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Overview

In February, the University Oversight Steering Committee submitted its Final Report to President McPhee as part of the *Positioning the University for the Future* Initiative. President McPhee subsequently reviewed the Final Report and issued a disposition on the acceptability on each item/recommendation. Each division is now responding to the request to provide additional information and more substantial proposals for each item under consideration.

In this report, the Division of Business and Finance has prepared responses to President McPhee’s comments on the directed items and areas of responsibility. The responses include additional information where required, more formal proposals on items, and some general considerations for items that are more university-wide in nature.
Recommendations - Academic & Instructional Review

A&IR (Section A) OSC Proposal 5 (1)

Proposal: Reduce classified and administration staff in all Executive Divisions.

Current Status: Recommendation Accepted.

President’s Comments: Support the recommendation that the five administrative divisions and the President’s Office examine their structure and staffing for further consolidation, restructuring or elimination of positions, projects and programs from the perspective of mission criticality.

Action: Unfilled and unfunded positions are being eliminated in the new budget. Filled positions are not currently being eliminated but may not be refilled if they become open as a result of the employee voluntary buyout plan. The Division of Business and Finance departments and activities are primarily campus support organization dedicated to meeting the service requirements of the campus, including handling many legal and regulatory requirements associated with the University’s programs. Efficiency and productivity of employees are constant areas of concern for the Division. In addition to the in-house organizations, the Division does outsource several activities to reduce cost and improve services.

Notwithstanding that the Division departments and activities are mission critical like every department on campus, it will continue to reduce staff as feasible. It should be understood, however, that any resulting contractions of requirements or services could be met with a corresponding reduction in programs or positions.

A&IR (Section A) OSC Proposal 5 (2)

Proposal: Suspension of overtime pay for clerical (classified) workers unless funded externally.

Current Status: Recommendation Accepted.

President’s Comments: Support the recommendation; a need exists to examine the overall efficiency of this practice, with the understanding that some activities will still require overtime, especially those related to registration and the enrollment of students.

Action: Human Resources will work with all divisions and departments to help reduce overtime expenditures; however, it cannot dictate to them how to handle their operations. Notwithstanding, however, departments are somewhat limited on what they can spend on overtime purely based on their budgets. The availability of new funds too will obviously be limited with the overall University budget reduction. This being said though activities, e.g. Facilities Services, requires regular use of the overtime process for classified employees, especially in response to call backs for maintenance activities after hours and on weekends, etc. In many cases an immediate response is required to address a problem and minimize the cost implications of further damage to a system. In addition, there is scheduled overtime for various events and activities on campus. These services include events operations, trash pickup, custodial services, etc. In general, serving many of these needs during non-routine business hours using overtime/call backs is economically beneficial compared to other alternatives such as...
additional staffing, etc. Some departments do employ comp time in lieu of overtime pay in
certain cases. This is weighed against the impacts of insufficient staffing during regular business
hours. That said, all departments will continue to evaluate the overall efficiency of the practice
of overtime.

**A&IR (Section A) OSC Proposal 5 (14)**

Proposal: Provide incentives for senior tenured faculty to retire and begin post-retirement
teaching.

Current Status: In process.

President’s Comments: This concept is currently under review by TBR.

Action: The University has developed a voluntary employee buy-out plan to be submitted to
TBR for approval, which available to both faculty and staff. Participants will be able to sign up
for the plan in fall 2009 with a severance date after the spring 2010 semester (June 30, 2010).

**A&IR (Section A) OSC Proposal 6 (1)**

Proposal: Analysis and discussion of the viability of a tri-semester schedule but does not make a
recommendation at this time.

Current Status: Continue review of this recommendation.

President’s Comments: Support this recommendation but need further review and discussion
along with an impact analysis.

Action/Comments: This would require significant analysis of what would be required to support
a tri-semester schedule. Just one example is that a trimester schedule would require Facilities
Services to adjust routine maintenance and capital maintenance project schedules, which are
performed primarily in the summer months, accordingly. The primary impact could be in
availability of space/buildings for required projects.

**A&IR (Section A) OSC Proposal 6 (2)**

Proposal: Six day schedule of M/W, T/R, F/S classes for more efficient use of the facilities,
greater productivity and expansion of offerings.

Current Status: Continue review of this recommendation.

President’s Comments: Support this recommendation but need further review and discussion
along with an impact analysis.

Action/Comments: This would require significant analysis of what would be required to support
a tri-semester schedule. Just one example is that from a Facilities Services perspective, this has
implications in three primary areas. First, there would be additional utilities costs for adding
Saturdays. In general, these costs would be relatively small. FSD estimates an increase of
approximately $2,000 to $2,400 per day, based on today’s utility rates, for each additional day
(Saturday). Second, there would be less time to perform necessary project work in the facilities. While this is not quantified financially, it is understood the greater the restrictions – the higher the cost. And many projects needing to be put off to more convenient time could increase the risk of unplanned outages, etc. The third, and perhaps most significant impact, would be an anticipated increase in the operations and maintenance services that would be required for the additional days. A true six day work week would require additional cleaning services and appropriate workers, supervisors, etc. to support the physical needs of the campus. Consider the custodial; a 10% -15% increase in the custodial costs for E&G space would total to approximately $150,000 to $225,000 per year. Other areas of Business and Finance would have similar issues. Notwithstanding, however, the tri-semester or six day week would provided some efficiencies on space use.

**Recommendations – Non-Academic Support Units**

**NASU (Section A) OSC Proposal 3**

Proposal: Outsource Murphy Center custodial services.

Current Status: Recommendation Accepted.

President’s Comments: Support this recommendation. During these difficult economic times, we must find ways to leverage resources.

Action: The cleaning requirements for the Murphy Center Complex are included, as an alternate, in the Request for Proposal for cleaning services for the MTSU campus, which is currently being rebid. Once a selection is made that occurs, MTSU will have pricing that can be used as a basis for negotiating a contract with the vendor for the Murphy Center Complex services. MTSU will have the option of awarding this scope of work in its entirety or systematically over a period of months/years if desired. The desired result is reduced operation costs.

**NASU (Section A) OSC Proposal 4**

Proposal: Eliminate free Athletic tickets to retirees.

Current Status: This proposal has been accepted with modifications.

President’s Comments: Support the recommendation. Consider possible grandfathering of current retirees or other proposal. The plan should include a proposal for accountability for the use of tickets by retirees or forfeit privilege.

Action: Retiree ticket usage will be monitored during the 2009-10 seasons. A 50% use study has been approved for FY 2010 and those not meeting the 50% use requirement will lose the complimentary tickets privilege. Retirees were sent a memorandum from Human Resources regarding proposed changes in ticket distribution.
NASU (Section A) OSC Proposal 8


Current Status: Recommendation accepted with some modification.

President’s Comments: Support this recommendation but will study continuation of EESP as a self-supporting unit. (Note: InRoads in this recommendation reports under the Sr. VP.)

Action: InRoads has been eliminated; the Evening Extended School Program has raised its rates to cover direct costs; and the administrative services portion will be transferred to auxiliary support.

NASU (Section A) OSC Proposal 10

Proposal: Consolidation of Distribution/Receiving/Post Office.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Support this recommendation provided that we can show cost savings and efficiencies.

Action: The Post Office: This is a retail operation that is contracted with the United States Postal Services (USPS) to operate. The Post Office assists departments on campus with navigating the many new postal regulations, which are changing rapidly due to budget cuts at USPS. It operates metering machines for outgoing out of the back of the facility, sort incoming mail into departmental boxes for distribution on campus, sell stamps at the windows, distribute student packages, and UPS package service has been added. There were originally 15 people at the Post Office and 5 positions have been eliminated. It will lose another person due to retirement in June 2009 and possibly an additional person in February 2010. If consolidated with the other departments, it would be necessary to have a supervisor at this location that had knowledge of the postal regulations and procedures. This department is a much different than the other two activities.

Distribution Services: This activity is located at the blue warehouse located by the gas pumps at Facilities Services. It receives UPS, Fed Ex, DHL, and other express packages. They write up receiving slips on each package received in order to track and account for them. They pick up the US Mail at the Post Office and mix it with the express packages for delivery to the offices on campus. If delivery service was eliminated on campus, it would be necessary to require the express carriers to deliver on campus, which would create the need for each building to have a street address and building numbers. Also, it would result in having multiple delivery trucks delivering on campus one for each of the express companies. A good portion of the packages would never make it to their final destinations due to errors in the addresses given by the departments when ordering goods. Presently if it is addressed to MTSU with a name, the campus destination can usually be determined. This service could possibly be consolidated with
Receiving and Moving Services, which could eliminate a manager position provided both operations can be run from one location.

*Receiving, Moving, and Inventory*: This activity works out of the Receiving Dock on Greenland Dr. It receives the over the road (large) freight for the campus, which keeps most of the large 18 wheel tractor trailers off of campus. It provides inside delivery of the freight received and does many of the moves for the campus. It maintains the fixed asset inventory for the campus and performs the P-Card reviews for the P-Card program. It also operates the off campus warehouse and is responsible for selling the surplus property on Govdeals.com. It could be consolidated with Distribution, which could eliminate a manager if both operations can be run out of one location.

As staffing reduction can occur, i.e. voluntary separation or retirements, activities will be combined as best as they can consistent with above.

**NASU (Section A) OSC Proposal 14**

Proposal: Consolidate event scheduling/event coordination into one office for improved efficiencies.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Support Recommendation but need to review organizational structure related to this program.

Action: The Office of Events Coordination is working with the various facilities’ scheduling staffs to come up with a workable plan and processes.

**NASU (Section B) OSC Proposal 2**

Proposal: Restructuring of Miller Coliseum and the Livestock Center with a plan to achieve self-sufficiency.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Support this recommendation with the goal to become more self supporting.

Action: Each activity has raising rates to increase revenues and will be working to consolidate management, which will be dictated by staff reduction from voluntary separations and retirement. Every effort too will be made to reduce other operating cost.

**NASU (Section B) OSC Proposal 9**

Proposal: Implementation of online Timekeeping through BANNER to increase efficiency.

Current Status: This recommendation remains under review pending a proposal from the Sr. VP, which is due by August 2009.
President’s Comments: Inclined to support this recommendation. The transition will need to be carefully managed due to the requirement of a two-week hold back in pay for staff.

Action: This is still being evaluated. Administration must carefully weigh the negative impact that a two-week hold back in pay for staff will have.

**NASU (Section C) OSC Proposal 2**

Proposal: Analyze fee schedules for facilities that are available for rental and enforcement of those fees.


President’s Comments: Support this recommendation. The current financial situation requires that we explore options in these areas.

Action: As part of the discussion to consolidate event scheduling/event coordination into one office for improved efficiencies (**NASU (Section A) OSC Proposal 14**), rates are being discussed. Central administration enforcement of the use rules and rates will be necessary for this to be effective.

**Recommendations – Energy Efficiency and Conservation**

(Nota: These proposals will be handled primarily by Facilities Services unless noted otherwise)

**EEC (Section A) OSC Proposal 1 (A)**

Proposal: Lights Out Campaign.

Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations. Any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save energy and energy costs (target $102,000 per year) associated with lighting by reducing light levels and aggressively turning lights off when not needed. These actions would require administrative action and broad support and participation across campus to be successful.

This campaign would incorporate guidelines for manually turning off lights where switches are present, increasing the use of occupancy sensors and automatic controls where possible (cost considerations for labor and materials), and delamping – remove lamps in fixtures, keep some fixtures switched off, better use of task lighting and natural daylighting where possible.

Regarding the guidelines, they would be required to specify appropriate operating schedules and direct faculty and staff to turn lights off manually in buildings and spaces where automated technology does not exist.
Regarding automated controls, Facilities Services performed a major relamping project in 2005 whereby 23 buildings were retrofitted with more efficient lights and some measure of lighting controls. For buildings where automated controls do not presently exist, FSD has requested and will continue to request funding from the Sustainable Campus Fee as well as from appropriate stimulus funding for controls. There is a substantial building energy management system (EMS) project that has been suggested for stimulus funding that would provide controls to assist with lighting in public areas of several buildings.

Regarding delamping, Facilities Services would systematically remove single lamps from fixtures or disconnect fixtures all together in selected areas in an effort to reduce the lighting energy on campus. This would be somewhat labor intensive and would require several months to accomplish. This has a negative effect in that fixtures appear to have burned out lamps.

**EEC (Section A) OSC Proposal 1 (B)**

Proposal: Reset Temperature Set-points—Occupied Hours.

Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations. Any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save energy and energy costs (target $50,000 - $75,000 per year) by adjusting the temperature set points during the winter and summer months to save heating and cooling energy. These actions would require administrative action and broad support and participation across campus to be successful.

Reset the temperature set-points for E&G spaces to 68 degrees winter and 76 degrees summer (this may vary depending on type of HVAC system serving the building) during the occupied hours. Some buildings have an energy management system (EMS) that would assist in this effort, while many buildings do not. For those with an EMS reprogramming the energy management system would be required including override protections in order to maintain strict adherence to these set-points. For those without and EMS, occupants accessing wall mounted thermostats would have to maintain strict adherence to these set points. Also, there is a substantial building energy management system (EMS) project that has been suggested for stimulus funding that would provide controls to assist with managing the set points for several buildings.

**EEC (Section A) OSC Proposal 1 (C)**

Proposal: Reset Temperature Set-points—Unoccupied Hours.

Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations. Any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.
Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save energy and energy costs (target $50,000 - $75,000 per year) by adjusting the temperature set points during the winter and summer months to save heating and cooling energy. These actions would require administrative action and broad support and participation across campus to be successful.

Reset the temperature set-points for E&G spaces to 65 degrees winter and 78 degrees summer (this may vary depending on type of HVAC system serving the building) during the un-occupied hours. Some buildings have an energy management system (EMS) that would assist in this effort, while many buildings do not. For those with an EMS reprogramming the energy management system would be required including override protections in order to maintain strict adherence to these set-points. For those without and EMS, occupants accessing wall mounted thermostats would have to maintain strict adherence to these set points. Also, there is a substantial building energy management system (EMS) project that has been suggested for stimulus funding that would provide controls to assist with managing the set points for several.

EEC (Section A) OSC Proposal 1 (D)

Proposal: Reduce Plug Load Energy.

Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations. Any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save energy and energy costs (target $10,000 - $20,000 per year) by reducing the appliance and office type equipment electrical loads (often referred to as “plug loads”) on campus. This would require developing recommended/required parameters for owning and using various types of equipment that consume electrical energy. These parameters would include: (1) minimizing use of space heaters, refrigerators, etc., (2) consolidating/optimizing the use of printers, copiers, etc., (3) establishing appropriate shutdown schedules for personal computers, monitors etc. (this would need to be coordinated with ITD for virus protection applications). Also, there is a substantial computer server technology project that has been suggested for stimulus funding that would reduce the electrical) energy (plug load and cooling energy) associated with computing.

EEC (Section A) OSC Proposal 1 (E)

Proposal: De-lamp Campus Vending Machines.

Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations. Any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save energy and energy costs (target $5,500 per year) by removing the illumination lamps in the front of the Pepsi vending machines. The vendor can remove the lamps (or turn off a switch if available) in the front of machines. In order to facilitate the public education concerning the working status of the
machine with the lights out, the vendor has prepared the following marketing snipe to be placed on each machine:

![Marketing Snipe Image]

**EEC (Section B) OSC Proposal 2 (A)**


Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations; any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to position the University for the future and save future energy and energy costs by giving stronger consideration for energy efficiency in the development of projects on campus.

One opportunity involves the use of the Sustainable Campus Fee (SCF) funding of energy projects. Twice a year, the SCF committee reviews submissions for local energy and sustainability projects to be implemented on campus. Recently, the committee has reviewed the funding allocation to determine if additional funds could be allocated to increase the number of energy projects on campus providing greater benefits. There is an openness to the prospects of increased funding for energy projects (compared with green power purchases for example) provided there are sufficient energy projects to merit such consideration.

In addition, there are a substantial number of energy management projects that have been suggested for stimulus funding that would provide energy efficiency benefits for several buildings and systems.

**EEC (Section B) OSC Proposal 2 (B)**


Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations; any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to position the University for the future and save future energy and energy costs by developing a watering/irrigation strategy to reduce the watering costs associated with landscaping on campus. This would involve
appropriate (more drought tolerant) plants selections, appropriate number of planting etc. In general, irrigation systems would only be used to establish new plants (typically first year) and in the event of severe drought conditions after that. This strategy would be applied to existing landscape areas and incorporated in the design process for new facilities.

Facilities Services is currently performing an inventory of existing irrigation system and water meter configurations to implement an appropriate schedule for turning the systems that serve general areas and E&G buildings off. Athletic fields would not be affected by this strategy and Auxiliaries could be included if they desired.

EEC (Section B) OSC Proposal 2 (C)

Proposal: Incorporate Economically Sound Sustainability Initiatives in New Construction.

Current Status: All recommendations in the section are accepted.

President’s Comments: Support these recommendations; any effort designed to support energy efficiency should be encouraged.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to position the University for the future and save future energy and energy costs by implementing the Tennessee Sustainable Design Guidelines (TNSDG) on the design and construction of new projects. This is a new requirement for TBR capital projects. Many measures in the TNSDG are designed to provide for energy and operating cost savings for the facilities once they are occupied. These measures are currently, and should continue to be, highly favored in the design process provided there is an economic benefit.

Even though the TNSDG is now required for new capital projects, its effectiveness is greatly determined by the diligence of the design team. Facilities Services and Campus Planning maintain a strong commitment to the effective use of this tool.

EEC (Section C) OSC Proposal 3 (A)

Proposal: Reduce Cleaning Standards for E&G Facilities.

Current Status: Support further reductions in cleaning services cost pending a plan from the Sr. VP.

President’s Comments: Although reductions have been made in this area, more tough choices may be necessary.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save operating costs (target $150,000 per year) by reducing the cleaning services provided to E&G facilities. Facilities Services and the Provost Office will collaborate to identify areas where cleaning services can be reduced. Emphasis/priority will be placed on the health and hygiene of restrooms, and the basic cleanliness of classrooms and public areas in buildings. This effectively reduces the cleaning standards from APPA level 3 to APPA level 4 (level 2 will be retained for restrooms).
A first step for this proposal was recently taken in the procurement process for custodial services on campus. The Request for Proposal (RFP) included some reduced services from the previous cleaning standards. The service is currently being rebid; so a final vendor has not been finalized. Once a selection is made, it appears that some, not all, of the targeted savings may be realized. The cleaning standards will be reviewed, at the desired time, to reduce the cleaning levels further to attain the appropriate combination of services and cost savings.

**EEC (Section C) OSC Proposal 3 (B)**

Proposal: Re-bid Custodial Contract.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments:

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save operating costs (target $50,000 - $100,000 per year) by re-bidding the custodial contract for E&G facilities. Given the time required to perform the procurement and the timing required to mobilize a new vendor (should that be the final outcome), the Request for Proposal (RFP) was originally issued in late February, 2009; however, the service is currently being rebid. Once a selection is made, it appears that most of the targeted savings may be realized. Cleaning standard modifications will have to be incorporated, at the appropriate time, to achieve the final desired cost reductions.

**EEC (Section C) OSC Proposal 3 (C)**

Proposal: Reduce Grounds/Greenhouse Services to E&G.

Current Status: Accept recommendation with modification. Note: Will entertain a plan from the Sr. VP that reduces costs without compromising the aesthetics of the campus. Proposal due September 2009.

President’s Comments: Although some greenhouse services could be reduced or eliminated, I do not support the idea of a drastic decrease in campus aesthetics. An attractive campus is essential for the recruitment of students and personnel.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save operating costs (target $75,000 - $100,000 per year) by reducing the level of services provided to the upkeep of the E&G grounds across campus. This would result in replacing high maintenance areas (flower beds, etc.) with lower maintenance areas (turf, etc) and scaling back the services associated with interior plants. Services for auxiliary grounds (Residential Life, Campus Recreation, Parking, etc) would remain the same. Facilities Services is currently identifying the areas of campus that would be most affected and implementing a “contraction” schedule in order to determine and minimize the aesthetic implications in consideration of President McPhee’s comments.

**EEC (Section C) OSC Proposal 3 (D)**

Proposal: Discontinue Lease for Off-campus Warehouse.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.
President’s Comments: Warehouse space is needed but we need to look at reducing the total space needed.

Action: While it might be possible to eliminate the off campus warehouse at some point in time, there is not sufficient warehouse capacity on campus to house the items contained in that warehouse at this time. The warehouse serves many functions for the campus, e.g. storage of props and costumes for the Speech and Theater, archives, new classroom project furniture, surge space for construction and renovation projects on campus, surplus material that we reuse and reconfigure, and housing surplus property for elimination on Gov.deals.com. Every effort will be made to eliminate this facility or a portion of it in the future; however, there will continue to be a need for some warehousing space either on campus or off. Until space needs can be met on campus, leasing storage space will remain necessary. The current space was just recently rebid and awarded.

**EEC (Section C) OSC Proposal 3 (E)**

Proposal: Reduce Standards for Uniforms for Facilities Services.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Reducing uniform standards could pose an increased security risk since we would not be able to quickly identify individuals who are working on the grounds.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save operating costs (target $20,000 per year) by reducing the uniform standards for Facilities Services personnel to include only a shirt with MTSU logo and person’s name patch. This will result in savings from leasing fewer articles of clothing and will eliminate the laundering services for the uniforms. In addition to the shirts, appropriate protective clothing will be provided to meet certain job function requirements. At this time, Facilities Services is reviewing the uniform practices, comparing the practices of other departments of campus, and looking to incorporate appropriate cost savings measures.

**EEC (Section C) OSC Proposal 3 (F)**


Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Inclined to support this recommendation provided it would not place an additional financial burden on departments that would be difficult to support under these economic circumstances.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to save E&G operating costs (target $45,000 - $50,000 per year) by allocating a pro-rated share of the trash pick-up and disposal costs to Auxiliary Services using the building square footage as the primary basis for determining the trash generation levels. Facilities Services has performed the cost calculations and had preliminary communications with the appropriate auxiliary units.
EEC (Section D) OSC Proposal 4 (A)

Proposal: Initiate Campus Facilities Fee.

Current Status: Recommendation not accepted. No further action required.

President’s Comments: Any increase in student fees will need to be carefully evaluated in light of the increased financial burden on students.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to position the University for the future by supplementing the operating budget through a new Facilities Fee when feasible, similar to other institutions in the TBR system. There is no action on this proposal at this time.

EEC (Section D) OSC Proposal 4 (B)


Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Refer to comments for EEC (Section B) OSC 2 (B)

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to position the University for the future and save future energy and energy costs by developing a watering/irrigation strategy to reduce the watering costs associated with landscaping on campus. This would involve appropriate (more drought tolerant) plants selections, appropriate number of planting etc. In general, irrigation systems would only be used to establish new plants (typically first year) and in the event of severe drought conditions after that. This strategy would be applied to existing landscape areas and incorporated in the design process for new facilities.

This proposal is essentially the same as that in EEC OSC Proposal 2 (B) above with the emphasis being on the extension of watering/irrigation strategy to the design process for new facilities. To that end, Facilities Services is working with Campus Planning to design the landscaped areas of new buildings in a low water format. Campus standards identify appropriate, more drought resistant plantings as well as metering strategies designed to minimize the water costs for these areas.

EEC (Section E) OSC Proposal 5 (A)

Proposal: Expand P-Card for travel (airlines).

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Inclined to support this recommendation but the expanded use of the P-Card must be accompanied by additional policies and procedures that would control potential abuse.

Action: Guidelines are still being worked out by the Business office.
EEC (Section G) OSC Proposal 7

Proposal: Reduce Depreciation Charges for Motor Pool.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Facilities Services should conduct an analysis of this recommendation and submit the appropriate information to the Sr. VP.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal intends to reduce operating costs (target $50,000- $112,000 per year) by adjusting the amount set aside in the motor pool R&R to cover the future replacement cost of the vehicles. The rental fleet is relatively new and there are sufficient reserves for these vehicles such that some adjustments to the schedule could be achieved. The final determination of this set-aside amount would require a review by the Business Office.

EEC (Section G) OSC Proposal 8


Current Status: Continue to review this recommendation.

President’s Comments: Facilities Services should conduct an analysis of this recommendation and submit the appropriate information to the Sr. VP.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: A cursory analysis of the rental/driving patterns of University personnel and associated costs was performed to compare the economics of in-house motor pool vs. outsourced car rentals (namely Enterprise). The analysis reviewed the driving records from a sample taken in the fall and spring. It considered the duration and length of trips, costs of operating and maintaining the vehicles, and other factors to evaluate the annual operating costs of each option. The report concludes that the two options are very close in annual costs with the in-house operation being slightly less than renting from an outside vendor.

This report supports the original recommendation to not outsource this service, since there is no reduction in operating expenses. However, the original proposal indicated that eliminating the motor pool rental fleet could produce a one-time savings (revenue) of approximately $166,000 based on selling the vehicles in the fleet.

EEC (Section H) OSC Proposal 9


Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: This has become part of the standard bid requirements.
EEC (Section H) OSC Proposal 11

Proposal: Implement Energy savings measures and projects, including lighting, LEDs, wind power, photovoltaic, geothermal applications, methane, etc.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Inclined to support this recommendation but consider on a project by project basis.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: This proposal is similar to EEC OSC Proposals 2 (A) and 2 (C) in that they emphasize the implementation of energy efficiency projects but it specifically includes newer technologies and various renewable energy sources. Similar to the responses on those proposals, Facilities Services will continue to investigate the cost effective applications of these technologies – for both retrofits and new design/construction – and include them where possible in stimulus funding projects, Sustainable Campus Fee projects, and new project design as part of the Tennessee Sustainable Design Guidelines.

EEC (Section I) OSC Proposal 12

Proposal: Review chargeback procedures to non-E&G customers for O&M services and event support.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Care should be taken not to pass too many additional costs on to departments in these tough economic times.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: Facilities Services provides numerous services (custodial, grounds, greenhouse, other O&M) to non-E&G customers in support of events and non-routine functions on campus. Many of these events incur a cost for support but do not produce a revenue stream to cover the costs. Currently, there is a University policy categorizing the customers according to those who must pay for the services as well as those who receive no charge. This proposal suggests that the policy be reviewed for the purpose of reducing/eliminating the number of events that do not pay for the services required to host the event. In addition, the appropriate chargeback procedures could be revised, as necessary, to assess the true cost and improve the accounting.

EEC (Section I) OSC Proposal 13

Proposal: Review outsourcing and in sourcing opportunities.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Inclined to support this recommendation if it will decrease costs and improve services.
Action: All Business and Finance functions, including Facilities Services, regularly review in-house productivity, demands for services, and overall cost effectiveness of delivering services. FSD currently employs a multitude of means to deliver these services. These include: (1) in-house services, (2) service contracts for specific products and services, and (3) large out-sourced contracts with vendors for services (custodial, construction). As the economy changes, there may be additional opportunities to redress these service delivery options. All departments and activities are looking for cost reductions in existing service contracts and entertaining outsourcing options as appropriate.

EEC OSC (Section J) Proposal 16

Proposal: Investigate telecommuting opportunities.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

Action: All divisions are considering if this can be implemented. There are concerns, however, on such really being cost effective and how employees will be monitored.

EEC OSC (Section J) Proposal 17

Proposal: Implement cost effective expansion of recycling.

Current Status: Recommendation accepted.

President’s Comments: Inclined to support this recommendation provided it does not have a net cost affect.

Facilities Services Action/Proposal: The recycling program on campus is designed and scaled to be cost effective. Facilities Services constantly reviews new opportunities to expand services and reduce costs. The major economic considerations include balancing the price/revenue of the commodity with the collection processes and associated costs. FSD has taken, and will continue to take, advantage of the Sustainable Campus Fee program to procure additional equipment to increase the efficiency of the collection processes. Also, FSD uses work study students and community service individuals to increase the labor pool at minimal costs.

Fundamentally, a change in the attitude of campus will be needed to have any great affect on the prospects of expanding the program cost effectively. Faculty, staff, student workers, students, and the general public will need to take a more active role in the collection process by taking materials to a final pick up point and reducing the area to be covered by recycling staff. In other words, everyone needs to be involved in the process of recycling beyond being a generator.

ERD OSC (Section A) Proposal 2

Proposal: Improve MTSU’s Ability to Compete for External Resources through Federal, Private Sector, Foundation, and Non-Profit Alliances.

Current Status: Continue to explore the possibilities of implementing the suggestions in this section. Note: The Interim Provost will review the proposal as developed by the Sr. VP and the VP DUR and provide an evaluation of the programmatic, functional and cost implications.
associated with the proposed Office of Strategic Alliances from an Academic Affairs perspective. Final recommendation from Sr. VP and VP DUR is due by August 1, 2009. President’s Comments: Explore ways to integrate these suggestions with existing areas.

Action: This is still being discussed. A major concern is the cost of establishing a new office with associated staff and operation cost, plus office space, which may negate any real values gained. It may be better to establish a group/committee to initially work on this.