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AGENDA AND MINUTES

**Tchotchke drop off** - (We’re collecting samples of fun giveaways from across campus. Thanks for bringing any you’re able to share.) – Thanks everyone for bringing your goodies; they will be shared with the Promotional Products Working Group

**Printing Services (Dee Dee Caneva and John Burke)** – Dee Dee and John outlined the schedule for the reduction in services and eventual closing of the Printing Department. Joel noted that once the Printing Department is closed, state law will require certain statements to be included in each publication: “Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois,” date of publication, number of copies, and printing order number. More details, info about the use of soybean-based ink and recycled materials is here: http://www.obfs.uillinois.edu/manual/central_p/sec7-2.html#fff

**Committee Reports:**

**Branding (Sue Johnson) and Reputation Building (Charlotte Bauer)** – These committees shared a joint report that came about as a result of common themes that the groups were encountering. A recommendation was made to consider some strategies to involve faculty and other constituents with telling the Illinois Story. One suggestion was to put forth a “Why Illinois” campaign.

**Shared Resources (Melissa Edwards)** – Melissa outlined the group’s efforts to coordinate with the Portal Project to discuss ways to deliver content electronically.

**Technology (Lee Busselman)** – Lee updated us on the group’s efforts, specifically to concentrate on email marketing.

**Update on ARR communications review (Robin Kaler)** – The public affairs leads for the University Administration and the three campuses submitted draft recommendations regarding communications (see attachment: ARR exec summary) to the Administrative Review and Restructuring Working Group. These were the result of a charge by the ARR to identify total current costs for marketing/communications activities, as well as recommendations for 10% savings throughout the institution in this area.

Please note the group found that the University's current tracking systems do not tie expenses to communications functions in a way that allows us to determine the current baseline spending, so we did not offer a roadmap to 10% savings. However, we did recommend working together to implement a tracking system that would allow units to track such expenses in the future.
The ARR group has reviewed all of the recommendations in the executive summary document, and has estimated that our suggestions, if implemented, could save as much as $2,000,000. We have asked that the estimate be removed, or that it be attributed to the ARR group and not to the public affairs group. We will share a final version of the report as soon as we receive it, and we look forward to continuing to work with you on implementing the wonderful ideas you've helped develop over the past few weeks and months.

The Preferred Vendor List Explained (Chris Harris) –
The Complete History of the Preferred Vendor List (Abridged)
- Membership on the list was by response to a request for bids from the Purchasing Department – based on criteria established by CCO members and after review of work samples
- However, it is important to note that a vendor’s presence on the list does not mean a campus endorsement of their current performance or quality
- As discussed, we’ll talk with purchasing about renaming this to something more indicative of its actual use/purpose – ex: Approved Vendor List?
- Vendors on the list basically sign an open contract with the campus – establishing annual hourly rates and agreement with all campus requirements
- Campus units can use vendors from the preferred list with far fewer business/process hurdles
- Original vendors can renew participation annually
- The current membership of the list is locked until a new bidding period will be initiated after July 2012

Information needs (Bridget Jamieson) As Public Affairs has very little direct contact with several of the University's key stakeholders (e.g., alumni and donors), we count on you to let us know when you're receiving questions to which you do not have answers. We're always happy to prepare FAQs, talkpoints, quotes from administrators, etc. to help you connect with your constituents. We'll add this agenda item to each CCO meeting as a reminder, but we hope that anytime you need information, you'll reach out to us immediately.

US News Graduate Rankings (Chris Harris) –
2011 graduate program rankings were released in late April – quick summary
- 1 program ranked 1
- 12 programs rank among top 5
- 29 programs rank among top 10
- 40 programs rank among top 20
- Engineering, Chemical & Computer Sciences were ranked in every possible subdiscipline – Education in 8 of 10 categories
- 82 programs newly evaluated by US News this year

Ensemble video update (Joel Steinfeldt)
- The Here & Now video section now feeds directly into iTunes U via an RSS feed. Apple recently added Illinois’ iTunes U channel to others that appear in the
iTunes Store. Directions for adding an RSS feed from your unit’s Ensemble account to your unit’s iTunes U account are at: http://publicaffairs.illinois.edu/resources/ensemble.html.

- Ensemble is now being used to feed video to the student portal – users should check that box under “Sharing” to submit it to Todd Nelson’s team.
- The domain name multimedia.illinois.edu has been claimed and will be used to showcase all video content produced on campus once the site, hosted by Computer Science, goes live. Users should check the “All Illinois Media” box to share their unit videos there.
- An Ensemble workshop will be scheduled in May for CCOs unable to attend the March workshop.

Office of Advancement (Don Kojich/Heather Tucker) – Don gave an update on Annual Meeting video/news needs. Please submit any story ideas related to giving and its impact during the Brilliant Futures campaign to Don or Heather. Annual meeting is held Sept 30, Oct 1 and 2; please submit content/ideas by June 1.

Illinois Alumni story ideas (Bea Pavia and Vanessa Faurie) – no report

Office of University Relations (Ginny Hudak-David) – no report

Other – Lori Herber asked about possible changes to the policy governing forms required when submitting purchase orders for printing. The following rules are taken from the Campus Administrative Manual:

a) Less than the sealed bid level ($30,500) applicable to general supplies and services for Higher Education.

No Off-Campus typesetting, printing, copying or binding may be authorized until: (1) a Purchase Order has been issued; (2) a Purchase Order number has been assigned by the Purchasing Division; or (3) a P-Card transaction has been authorized subject to the following restrictions.

Typesetting, printing, copying or binding for which the total cost is lower than the sealed bid level ($30,500) requires only one written vendor quotation. The Banner request or the P-Card record shall state that the total cost is based on a vendor quote. A signed vendor certification letter, which certifies the vendor is in compliance with the prevailing wage and soybean oil-based ink requirements of the Illinois Procurement Code, must be attached to the Banner request, or the P-Card record.
ATTACHMENT: ARR EXEC SUMMARY

The University faces an unprecedented set of challenges: a struggling national economy, a state in financial crisis, and an institution in transition. In the coming weeks and months, reducing expenses in meaningful and visible ways will be critical to our ability to transcend these challenges. Equally important will be reaching our key audiences with the singular message that the people on the three campuses of the University of Illinois are changing the world, because to continue our shared mission we need and deserve the support of our stakeholders. Finally, the ability to measure the value of our communications efforts moving forward and to adapt those efforts to a changing, competitive environment will mean the difference between strategic focus on a clearly articulated, shared vision and fumbling in the dark while our competitors pass us.

As the University undergoes an examination of support functions to identify ways to reduce costs, improve services and streamline/clarify duties and roles, communications professionals are exploring ways to pool and share resources, to rethink longstanding practices and to accurately measure the effectiveness of a wide array of marketing-communications (mar-com) efforts.

Marketing-communications professionals provide a broad range of services to help the University connect with its many stakeholders and achieve its goal of national and international recognition as a pre-eminent university. These professionals lead strategic communications efforts at the University, campus and unit levels. They handle a wide range of responsibilities, including, but not limited to, branding, crisis and emergency communications, copywriting, editing, event planning, graphic design, media relations, marketing consulting, social media, speechwriting and website development and maintenance. Many of them also have responsibilities that stretch into alumni relations, fundraising and other functional areas. The work product of mar-com professionals reaches the many – and varied – stakeholders of the institution: prospective and current students, their parents, prospective and current faculty, our alumni and friends, donors, legislators, funding agencies and the general public.

For years, mar-com professionals have been underfunded relative to their peers, but they have made great strides toward building the University of Illinois brand family. For example, over the past 10 years in the Office for University Relations, in the Urbana and UIC Public Affairs offices and in several college offices, leaders have implemented systems to enhance visibility for teaching, research, clinical care and public engagement missions by providing tools, training and support for communications professionals throughout their organizations.

The ARR charged this group with identifying the baseline amount spent across the institution on communications (personnel and marketing materials), then exploring ways to reduce that amount by 10 percent, while preserving, and if possible enhancing, core functions, as well as eliminating any redundant functions that could be streamlined to achieve savings and/or improved efficiencies/efficacies. In working with the talented staff at Decision Support, it has become apparent that our ability to analyze current investments by function is virtually impossible. The lack of uniformity of CFOAPAL usage, as well as the underutilization of the power of the CFOAPAL does not allow us to connect expenses to functions. In addition the standard classification codes (p-class codes) are inconsistently implemented for personnel expenses and the FTE of the job usually does not reflect the % FTE correlating to that functional role. A painstaking manual review of the data shows many inconsistencies and inaccuracies. A 2001 report by the communications firm Lipman Hearne said benchmarking data showed that most research universities spent between 1-3% of their annual budgets on communications.

Recommendation 1: Create a policy that guides position/job set up to facilitate clearly delineated headcount and percent FTE of employees handling marketing-communications responsibilities and functions. In addition, use Banner CFOAPAL segments to clearly label expense functions like the amount spent on materials and services generated to externally market the institution. This will allow each unit to track its investment in marketing and the results of those efforts.

Completion: September 2010

Recommendation 2: Establish best practices across the institution for measuring or approximating the return on investment (ROI) of marketing efforts. Currently, the only metrics available for most non-Web efforts are purely qualitative – anecdotal or “gut feelings.” This makes it impossible to determine where to invest scarce resources and how to adapt to a changing competitive environment.

Completion: September 2010
Despite the deficiency in current data-collection methods, opportunities for reducing costs, improving services and streamlining/clarifying duties and roles are being explored. The following are the most promising results of our most recent review.

Recommendation 3: Create a pool of internal graphic designers (print and Web), photographers, writers and editors to barter/share talent among colleges and units. Establish a system that would allow units with occasional excess capacity in one skill set to barter or “sell” hours of employee time with other units that lack capacity in a given area. This would allow participating units to receive higher-quality and more efficient service in all functional areas of communication, instead of only in the one or two for which they have in-house professionals. All this would happen without the usual additional costs of hiring freelancers.

Completion: December 2010

Recommendation 4: Do more with Internet and Social Media to Reduce Unnecessary Uses of Paper. Communications funds are local and, therefore, so are communications decisions. By habit and necessity, communicators produce materials that reflect the expectations of their home units and spend based on available resources. Administrators and communicators need to evaluate carefully what products are being printed with a goal to create fewer print projects, print fewer pages or copies, and seek out savings on paper, printing and mailing. A comprehensive review of printing mandates (e.g., University statutes, IBHE requirements) and products could identify opportunities to eliminate paper copies or significantly reduce quantities while providing even more of the information online.

Completion: September 2010

Recommendation 5: Expand the suite of design templates already offered to communications professionals. By collecting “gently used” designs that a unit has retired, other units could repurpose them, saving thousands of dollars in graphic design costs.

Completion: December 2010

Recommendation 6: Expand offerings of commonly shared marketing tools. The Web tools, image databases and other shared services created by Public Affairs units not only have saved the University hundreds of thousands of dollars, but also have greatly improved the quality and consistency of marketing materials. Similar benefits would result from further expansion of these services.

Completion: December 2010

Recommendation 7: Use our collective purchasing power to buy promotional items. By negotiating with vendors on a selected catalog of promotional items, we project a cost savings in the range of 10 to 15 percent, as well as improved quality and branding, and a reduction of waste/leftover products.

Completion: September 2010

Recommendation 8: Create a set of decision-support tools to assist institution/unit leaders and mar-com professionals in their joint annual strategic planning efforts. Allocating scarce resources requires laser focus and shared vision. Providing administrators and communications professionals quality planning tools, as well as teams of volunteer facilitators, will ensure higher-quality plans, which should lead to more effective implementation.

Completion: May 2010

Recommendation 9: Better utilize marketing-communications professionals when establishing strategies for achieving institutional/unit goals. Traditionally, mar-com professionals are not included in strategic planning. It is no surprise, then, that their efforts are not as effective as they would be with input in the planning process. There has never been a more important time to deliver the right message to the right audience at the right time. This single change could revolutionize the University’s ability to steward marketing-communications resources while significantly strengthening relationships with key stakeholders.

Completion: May 2010

We would be delighted to answer any additional questions you have regarding mar-com efforts, and we look forward to working with you to implement the recommendations in this report.

Submitted by:
Tom Hardy, Robin Kaler, Mark Rosati and Derek Schnapp