for the Pan
American Center. A list of WAC schools who have beer and wine sales are included in the report.

- The subcommittee on the research process availed themselves of the services of the Education Advisory Board to determine best practices for managing the research process. They recommend that you appoint a committee to evaluate the adoption of either the hybrid or integrated model and also suggest a reorganization of the VPR office to consolidate pre and post award functions in that office and, perhaps, to streamline the VPR office by assigning the WRRI, Space Grant, and Molecular Biology activities to an appropriate home college. In that these issues have been around since Abraham Lincoln was President, it is highly recommended that the evaluation process have serious deadlines for reporting back to you.

- The Library subcommittee recommends continued efforts to develop regional relationships to reduce the cost of acquisitions and to move quickly to digitized, searchable documents.

- The Sustainable Purchasing subcommittee recommends that NMSU Purchasing develop a policy that all computers purchased be “Energy Star” rated and that the policy require that NMSU units “consult and deploy where possible” the energy efficiency of all utilities.

The Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee will soon be selecting the topics for next semester and welcome your nominations. I have already commissioned the Education Advisory Board to evaluate best practices for employing differential tuition as a tool for paying for more expensive programs.

The Committee would also seek your attendance at a near term meeting to discuss progress on our original recommendations for efficiency and effectiveness.
NMSU Efficiency & Effectiveness Committee

September 2011

Recommendations
Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee
Team Members
And
Selected Priority Projects
2011 Spring Semester

Team Research and Report Development Process:
• Determine Problem Situation
• Literature search for best practices form any information source
• Develop NMSU’s opportunities for improvement (OFI)
• Develop actionable options to include dollar impact, cost/benefit analysis, and pro and con statements for each option
• Prioritize Team’s recommendation and outline continuous quality improvement (CQI) method to assess effectiveness of the recommendations

Teams and Projects:
• Institutional Research – Team Lead, Angela Throneberry
  o Jim Peach
  o Don Beasley

• Athletics - Team Lead, Shari Jones
  o Roseanne Bensley
  o Travis Dulany

• Research Process – Team Lead, Ricardo Jacquez
  o Wendy Wilkins
  o Ben Woods
  o Garrey Carruthers

• Library – Team Lead, Gary Rayson
  o Betsy Cahill
  o Cheri Jimeno
  o Keisto Lucero

• Sustainable Purchasing – Team Lead, Glen Haubold
  o Clay Doyle
Institutional Research Team Recommendations
**Topic:**
Institutional Research

**Problem Situation:**
Data and analysis provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Outcomes Assessment (Office of Institutional Analysis - IA) are critical to the efficiency and effectiveness of NMSU’s core missions. Two questions about the effectiveness and efficiency of IA are obvious. First, are the necessary data and analysis being provided in a high quality and timely fashion? Second, are the resources devoted to the Institutional Research process optimal?

**Best Practices:**
Research conducted by the committee revealed a variety of organizational structures and staffing levels among higher education institutions for the IA related functions but some consistencies or overarching factors were noted. The best practices identified contained many similarities to recommendations from committees previously established to review and evaluate NMSU’s information and collection processes.

- Collection, dissemination and analysis must be an institutional priority
- Clearly defined and established roles and responsibilities
- Centralization of data reporting responsibilities
- Assigned authority and responsibility for data integrity
- Provide timely and useful information for campus decision-making
- Accessibility of information and support to meet reporting and analysis needs of departments, units and committees

**Opportunities for Improvement, to include options with benefit cost analysis and/or dollar impact plus the pros and cons of each option:**
The university community directly and indirectly involved with institutional research recognizes the critical need to implement changes to rebuild the area of institutional reporting to better support the decision making needs of the university. All individuals involved in our discussions understood and preliminarily supported the idea of organizational changes and resource commitment that may be necessary to achieve desired results. As stated by one faculty member “there is a perception throughout the campus that the institutional research function of the university is broken”.

**Team Recommendation or prioritization of options:**
The Institutional Research Committee recognizes that over the last three years, two separate committees were established to review and evaluate the information and collection processes to make recommendations to support university decision making. In addition, NMSU has now hired Judy Bosland as Assistant Vice President for Institutional Analysis (previously Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment) who will be tasked with leading the effort to improve the institutional research, planning and analysis function for NMSU. Recommendations noted below are not considered to be a comprehensive list but to provide implementation priorities:
• Establish institutional research as a priority for NMSU demonstrated through strong support and clear direction from executive administration. The committee believes sufficient resources have been assigned to the data reporting function but the decentralized assignment of resources has contributed to inefficient and ineffective utilization.

• Establish and clearly communicate roles and responsibilities for various offices involved in data collection, storage, analysis and dissemination

• Office of Institutional Analysis should be assigned authority and responsibility for establishing institutional data business rules and coordination of data integrity for reporting with appropriate data custodian

• Assign the responsibility of external and end user reporting to Office of Institutional Analysis in place of the current structure which allows multiple units to report data. Data custodian internal reporting needs and operational reporting should be maintained through ICT.

• Office of Institutional Analysis should be responsible for receiving all college and department (non-central) report requests, handle coordination of operational reporting requests supported through ICT and distribution of completed reports

• Improve the data reporting portal and departmental web page for simplified data access and submission of departmental report requests. The portal should contain, at a minimum, all of the standard reports generated by IR.

• Complete the ICT reorganization plan approved by President Couture on 11/29/10. Committee recognizes circumstances involving the Office of Financial Aid warrant a delayed transfer of technical staff currently supporting the office. In addition, committee recognizes the needs for central departments to maintain an FTE to support functional needs.

• The Director of Business Intelligence should be moved under the Office of Institutional Analysis to provide support to meet business intelligence needs of the university. In addition, the position number and funding from the Director of Research Evaluation and Assessment position should be transferred to IA to supplement current staffing levels.

• The Office of Institutional Analysis should be physically relocated to the central part of the campus

**Continuous Quality Improvement outcome measures and processes:**

• Review and evaluation of modified organizational structure and duties/responsibilities related to institutional research to include campus communication

• Evaluate and monitor access and use of data reporting portal and departmental web page

• Centralized submission of departmental report requests

**Issues considered for study but not pursued at present time:**

• The committee recognizes that resource allocation to Institutional Research activities is a critical issue. Because of on-going changes in structure and personnel, the committee decided not to address the resource allocation issue directly at this time.

• The committee’s review focused on Institutional Research for the Las Cruces campus only but recognizes additional opportunities for efficiency and effectiveness may be identified by a separate review specific to community colleges.
Athletics Team
Recommendations
**Topic:**
Athletics Department

**Problem Situation:**

1) Funding/Revenue issues:
   a. Attendance at football and men’s basketball games impact revenues
      i. Marketing strategies and execution
      ii. Ticket pricing structures
      iii. Game-day experience—tailgating, atmosphere in venue
   b. Lack of consistent, comprehensive fundraising effort for athletics in past years, including numerous personnel changes and strategies
   c. Other revenue sources

2) Perception:
   a. Student participation/attendance is low so little perceived value for fee dollars spent
   b. Are we properly leveraging athletic program in our outreach to community, alumni, potential donors
   c. Facilities—identifying capital outlay funds for facilities that will also benefit full student body

**Best Practices/Current Status:**

NMSU hired a consulting firm to advise them on various issues related to marketing strategies and pricing structures. NMSU is currently surveying various constituency groups for input to be used in developing strategies. Report is expected in May 2011.

Within the last year, NMSU Foundation has added a primary development officer for Athletics (January 2010), a full-time special events coordinator (Summer 2010) and a temporary full-time staff member (January 2011). Various initiatives and strategies are being undertaken currently in the development area.

The Football Week—Aggie Spirit Game Day Experience Task Force has been formed by the President’s office to achieve:

- Greater fan support
- University efforts to enhance stronger town & gown relationship
- Greater sense of community pride in NMSU by faculty, students, staff and alumni
- Enhance the University’s appeal to perspective students and donors
- Leveraged institutional resources to become more efficient in marketing, branding, cross-branding efforts to support University priorities and values

This task force held its first meeting on April 5, 2011 and will work through the summer with the goal of having initiatives, plans, procedures, policies and strategies in place by the start of the Fall 2011 semester.

Recommend that E&E committee re-visit the Athletics issues as a Spring 2012 project. NMSU Athletics should be accountable at that time for how it has addressed and followed through on the recommendations of the consultants and task force.
In the interim, however, the subcommittee has addressed, and made recommendations, related to certain issues that were identified prior to learning about the current initiatives (consulting project and task force).

**Opportunities for Improvement, to include options with benefit cost analysis and/or dollar impact plus the pros and cons of each option:**

1) **Attendance/Other Revenue:** NMSU should take steps necessary to sell beer and wine at certain athletic events (Men’s Basketball and Football). Four of eight WAC schools currently sell alcohol beverages at Men’s Basketball games and/or Football games (see attached survey). It is estimated that 20% of university facilities in the U.S. sell alcohol at events. Promoters who rent the Pan American Center sell alcoholic beverages at their events. Initial sales should begin during the Men’s Basketball season (2011/2012) season with additional consideration to be given to extending sales to Football games. Attached to this report are revenue projections (Men’s Basketball only) and additional materials related to alcohol sales at athletic events.

The most profitable structure for NMSU is to own and operate under a liquor license for the Pan American Center similar to the licenses that are currently utilized by the Fulton Center and the NMSU Golf Course. These licenses are obtained through the State for little cost (approximately $1,300). Additional approval would be needed from the Dona Ana County Commission to operate the license. UNM recently obtained a license for sales in limited areas of The Pit for Men’s Basketball games in the 2011/2012 season.

Owning a liquor license directly would allow NMSU to operate the sales directly (campus personnel) or outsource the operations to a third-party provider for a percentage (possibly 30%--40%). Currently, promoters for events at Pan Am use a “picnic” license and NMSU only receives a percentage of the profits (less than 50%) from sales at those events. Owning the license directly would result in increases in the profits from these sales at special events in the Pan Am and is the highest profit scenario for Men’s Basketball events.

NMSU could leverage its HRTM programs by utilizing students as servers for practical experience (similar to what is being done at the Farm & Ranch Heritage Museum currently).

In addition to generating profits from the sales at the event, additional revenue can be generated from sponsorships and advertising by the alcoholic beverage distributors who only participate at venues where their products are sold.
Additionally, a positive impact on attendance can be expected when this proposal is limited. NMSU is competing for fans with other entertainment alternatives such as sports bars. This proposal “levels the playing field” when appealing to certain fans.

Concerns associated with this proposal can be addressed through specific rules and procedures related to sales limits, operating times, public service announcements, and training of security and special events staff. Feedback on this proposal was obtained from Athletic Department staff, NMSU Legal Counsel, NMSU Police, NMSU Special Events staff and outside entities who own liquor licenses. Parties queried all indicated that this proposal could be implemented with sufficient safeguards to address legal and social concerns generally associated with such sales.

2) **Student Perception:** Aggie Athletics must adopt concepts that make students feel like valued and necessary participants in every aspect of athletic events. Proposed concepts include: 1) Allowing student attendees to enter drawings to travel with teams to high profile events; 2) Fun extra perks for contest winners (e.g. couches in the corner of field during football games); 3) Outreach by coaches to campus organizations, coaches lunches, intramural clinics with coaches, etc.; 4) Student themes for events (similar to the pajama party for Men’s Basketball, white-outs or black-outs) which will allow students to feel that they are a part of the experience; 5) Allowing students to play championship intramural games in athletic facilities, allow Greek organizations to utilize facilities for their Greek Olympic events, participate with student groups for movies on the Jumbotron; 6) Continuous improvement meetings to discuss fan experience, tailgate issues, and future marketing concepts.

Student-athletes should be ambassadors on campus to encourage classmates to attend events. Student-athletes and coaches can reach out to faculty members to allow athletes to announce that there is a game, match, event upcoming and ask that classmates attend etc.

These options allow students to participate with the student-athletes and the Athletics Department as stakeholders and/or season ticket holders, rather than as a guaranteed source of revenue each year.

3) **Leveraging Athletics in Outreach to Community, Alumni, and Potential Donors.**

A) Silo approach to communication. Poor management of data base for donors and season ticket holders (i.e. email addresses).

**Example 1:** Marketing department regularly sends updates to NMSU mailing list but does not utilize other distribution lists (AAC or Alumni) lists in these updates.
Individual sports have separate and distinct distribution lists for information specifically regarding that sport.

Example 2: NMSU Athletics conducted a survey to learn more about what motivates people to buy tickets etc. The survey link was included on the website and was again sent to the NMSU mailing list. Certain AAC members did not receive the survey directly nor did it get sent to the full Alumni distribution list.

Email is a low cost solution for marketing events. However, lack of coordination of the message and the delivery make current process ineffective. Athletics has access to only about 30% of their season ticket holders email addresses. Athletics must spend the time/effort initially to obtain this information to be able to realize the benefits later. Special events (ticket office), Foundation, Alumni and Athletics would all benefit from this effort.

B) Poorly maintained NM Athletics website. Certain portions of NMSU Athletics website does not appear to be routinely monitored and updated.

Example 1: Link for Charitable Donation program for football tickets includes a 2009 season donation form.

Example 2: NMSU athletes performed 5,000 hours of community service last school year (2009/2010). This information is available under a sub link for “Aggie Athletics” and the community service photos are more than a year old (prominently show two former basketball players that finished playing in Spring 2010). There are two separate links for community service. One link for “Aggies in the Community” that has nothing but a 2008/2009 calendar.

Example 3: SAAC (Student Athlete Advisory Committee) lists the members from the 2007/2008 Academic Year.

NMSU is doing a poor job of getting its positive message out. Rather than burying the community service efforts, it should be promoted (but only if it is current information).

Team Recommendation or prioritization of options:
All suggestions can be addressed in the near term in conjunction with the established Task Force.

Continuous Quality Improvement outcome measures and processes:
See above.

Issues considered for study but not pursued at present time:
See above
Survey of WAC schools (Seven schools excluding NMSU)
June 2011

Schools that sell alcohol or plan to sell alcohol (5 of 7):

Fresno State University
- Have sold beer, wine and specialty drinks at all events in their arena (men’s basketball, women’s basketball and volleyball) for eight years in current arena. Other designated areas where liquor is sold in the arena.
- Previously sold alcohol at football games but have stopped in recent years. Revenue was not sufficient to cover costs and there were logistical issues that led to problems.
- Operations run through outside entity so they do not have information on the profitability (assume that they get only a percentage); they do charge $8/beer.
- Have no information on whether or not there was an impact on attendance as they also sold in previous arena.
- Have “Drink Responsibly” advertisements.
- No notable alcohol-related incidents.

University of Idaho
- Will begin sales this year in football stadium (premium seating and club areas).
- State law prohibits unless sold in controlled environments (reviewed annually).
- Catering company is licensed only for beer and wine but are pursuing full liquor license in future.
- Alcohol sales for special events in venues and are petitioning the Idaho State Board of Education (which only allows for football events) to extend to other men’s and women’s athletic events.
- Will be operated by concessionaire who will give athletics a percentage.
- Will roll out robust communication about their alcohol policies (consider policies to be “pretty strict”).

University of Nevada
- Football sales are beer only; sell liquor at basketball events.
- Sales occur at most events in their arena, including special events.
- Alcohol sales for at least 30 years, so no information on whether it impacted attendance. Generally hear from both sides (some people say that is why they attend, others say they won’t attend due to sales).
- Alcohol sales make up approximately 50-60% of the concession revenue; operated by their licensed concessions vendor.
- Mandate that the distributors have Responsible Drinking messaging strongly incorporated into their overall branding efforts.
- Incidents have been reduced over the years by stronger sales controls (one drink purchased at a time per person, sales end at end of the first half for football).

San Jose State
- No response received, however, anecdotally do know that they alcohol at basketball arena and at football stadium for events.
University of Hawaii
- No response received, however, anecdotally do know that they alcohol at basketball arena and football stadium.

Schools that do not sell alcohol (2 of 7):
Louisiana Tech
- No sales, but have considered it.
- Hope to build a new football endzone facility that will sell alcohol but has not yet been approved.
- Cultural issue in Ruston, which used to be a dry city. Campus is officially dry but that policy can be changed for select locations, such as suites.

Utah State University
- No alcohol sales.
- Have not considered it in the past and don’t expect to consider it in the future.
- Cultural issue in the state of Utah.

See Appendix for Alcohol Sales Spreadsheet
Research Process
Recommendations
Topic: Research Process

Problem Situation:
Effective growth of externally funded research at NMSU is dependent on three factors: efficient administration of the comprehensive research process, business and personnel policies and procedures that impact grant management and investment of indirect costs (IDC) recovered from grants into the research infrastructure of the university. Basic questions associated with these three factors are stated below.

The Comprehensive Research Process. Administration of the research process at NMSU is divided into two separate areas, pre- and post-award processing, i.e., proposal stage and award stage. How do our peer institutions structure pre- and post-award offices? Have peer institutions combined pre- and post-award functions into one single office? What advantages and disadvantages does this model confer? What strategies have peer institutions adopted to mitigate any challenges that accompany a combined office?

Grant Management. What are the business and personnel issues within NMSU that negatively impact grant management and therefore, negatively impact the morale of the faculty who ultimately drive the research engine? How and by whom should these issues be addressed?

Investment of IDC. How are peer institutions allocating IDC to the central administration and individual colleges? What kinds of strategic investments are peer institutions making with these funds?

Best Practices:
The Comprehensive Research Process. The committee commissioned the Education Advisory Board (EAB, University Leadership Council, the Advisory Board Company, Washington, D.C.) to research peer institutions on these issues. A list of the peer institutions contacted and an executive summary of the EAB report is attached.

Three models of organizing an office of sponsored projects are used by NMSU’s peer institutions (# of institutions employing the model):

- Separate (1): Pre- and post-award services are not co-located and report to different administrative leaders. Recommended for small institutions/offices.
- Integrated (1): Pre- and post-award services are combined, co-located and provided by generalists, and the office reports to the VP of Research. Staff members work on a “life-cycle” team and conduct pre- and post-award grant functions. Recommended for any size institution/office.
- Hybrid (5): Pre- and post-award services are co-located and report to the VP of Research and staff specializes on one side of the award administration process. Recommended for any size institution/office.
When structuring a post-awards office, university leaders must not only consider the organizational structure of the office, but also what procedures and policies will encourage a positive working relationship between faculty and post-awards staff. Because pre-awards staff work closely with faculty to procure grants, faculty typically regard this office highly and sustain a positive working relationship with pre-awards staff. Conversely, faculty have a tendency to fault post-awards staff for any problems that arise over the course of a grant cycle (e.g., budgeting limitations and delay in equipment purchasing), placing considerable strain and pressure on post-awards staff and resulting in a poor working relationship between the two groups. For this reason, it is important for central administrators to foster a positive relationship between faculty and staff. While the structure of a post-awards office can help to improve faculty-staff relations, research concludes that other effective methods include:

- Hiring staff who place a premium on customer service,
- Providing faculty with ongoing educational workshops about the roles and responsibilities of the post-awards office, and
- Creating opportunities for faculty and staff to meet and form relationships with one another.

Two organizations on campus currently operate under the “life cycle” approach to research management described above, the Engineering Research Center (ERC) and the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES). Faculty and research staff in both colleges express an exceptionally high vote of confidence for the high quality operational service and support provided by the ERC and AES. They also acknowledge significant credit to the two organizations for the success of their college’s research program which is facilitated through “case worker approach, faculty/staff friendly” pre- and post-award service.

Grant Management. “In Fall 2010, President Couture convened the (NMSU) Research Process Issues Committee to study issues related to NMSU research processes and to recommend solutions for improving and streamlining these processes and procedures to create a more productive research environment at NMSU.” (Quote from the Executive Summary of the Committee’s report.) The committee identified 41 issues impacting the research process. These issues were consolidated into 26 and were categorized into the following four areas: accounting, human resources, procurement, and system procedure and/or policy. The report makes recommendations for resolving the issues and identifies the departments responsible for implementing the recommendations. The executive summary of committee’s report is attached.

Investment of IDC. Distribution of IDC within the institution (units and percentage) varies widely among peer institutions. Generally, IDC is distributed to the following units: upper administration (including the president and provost), the office of the VPR, the library, colleges (deans), departments, and individual PIs. A summary of the distribution formulas employed by each peer institution is presented in the EAB report. IDC at NMSU is distributed according to the following formula: upper administration 50%, VPR 5%, and colleges 45%. Formulas within NMSU colleges vary on distribution of the 45% to the college, departments, and PIs. With respect to incentivizing the research process, the EAB report states that “The VPR is not best-able to develop incentive programs; colleges should instead. Strong incentive programs that encourage research or entrepreneurial activity can be very effective if they are thoughtfully
developed with research interests, institutional history, and plans for the future kept in mind. The VPR may be too separated from the interests within individual colleges to establish incentive programs and encourage start-ups”. Allocating IDC to the PI level is also viewed as an effective encouragement for faculty to seek funding. However, the likelihood that IDC is not used to support research infrastructure increases as these funds are allocated to individual PIs.

**Opportunities for Improvement, to include options with benefit cost analysis and/or dollar impact plus the pros and cons of each option:**

The research community has been calling for improvement of the research enterprise within NMSU since 2004. Between 2004-07 the program office of the Support of Continuous Research Excellence (SCORE) worked with research faculty and staff across colleges to characterize their working experience and to define aspects of the research environment that help or hinder their scholarly work. In 2005, seven problem areas and solutions were presented to President Martin. In 2007, SCORE published “NMSU Research Environment Survey: Analysis of Quantitative Survey Responses.” From 266 respondents surveyed, seven major themes describing the research environment emerged. On the average, 80-90% of the respondents expressed a negative rating in the seven major themes. In 2008, SCORE published the “NMSU Research Environment Survey: Qualitative Analysis of Open-Ended Survey Responses,” a qualitative compliment to the first report. Eight recurring problematic themes were identified and suggestions for improving the research enterprise were proposed. In 2009, nine steps to improve the grant management process were presented to the University Research Council (URC). In 2010, SCORE published the report “Recent Problems and Improvements in the NMSU Research Environment, Responses of 12 NMSU Biomedical Research Faculty.” This third report was prepared at the request of President Barbara Couture. A total of 12 recurring problems were identified including issues elucidated in the 2006 survey. Four improvements to past issues were also reported. After seven years and five formal reports, the basic complaints and dissatisfaction with the research process still exist. The research community recognizes the need for improvement and they have been a persistent voice in advocating for change. The Research Process sub-committee of the Effectiveness and Efficiency Committee supports the need for evaluating and implementing change that will improve NMSU’s research enterprise.

**Team Recommendations or Prioritization of Options:**

**Comprehensive Research Process.**

- NMSU should conduct a comprehensive evaluation for consideration of adoption of either the hybrid or integrated models as the comprehensive research process for the institution. President Couture should appoint a task force consisting of the VPR, VP for Business and Finance, the chair of the URC, and the six college research associate deans, to review and evaluate the two models to determine the most appropriate fit for NMSU. The operation and function of the ERC and AES should be used as the models of the “life cycle approach” to the research process that is facilitated through a “case worker approach, faculty/staff friendly” pre- and post-award service.

- The model selected for administering the research process should include the flexibility for academic colleges to create or maintain their own research centers, like the ERC and AES. The respective college will manage their center, which will be fund through IDC.
return to the college. These offices would operate as a satellite office to the VPR. This relationship will enhance the overall service to research faculty because the center staff will serve as advocates/ombudsmen for the faculty in implementing the revised pre- and post-award service. Therefore, the NMSU policy for creating, managing, supporting, and terminating externally (non-I&G) funded programs, centers, and institutes should be reviewed and modified if necessary to be consistent with these recommendations.

- At the same time that the restructuring of the research process is being evaluated, a restructuring of the VPR’s office should also be conducted. Under the models of operation being considered, the primary focus of the VPR’s office should be administration of the research process within the institution and facilitating the growth of externally funded research within academic colleges. Locating research units within the VPR’s office is a distraction to the primary business of the office, administration of the research process, and is a conflict of interest between an administrative office and an academic college where the research is performed. It also creates a conflicting situation for faculty with their college dean and department head as well as between the VPR and the college deans. The primary units that should be reassigned include: the NM Water Resources Research Institute, the Institute of Applied Biosciences, NM Space Grant, the Molecular Biology interdisciplinary degree program, and any other research based units that have a logical fit with an academic college. Based on the technical nature of units listed above, the primary colleges that should be considered as homes for reassigning these research units include ACES, Arts and Sciences, and Engineering.

- The restructuring of the VPR’s office should also include reassignment of funding of start-up packages to the academic colleges. Start-up packages are currently created by the department and college, partially funded by the college and department, and funding is finalized through the office of the VPR. This change will serve to incentivizing the research process. As noted above, the EAB report states that “The VPR is not best-able to develop incentive programs; colleges should instead. Strong incentive programs that encourage research or entrepreneurial activity can be very effective if they are thoughtfully developed with research interests, institutional history, and plans for the future kept in mind. The VPR may be too separated from the interests within individual colleges to establish incentive programs and encourage start-ups.” This restructuring will require that appropriate IDC be returned to the college for funding of the start-up packages. This recommendation is stated in the Investment of IDC section below.

- The support for all research associate dean positions should be converted to I&G funds. Currently, academic colleges support their research offices and staff in different ways. By consistently supporting all research associate deans from I&G funds NMSU will validate the basic premise that research is an integral part of the university mission.

Grant Management.

- All recommendations developed by President Couture’s “Research Process Issues Committee” should be evaluated for alignment, consistency, and fit with the research process models recommended for implementation. To the greatest extent possible, the
“Committee’s” recommendations should be adopted for improving the grant management process.

**Investment of IDC.**

- The general procedure of distributing 45% IDC to academic colleges should continue. Deans should continue to be given the flexibility to determine the distribution of this fraction within their colleges: dean’s office, departments, and faculty (PIs).

- Current use of IDC retained at the upper administrative level (the 50% fraction) should be reported to the campus community. The report should cover a five-year period and should include total IDC retained at the 50% rate, categories of use, and amounts and percentages assigned to each category. This report should be reviewed and evaluated by a task force consisting of: the provost, VPR, Assistant VP for Business and Finance, college deans, and research associate deans. This task force should be charged with the responsibility for establishing a formula for distributing IDC to the VPR from the current upper administrative allotment (50% fraction) that adequately supports the research process model adopted for implementation. Their review should also determine the percentage of the IDC that should be added to the allotment currently returned to academic colleges (45% fraction) for use in creating start-up packages for new faculty hires.

- There have been several requests by various NMSU constituencies for transparency in the allocation and investment of IDC. To address these continuing requests, NMSU should publish an annual accounting describing broad categories of expenditures charged against IDC. The report should show aggregated data from all campus units and should be coordinated through the office of the VPR.

**Continuous Quality Improvement Outcome Measures and Processes:**

The following time lines should be adhered to in evaluating restructuring of the research enterprise at NMSU:

- Scoping of the research management process: October 1, 2011
- Naming of the research management process committee: October 15, 2011
- Preparation of a draft report and recommendations: December 1, 2011
- Final report to the E and E Committee: December 15, 2011
- Recommendations to the President: January 1, 2012

The initial outcome will be the successful completion of a report on potential restructuring of the research process and organization at NMSU.

**Issues Considered for Study, but not Pursued at Present Time:**
None.

See Appendix for referenced attachment
Library Team
Recommendations
**Topic #1:**
Decreases in scholarly journal subscription and monograph holdings

**Problem Situation:**
Continuing increases in scholarly journal subscriptions and declining funds designated for acquisitions has led to increasing frequency and severity of journal subscription cancellations.

**Best Practices:**
Several Universities have combined resources to increase purchase power of each institution’s library through formation and exercise of consortia (e.g., the States of Texas and Mississippi).

**Opportunities for Improvement, to include options with benefit cost analysis and/or dollar impact plus the pros and cons of each option:**
New Mexico State University currently belongs to a State-wide consortium of college and university libraries, the New Mexico Consortium of Academic Libraries (NMCAL). This body has been successful in the past regarding efforts to bring general obligation bond issues before the public for securing funding of libraries throughout the state. Consolidation of the purchase power of this large number of institutions (>30) has the potential for decreasing the financial burden of each institution while maximizing accessibility of the students at each institution (including NMSU) to a larger collective holding of scholarly journals and monographs.

Recent economic hardships facing New Mexico and neighboring States may provide unique opportunities for the expansion of the NMCAL to include institutions within Arizona and Colorado. While the number institutions within each of these States does not approach the number of institutions within the State of Texas (and its corresponding consortium), the combination of the corresponding institutions holds the potential of leveraging similar discounted rates to those currently realized within the Texas consortium.

**Team Recommendation or prioritization of options:**
It is the recommendation of this committee that:

1. **Immediate efforts be made to strengthen the scope and mission of the NMCAL to include the consolidation of financial resources for the appropriate enhancement of each member institution’s library holdings and to facilitate mechanisms of reciprocity regarding the current holdings of each institution throughout the consortium.**

2. **Dialog be initiated with leadership at institutions of higher education throughout a three-state region (i.e., New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado) regarding the potential formation of an expanded consortium for both enhancement of accessible holdings and facilitating exchange of unique scholarly collections currently held at individual institutions within the region.**

**Continuous Quality Improvement outcome measures and processes:**
Implementation of these recommendations should result in improved access to scholarly journals, monographs, and archived holdings by students and faculty at NMSU and all other institutes of higher education throughout the State and region (including the affiliated community colleges). Leveraging ever-decreasing financial resources will significantly improve the ability of proposed member institutions to
engage in collection enhancement rather than continuing of the current down-ward spiral of library holdings.

**Issues considered for study but not pursued at present time:**

A detailed analysis of potential holdings that could be improved through implementation of the proposed recommendations.

**Topic #2:**
Digital formats for library holdings

**Problem Situation:**
Limitations of physical space and financial resources impacts library holdings

**Best Practices:**
Academic libraries appear to be moving to increasing their holdings in digital formats and decreasing hard-copy holdings (journals, monographs, theses, dissertations, references tools). This provides greater access to these holdings in formats that can be explored using search engines.

**Opportunities for Improvement, to include options with benefit cost analysis and/or dollar impact plus the pros and cons of each option:**
Increasing digital-format holdings will enable reductions in physical space requirements without negatively impacting access to current and future holdings. Although many journals and monographs are currently available in digital form, not all have been digitized. Additionally, government documents and special archive collections will be more difficult to have digitally accessible.

A significant negative consequence is the need to maintain archival subscriptions to scholarly journals and related publication indefinitely because some publishers require current subscriptions to enable access to archived volumes. Because those costs are currently controlled by the respective publishers, the long-term financial burden resulting from complete conversion to digital formats could prove to be costly in the future.

**Team Recommendation or prioritization of options:**
It is recommended that efforts be focused on conversion of applicable holdings (current and future) to digital, fully searchable formats.

**Continuous Quality Improvement outcome measures and processes:**
It is anticipated that conversion of even a significant portion of current and future holding to digital formats will ease physical demands on present structures while providing for alternate use of those facilities to enhance learning opportunities for students and other scholarly endeavors.

**Issues considered for study but not pursued at present time:**

Detailed time-lines for such a conversion process and the associated costs of that conversion were not fully considered by the committee
Sustainable Purchasing Team Recommendations
Topic: Sustainable Procurement

Problem Situation: There are opportunities for reduction in the campus utility bill by simply changing the purchasing guidelines. Procurement practices have historically generally focused on lowest first cost rather than on the “life cycle cost” of a product. This issue is exacerbated by the return of any operational savings to the utility budget and is the justification behind the recommendation for a revolving fund that returns a portion of any utility savings realized from an energy conservation measure to the users responsible for generating those savings.

Best Practices: Many local governments have followed the lead set by the federal government:

http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=fed_agencies.fed_ag_index

“Federal agencies are required to purchase energy-efficient products and activate power management settings on their computers by the following two federal initiatives:

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 requires federal agencies to buy either ENERGY STAR products or products designated as energy efficient by the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP). These requirements are included in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 23.203. In March 2009, the Department of Energy published a Final Rule to provide guidance to Federal agencies implementing EPAct, Section 104: “Federal Procurement of Energy Efficient Products.”

Executive Order 13423 requires federal agencies to activate ENERGY STAR “sleep” features on computers and monitors and mandates that federal agencies buy EPEAT* registered products. In March 2007, the Council on Environmental Quality issued instructions defining agency requirements for implementing Executive Order 13423 and broad strategies for achieving them.

Executive Order 13514 sets sustainability goals for Federal agencies and requires Federal agencies to establish a 2020 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target within 90 days. In terms of energy efficiency, agencies must:

Ensure that 95 percent of new contracts include products that are energy-efficient (ENERGY STAR qualified or Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) designated) and environmentally preferable (e.g., Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) certified).

Promote electronics stewardship by ensuring: 1) procurement preference for EPEAT-registered electronic products; 2) enablement of computer power management; 3) activation of duplex printing functions, and; 4) procurement of ENERGY STAR qualified and FEMP designated electronic equipment.”

Opportunities for Improvement, to include options with benefit cost analysis and/or dollar impact plus the pros and cons of each option:

There are approximately 10-12,000 computers on the NMSU network that belong to the university. Assuming that 2,000 are replaced each year, NMSU could save from $100,000 to $200,000 annually simply by requiring that all computers be Energy Star rated. The savings would be greater if coupled with a computer power management program. There is minimal implementation cost.
Team Recommendation or prioritization of options:

- NMSU Purchasing should be directed to develop a Sustainable Purchasing Policy that includes, at minimum, a requirement that all computers purchased be “Energy Star” rated.
- An additional component of the Sustainable Purchasing Policy should be a statement that “NMSU Purchasing will consult, and deploy where possible, the Energy Efficiency incentive programs of El Paso Electric Company and all other energy service providers and manufactures when purchasing energy (electric & gas) consuming equipment”.
- A revolving fund should be created for the purpose of encouraging departments to deploy energy conservation measures. In addition to providing a means to fund energy conservation measures, this proposal would return a portion of the utility savings from an adopted energy conservation measure to the implementing department.

To assist with the implementation, we propose training for the procurement professionals and a tracking system for new purchases of computers. We also propose that this recommendation be coupled with the investigation of a technological solution of insuring that equipment shuts down when idle and possibly measuring the savings remotely.

Continuous Quality Improvement outcome measures and processes:
Accurate performance metrics will be challenging but purchases before and after can be tracked by a process already in place. We are more interested initially in the practicality of the proposal for fostering behavior change through procurement policy.

Issues considered for study but not pursued at present time:
The addition of appliances and other items to the proposed procurement policy were considered but were not pursued until the first step in the initiative can be evaluated. This proposal could be tied in later with the proposal for a revolving fund that provides for a portion of the utilities savings to be re-invested in additional conservation measures.
Appendix
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### Estimates of Revenue from Alcohol (Beer/Wine) Sales at Men’s Basketball Games in the Pan American Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance average--reported</th>
<th>5,500</th>
<th>5,500</th>
<th>5,500</th>
<th>5,500</th>
<th>5,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% actual attendance</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance average--actual</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% over 21 years</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance over 21 years</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% attendance buying 1 drink</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of drinks purchased (% total)</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price/drink</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of product sold</td>
<td>$ 1,425.60</td>
<td>$ 1,188.00</td>
<td>$ 950.40</td>
<td>$ 712.80</td>
<td>$ 475.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>$ 2,542.32</td>
<td>$ 2,118.60</td>
<td>$ 1,694.88</td>
<td>$ 1,271.16</td>
<td>$ 847.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of games</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional revenue--Full season</td>
<td>$ 106,777.44</td>
<td>$ 88,981.20</td>
<td>$ 71,184.96</td>
<td>$ 53,388.72</td>
<td>$ 35,592.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attendance average--reported | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| % actual attendance           | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   |
| Attendance average--actual     | 4,800 | 4,800 | 4,800 | 4,800 | 4,800 |
| % over 21 years                | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   |
| Attendance over 21 years       | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |
| % attendance buying 1 drink    | 60%   | 50%   | 40%   | 30%   | 20%   |
| Number of drinks purchased (% total) | 2,160 | 1,800 | 1,440 | 1,080 | 720 |
| Purchase price/drink           | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 |
| Cost of product sold           | $ 1,080.00 | $ 9,000.00 | $ 7,200.00 | $ 5,400.00 | $ 3,600.00 |
| Other costs                    | $ 2,733.44 | $ 2,311.20 | $ 1,848.96 | $ 1,386.72 | $ 924.48 |
| Number of games                | 18    | 18    | 18    | 18    | 18    |
| Additional revenue--Full season | $ 116,484.48 | $ 97,070.40 | $ 77,656.32 | $ 58,242.24 | $ 38,829.16 |

| Attendance average--reported | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| % actual attendance           | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   |
| Attendance average--actual     | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,600 |
| % over 21 years                | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   |
| Attendance over 21 years       | 4,200 | 4,200 | 4,200 | 4,200 | 4,200 |
| % attendance buying 1 drink    | 60%   | 50%   | 40%   | 30%   | 20%   |
| Number of drinks purchased (% total) | 2,340 | 1,950 | 1,560 | 1,170 | 780 |
| Purchase price/drink           | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 |
| Cost of product sold           | $ 11,700.00 | $ 9,750.00 | $ 7,800.00 | $ 5,850.00 | $ 3,900.00 |
| Other costs                    | $ 7,010.64 | $ 5,842.20 | $ 4,673.76 | $ 3,505.32 | $ 2,336.88 |
| Number of games                | 18    | 18    | 18    | 18    | 18    |
| Additional revenue--Full season | $ 126,191.52 | $ 106,159.60 | $ 84,127.68 | $ 63,095.76 | $ 42,063.84 |

| Attendance average--reported | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| % actual attendance           | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   | 80%   |
| Attendance average--actual     | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| % over 21 years                | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   | 75%   |
| Attendance over 21 years       | 3,256 | 3,256 | 3,256 | 3,256 | 3,256 |
| % attendance buying 1 drink    | 60%   | 50%   | 40%   | 30%   | 20%   |
| Number of drinks purchased (% total) | 2,520 | 2,120 | 1,700 | 1,260 | 840 |
| Purchase price/drink           | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 |
| Cost of product sold           | $ 10,785.60 | $ 8,988.00 | $ 7,190.40 | $ 5,392.80 | $ 3,595.20 |
| Other costs                    | $ 7,549.92 | $ 6,291.40 | $ 5,033.28 | $ 3,774.96 | $ 2,516.64 |
| Number of games                | 18    | 18    | 18    | 18    | 18    |
| Additional revenue--Full season | $ 135,898.56 | $ 113,248.80 | $ 90,599.04 | $ 67,949.28 | $ 45,299.52 |

---

Additional revenue: Full season

### Efficiencies & Effectiveness Task Force
### New Mexico State University