



DESIGN PHASE BUSINESS CASE

University of California, Berkeley

OVERVIEW

DESCRIPTION	Comprehensive document summarizing the Design phase findings and Implementation phase recommendations <i>In some instances, initiatives may be comprised of distinct projects which may be proposed before the Design phase is complete. In those cases, a preliminary business case will be required to set the context for the proposal.</i>
OWNER AND AUDIENCE	Owned by Initiative and Functional Sponsor and presented to the Executive Committee for approval before the Initiative can move into Implementation
TIMING	To be completed by the end of the Design stage

NOTES

- Template includes a PowerPoint file (OE Design Phase Business Case.ppt) and an Excel file (OE Design Phase Business Case_Financial Analysis.xls)
- A signed hard copy of the Business Case should be submitted to the OE Program Office with electronic copies of both files
- Additional detail may be included by adding additional slides in each section or in back-up

SPONSORSHIP

Initiative

INITIATIVE	Organizational Simplification		
INITIATIVE MANAGER	Moira Perez		
PHONE	2-5068	E-MAIL	moirap@berkeley.edu

Sign Off

SPONSOR NAME	Frank Yeary		
SPONSOR SIGNATURE		DATE	
SPONSOR NAME	Keith Gilless		
SPONSOR SIGNATURE		DATE	
OE PROGRAM OFFICE SIGNATURE		DATE	
Notes			

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The team recommends the campus **adopt an Integrated Service Delivery Model for Shared Services Centers.**

The reporting structure for shared services should **include a new position to oversee the implementation of shared services and provide operational leadership to center Directors.** Academic leadership must be represented in shared services governance.

Centers should be created based on clearly defined **guiding principles: achievable scale, manageable size, culture/affinity, and type of work conducted.**

Centers should be staffed through a combined approach that allows high performing staff in units and departments, as well as applicants new to the campus, to be recruited in to the new centers during implementation, with a gradual reduction of FTE achieved through natural attrition and/or layoffs at the departmental or unit level.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

- Year by year breakdown of savings and costs
- Key assumptions

The total cost of delivering HR, IT, and finance services to the campus is currently \$185 million (after in-unit restructuring). The team estimates that ~1,000 FTE of the ~2,100 currently performing human resources, finance, research administration and IT activities are shareable. The total estimated cost of the shareable portion is ~\$90M (salary plus benefits).

The team believes savings can reach a target of \$20-30M. The target range suggests ~11-16% savings from total expenditures (~\$185M) or, put differently, ~20-33% savings from the shareable portion (~\$90M). How quickly the campus achieves these savings will depend on decisions about the staffing approach and pace of the phasing process. If we follow the ERSO model, savings may take up to five years to completely materialize. Actual costs of running the centers will need to be assessed during implementation planning, as systems needs, process changes, and resources are identified.

For more detail on this analysis, please see chapter 4 of the Shared Services Design Team Report.

PROBLEM STATEMENT/NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Objectives
- Situation
- Opportunity

From Chapter 2 of the Shared Services Design Team Report:

California's fiscal and budgetary environment has progressively deteriorated in the last decade and, for the first time ever in the history of the University, per student support from the State is projected to be less than the cost of CA resident fees. The governor's budget for 2011-12 proposes a \$500M reduction to the UC budget. The situation requires us to manage our administrative costs aggressively and streamline our operations in order to support our core mission and maintain academic excellence.

The Operational Excellence Diagnostic Report published in November 2009 (<http://oe.berkeley.edu/phase1/full.pdf>)

made several high-level recommendations to the campus for simplifying and streamlining our organization, achieving savings, and increasing efficiency and productivity in key areas of campus administrative work. The Diagnostic Report recommended grouping major common functions currently being delivered by more than 200 units on campus, and specifically identified the areas of information technology, human resources, and finance as opportunities for grouping into new shared services organizations. The Diagnostic Report was accepted by the Chancellor in May 2010 (<http://oe.berkeley.edu/phase1/response.shtml>) and the **Shared Services Design Team** of the Organizational Simplification Initiative was subsequently formed and **tasked to identify models for effective shared services delivery** based on the Diagnostic Report findings (see pages 50-71 of Diagnostic).

The team identified more than 2,000 positions dedicated to the relevant work areas distributed across more than 200 units (i.e., all positions under the IT, human resources, finance, and general administration job families). The current overall cost of delivering these services annually is \$185 million.

For a public university of our age, size, diversity and unmatched comprehensive excellence, it is no surprise that we have a very complex organizational structure. Our decentralized configuration evolved over time in large part due to the vibrant entrepreneurial culture of our campus, and often in response to changing fiscal imperatives.

Unfortunately, **this highly distributed approach has resulted in uneven delivery of services to units and departments.** Units with greater resources have grown unique systems and processes to optimize service at the local level, while other units that are solely dependent on state funding have had to struggle to meet continuing or new requirements and workload without the added benefits of effective business systems, new funding, and staffing.

A highly distributed, decentralized approach also creates major risks for the campus. We have numerous redundant, departmentally-developed systems of uneven quality. We are duplicating work and developing different ways to accomplish the same tasks without always following the same standards and protocols. Most importantly, the staff doing the finance, human resources, and IT work in administrative and academic units are often isolated and without peers to rely upon for consultation, support, and backup during normal absences. This creates delays in service provision and does not facilitate the sharing of best practices or foster the growth and development of our staff.

The concept of shared services is not untested in industries including higher education. Large non-profit organizations, medical enterprises, governments, NGOs, and business organizations have been consolidating administrative operations for decades and have done so successfully. Many universities around the nation and internationally are seeking ways to streamline and standardize processes, and achieve savings by consolidating business services. (See Appendix 12 for a list of universities and other resources regarding these efforts). Our very own Board of Regents has called for achieving greater efficiency in administrative processes through the implementation of shared services (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/5100.html>).

In recent years, our **campus has taken some bold steps toward optimizing services** and cutting costs by creating administrative clusters and new organizations to consolidate a number of distributed organizations. For example, Student Affairs recently combined all of its business services into four regional “smart” clusters. Another example is the HR Center that opened July 2010 and provides support to all units under the VC Administration, IST and the Office of the Chancellor. Similarly, about a year and a half ago, VC Research consolidated the business operations and research support for all Organized Research Units (ORUs) reporting to the Vice Chancellor for Research into what is now called Research Enterprise Services (RES). About five years ago, the College of Engineering consolidated research support functions for engineering-associated ORUs into the Engineering Research Support Organization (ERSO).

These efforts offer us examples that are relevant to our own campus and to study best practices for service delivery in the areas of IT, human resources, and finance.

RECOMMENDATIONS (Extended; summary above.)

- Deliverables
- Rationale
- Costs/Benefits/Risks
- Key assumptions

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS (For a detailed discussion of each of these recommendations, please read the Shared Services Report)

It is clear from our analysis that our current model for delivery of IT, human resources, and finance services is unsustainable and inefficient.

DELIVERY APPROACH

The team recommends the campus adopt an Integrated Service Delivery Model for Shared Services Centers. From the users' perspective, a highly integrated approach, wherein IT, human resources, and financial services are combined within centers is ideal. This approach makes it possible for the centers to manage and triage user needs, and relieves the user from the burden of having to decide which office or unit to contact for what service. This is a "one-stop-shop" approach that prioritizes the users' needs.

REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The reporting structure for shared services should include a new position to oversee the implementation of shared services and provide operational leadership to center Directors. All the center Directors would report directly to this individual, whom we have tentatively termed the "Chief Operations Officer."

Academic and administrative leadership must be represented in shared services governance. Team members had differing views on how this could be achieved, whether by appointing a single faculty sponsor (a dean) to partner with the Vice Chancellor Administration or by including a dean in the reporting structure of centers serving academic units (see section 5).

Functional owners (the campus units that provide leadership on policies and standards associated with specific areas of activity) **must play an integral role in the hiring of key staff and in developing standards and guidelines for work conducted in the Shared Service Centers.**

Mechanisms for input and monitoring of performance according to standards should be developed and deployed by the Chief Operations Officer in consultation with users. Our faculty, staff, and students should be able to expect high quality service.

A clear articulation of **decision rights** and **accountability** between functional owners, Shared Service Center staff, and users will need to be a priority of the implementation team.

CENTER GROUPINGS

Centers should be created based on clearly defined guiding principles: achievable scale, manageable size, culture/affinity, and type of work conducted. The team recommends an administrative consolidation effort that will significantly reduce the provision of IT, human resources, and finance services distributed throughout the campus, to arrive at as few Shared Service Centers as possible in order to reach scale, achieve savings, and establish consistent procedural standards across campus. However, there should be an adequate number of Shared Service Centers to ensure that the specific needs of the diverse units on campus can be met. The team recommends seven centers serving academic units, with at least one center delivering service to all administrative units.

STAFFING PHILOSOPHY

Centers should be staffed through a combined approach that allows high performing staff in units and departments, as well as applicants new to the campus, to be recruited in to the new centers during implementation, with a gradual

reduction of FTE achieved through natural attrition and/or layoffs at the departmental or unit level. This model worked well for the Engineering Research Services Organization (ERSO) which was able to reduce total FTE by 30% in five years with relatively minor disruptions to work and impact to staff morale. Other universities, such as UC Davis, are taking this approach.

REQUIREMENTS FOR SHARED SERVICES

The team agreed that Shared Services Centers must be designed to meet at least the following criteria:

1. **Significant financial savings for the campus must result** – An oft-cited critique of the shared services concept is that it represents merely a shift of resources from the local to the center. This is *not* our vision for Shared Services Centers. The idea is not to centralize; rather, it is to build organizations that are better equipped to meet unit needs by providing the appropriate depth of staffing in the functional areas. Savings would result from an overall reduction in the size of the management layer; increased efficiency; increased expertise in areas requiring specialized knowledge; lowered expense through elimination of the need to maintain individual locally developed business applications; reduced training costs for new systems (e.g., transactions would be entered by a smaller cohort of experts as opposed to large numbers of users currently in distributed units); and, most significantly, investments in improved workplace technology.
2. **Improvements in workflow, systems, and automation** – While it is understood that new systems are not likely to be in place before the implementation of Shared Services Centers begins, particularly during the early piloting phase, it is clear that technological solutions must be deployed as soon as possible in order to minimize/replace tedious, redundant, and ineffective manual processes. Improved workplace technology must be accompanied by robust business process analyses to streamline steps and work flow. Campus functional owners and all levels of our organization must be committed to simplification. Training and planning for system upgrades will be easier to manage in the shared services environment, which will facilitate the adoption of the IT solutions our campus so desperately needs. Over time, effectively deployed systems and automated solutions will allow Shared Service Centers to function with fewer FTEs.
3. **Shared Service Centers must be large enough to achieve economies of scale.** The size of each center should be large enough to enable the development of the staffing expertise necessary to support each user group and make appropriate use of management talent. Furthermore, scale is a critical enabler to achieving significant savings by eliminating redundancies in management, work flow, process inefficiencies, and locally developed business applications.
4. **Quality of service to the user must be equal to, if not better than, services available now. Centers must meet the operational needs of users and be accountable to users.** Mechanisms for tracking user satisfaction should be deployed early and continuously, and should be made public. Service-level agreements (SLAs) and an empowered user governance structure are formal mechanisms that will allow the centers to maintain a strong service-orientation. Scaled appropriately, Shared Service Centers will provide better coverage during peak demand or in the case of absences, increase expertise in functional areas, and increase flexibility through shared resources.
5. **Improved regulatory compliance** must be achieved in a model that enables specific center staff to focus exclusively on compliance, rather than have this as one task amongst many, and to develop deeper expertise through repeated examples of similar issues and situations. Increased compliance and strengthening of internal controls should also be achieved in situations where currently units are too small to have sufficient separation of duties to support robust controls. Increased attention to compliance is critical for improved risk mitigation, a less quantifiable but vitally important consideration. For example, research administration services, performed consistently across the campus, will help avoid disallowances, fines, and loss of reputation.
6. **Clearly defined career paths for staff** – Defining clear career paths for staff is a challenge the University has

been tackling for several years. In the shared services environment, our staff should be able to acquire depth and expertise in specific areas, while also being exposed to cross-training opportunities, and thereby develop a deeper understanding of how business functions intersect. The Shared Services Centers should be explicitly charged with supporting the learning and career development for staff working in the centers.

Assumptions

Throughout our engagement and analysis, the team concluded that the success of shared services will depend on a number of contingencies that are outside the purview of the design team and, moreover, will not be under the control of the Implementation Team.

FUNDING MODEL

How will Shared Services Centers be funded? In developing a sustainable support model for Shared Service Centers, leadership should take into consideration the current uneven distribution of resources as well as the potential of further budget cuts due to our current economic climate, and consideration of what services and staffing will still be required in individual academic and administrative departments. What kind of mechanism will exist to allow Shared Services Centers to change their staffing levels in response to changing workload conditions? Will funding streams respond to policy changes that affect workflow and workload in the centers (e.g., decentralization of benefits and fees)? The Finance Initiative within OE is actively looking at productive and sustainable ways to ensure funding of common good on the campus. For more information on the scope of that initiative and its timeline, please see:

<http://oe.berkeley.edu/finance/index.shtml>.

The details of the funding model are critical to the adequate resourcing of the centers now and in the future, and they will affect the degree of buy-in from units throughout campus, all of whom have worked tirelessly to provide the best possible business services to their respective departments. It seems certain that part of the funding plan must capture savings or positions from units. If so, it is even more incumbent that our future solutions must deliver services that are equal to, or better than, what units experienced prior to the transition to shared services. In addition, people are understandably concerned that the services will come at a cost, not just in FTE losses, but also in the form of a charge for the services those staff used to provide.

It is important to keep in mind that the team's costing analysis addresses only savings at the global campus level and does not attempt the granular analysis that will be required for the implementation phase. If managed similarly to in-unit restructuring, units might be able to keep some savings locally for investment in their mission while significant savings are directed to the centers to fund new developments in systems, standardization of practices and procedures, and establishment and monitoring of metrics for continuous improvement.

Some consideration should be given to whether levels of service might be tiered, with higher-level services offered at a premium. The latter approach may be a viable model for some IT services, depending on how the IT function is eventually organized on the campus.

FUNCTIONAL OWNERSHIP

It is understood that the current structure for setting policies and standards is distributed across numerous functional owners (see Figure 2 on page 20 of the full report). While recognizing that such a structure presents challenges to the establishment of shared services environments, the team found it out of scope to make specific recommendations on the campus leadership structure. Nevertheless, the team recommends, in general, that the campus leadership consider establishing simpler reporting lines in order to streamline decision-making and direction that ultimately affect the flow of work in the areas of human resources, finance, research administration, and IT.

SYSTEMS

In-unit restructuring plans confirmed what the team heard at numerous forums and meetings throughout its analysis process: the campus is still in serious need of moving away from dependence on legacy systems. Some new systems have been implemented without adequate levels of investment and resourcing or adequate attention to training and change management. We recommend that the campus invest in business systems that are more intuitive, user friendly,

and improve workflow.

There are several areas of significant need for improved systems: we need better tools for reporting and forecasting, timekeeping, and online procurement. Fortunately, these projects are in the pipeline. The successful rollout of new systems will be critically important in restoring confidence and trust in the campus' ability to implement change.

Timekeeping: This system will be of universal interest and value to the Shared Services Centers. Developing a campus-wide timekeeping system should be one of the highest priorities for the campus. Departments and units spend an inordinate amount of effort tracking time using local systems that do not always reflect real-time leave accruals, etc.

Workflow system: Some individual units have developed significantly useful "workflow" systems in which users can enter a service request and follow it as it is directed through the established workflow until it is accomplished. These local systems do not always connect with the campus financial system. Development and deployment of a universal workflow system is critical.

Budget system: The campus has not had an effective budget system that allows consistent budget request/review/monitoring. There has been no system capable of salary or other projections. The OE Finance Initiative is expected to pilot a budgeting system in 2011. Its use will become more efficient with the advent of Shared Services Centers and will be critical in allowing local fund owners in academic and administrative units to effectively manage their resources. For more information on this initiative, please see: <http://oe.berkeley.edu/finance/index.shtml>.

Identity management and enterprise system access: The campus identity management request system (SARA) is cumbersome, time consuming, and allows different levels of access for different systems. Our workflow and system access are generally designed along departmental or unit lines. We need a system that allows coordinated identity management with an easy way for managers to review accesses for their units.

POLICIES

SAS115

During implementation, special attention must be paid to the transition of responsibility for compliance with the Statement on Auditing Standards No. 115 (SAS115) or the campus will be exposed to substantial audit risk. Our current practice requires certification of SAS115 compliance at level 4 (department) on our organization tree. The implementation team should work closely with the controller and campus auditor to develop compliance plans for activities that are conducted in the Shared Service Centers. This will require changes in the level at which we certify or coordinate between departments and Shared Service Centers in cases where compliance for any given unit is split between activities in the Shared Service Centers and the department/unit.

IT

During our engagement with the campus community, we heard a need for clear direction in many areas of IT procurement, application development standards, and infrastructure support. Departments and units are making decisions around these areas because, as it is perceived by users of IT, there is little or no central guidance. The OE IT Initiative is actively working on these issues and has developed case studies on several critical areas and has requested feedback from the campus. We invite our readers to respond to the OE IT Initiative's efforts. Please visit their BSpace location for details. More information can be found at: <http://oe.berkeley.edu/it/index.shtml>.

Human Resources

Staff recruitment and performance management are challenges for our campus. Perhaps we could streamline the classification review process and/or delegate decision-making to Shared Services Centers. Template job descriptions should be utilized for recruiting purposes whenever possible. Managers also need better tools to reward good performance and manage poor performance. Qualitative and quantitative metrics for performance are desperately needed.

The High Performance Culture Initiative is working on these issues. Please visit their site for more information on these efforts and provide feedback to the team: <http://oe.berkeley.edu/highperformance/index.shtml>.

Finance

The implementation of the deficit resolution policy (<http://campuspol.chance.berkeley.edu/policies/deficitresolution.pdf>) within a shared services framework could be challenging. In our current model, it is clear that deficits should roll up to the unit administering the fund and, if they have no funds, the deficit rolls further up to the cognizant Dean or Vice Chancellor. Thought must be given to potential conflicts and the costs of risks associated with errors in a shared services model. An insurance policy/fund for managing these risks should be worked into the service level agreements between the centers and the users.

TRANSITION PLANNING

The team's analysis uses FTE as a primary element for measuring effort and projecting potential savings. It is evident that many positions in IT, human resources, research administration, and finance are not organized exclusively around those specific areas of activity. For example, numerous staff with human resources or finance titles perform work in other areas, such as facilities management, capital projects, and development. In IT, staff provide desktop support, which could be shared, as well as highly specialized application development, which in some cases should remain separate from shared services. It will be particularly difficult to account for the distribution of FTE in a shared services environment where pieces of each person's job, not the whole, will transition to the service centers. It will be critical to involve unit leadership during the transition to ensure appropriate transition and distribution of FTEs into the new organizations and minimize the potential for losses in programmatic functionality.

Likewise, as FTE dedicated to human resources, IT, finance, and research administration moves to populate shared services centers, a void will be created in units and departments with managers whose responsibilities have included supervision of personnel in these areas. Those positions (primarily the MSO and CAO positions) will need to be redefined according to the new needs of the units and departments, possibly becoming adept as the liaison between the Shared Service Center and the unit the MSO/CAO is directing.

COMMUNICATIONS

Several areas of communications should be considered when beginning the implementation planning and other stages of shared services implementation:

- Be as transparent and inclusive as possible. Make use of the web and email to keep the campus community informed. We recommend posting status updates regularly so that people can have a place to see what is happening. We were only able to do this in a limited way during the design phase, but this will be extremely important once the initiative moves into implementation planning.
- Identify and check in with stakeholders often: Direct communication with stakeholders will enable them to participate in the process and ensure that they have enough information to form a strong opinion or preference, and provide meaningful input. Be receptive to their ideas as they become engaged. This proved invaluable in our initiative, and our own thinking evolved as we engaged with the campus community.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (including status quo)

- Costs/Benefits/Risks
- Key assumptions

Please see chapter 5 of the Shared Services Design Team Report.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- Implementation activities
- Functional ownership
- Timeline

The team analyzed experiences with the transition to shared services both within UC Berkeley as well as at other universities, to understand the value of piloting, proof-of-concept requirements, buy-in, and full implementation procedures.

TIMING

The team recommends piloting after in-unit restructuring plans have been implemented, therefore allocating the full first half of 2011 to develop a detailed implementation plan. All units on campus will be engaged in restructuring throughout the first two quarters of 2011. The team believes that further changes to organizational structures should be timed such that the units are able to stabilize before another major change begins, thus allowing staff and faculty time to plan for the phase-in process into shared services. The exception to this should be units that have been approved to begin building shared services centers before such a time.

Shared Services Implementation Timeline

- February 2011: Hire Implementation Manager (OS Sponsors and Initiative Manager)
- Spring 2011: Form Shared Services Implementation Team (Implementation Manager with input from OE Program Office and functional owners)
- January-June 2011: Develop detailed Implementation Plan (Implementation Manager with input from units and functional owners)
- July-December 2011: Pilot Shared Services Centers for administrative units leveraging existing centers (Implementation Manager with input and collaboration from administrative units)
- July-December 2011: Pilot Shared Services Centers for “ready” academic units (Implementation Manager with input and collaboration from units)
- 2012: Full implementation; integrate all administrative and academic units (Implementation Manager)

PILOTING APPROACH

Start piloting by building upon existing service units such as ERSO and the HR Center for Administration. Pay attention to lessons learned and address continuing challenges facing these organizations. This is a sound way to test new work flows and achieve proof-of-concept before full implementation.

Continue development with units that have expressed readiness in sharing services. Throughout the restructuring process, units were asked to submit a list of needs and contingencies that would make their restructuring processes more likely to succeed. The team believes that pilots should support these units by bringing shared services solutions to them first. This approach will allow the Implementation Team to test out new work flows with willing units and provide proof-of-concept to the units that are less ready for this change.

The implementation phase should support organic piloting among units that have the capacity and desire to build shared services for their units. The Colleges of Chemistry, Engineering, and L&S have all expressed a desire to start the process of consolidating HR, IT, and finance work within their units. These efforts should be guided by principles established for all centers and supported throughout their transition. All centers should be expected to adhere to the dual reporting structure (academic and administrative/functional leadership) recommended, implement campus-wide systems, and follow procedures established for the whole campus.

There are significant risks to organic piloting. Units may develop in-house solutions to meet business needs within

existing staffing levels because they are unable to wait for the “campus solution.” Transitioning all remaining units to a “campus solution” entails an additional set of implementation and change management challenges. Savings targets established for this phase of organizational simplification can be met only if units are given clear savings targets and timelines.

STAFFING

Centers should be staffed through a combined approach that allows current talent to populate the centers and allows management to reduce FTE through natural attrition and performance management. As stated earlier, this model worked well for the Engineering Research Services Organization (ERSO).

The team believes that this approach is congruent with campus values, is politically sound, and has relatively low implementation risks. It helps retain institutional knowledge through a major transformation and aids units to transition to a shared service model because key contacts remain on campus during the change process. This approach also helps relieve anxiety around the prospect of massive layoffs following this year’s major restructuring process in units.

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM COMPOSITION

Our team recommends hiring or appointing an Implementation Team to develop, oversee, and manage the implementation process. The volunteer model of the OE Design Phase would take too long to achieve implementation and would tax volunteer employees beyond capacity. The appropriate resources should be allocated to developing a detailed implementation plan to ensure that the change process goes smoothly for the campus. Implementation must be handled by staff dedicated solely to this task and with appropriate skills sets and experience in implementing shared services in public sector, non-profit, and/or higher education environments. The Design Team will remain as an advisory group to the Implementation Team to orient and aid in the process. For the overall project, the following five positions – at a minimum -- are needed as soon as possible:

- 1) Implementation Manager;
- 2) Project Manager;
- 3) Business Process Analysts (two to three);
- 4) Communications Coordinator;
- 5) Executive Assistant and Events Coordinator.

The total investment in implementation staffing over the next two years is roughly \$700,000 per year (please see resource request for expenditure breakdown). This investment will help save significant additional resources in risk mitigation and problems associated with transformational changes and implementation.

IMPLEMENTATION ROLES

It is important that the roles of the people involved in the transition be clearly identified and defined. Many people on campus, beyond the Implementation Team members, will be involved in implementing shared services. There are three types of roles for transitioning to implementation:

- decision-making roles
- initiative-supporting roles
- design and production roles

Decision-making roles

Operational Excellence Executive Committee (OE-EC)

- Reviews team recommendations
- Decides which funding requests to approve
- Decides which recommendations to implement
- Communicates decisions to campus and leaders

Initiative supporting roles

Operational Excellence Program Office (OE-PO)

- Supports Implementation Team, units undergoing change, sponsors, and initiative manager.
- Tracks and helps manage and redistribute savings
- Monitors success during and after implementation
- Owns all activity surrounding central savings management and investment
- Provides analytical resources and funding to initiative

Design and Production roles

Current Initiative Sponsors:

- Provide leadership to campus during implementation
- Participate in meetings with Manager and Program Office to ensure continuity and escalate issues to the EC
- Continue to participate in Coordinating Committee meetings
- Deliver ideas to the EC and campus leadership

Organizational Simplification (OS) Initiative Manager:

- Provide guidance to PO on communications to campus about OS
- Develop Implementation Team structure for Shared Services
- Develop job description for Implementation Manager and identify members of hiring committee
- Participate in hiring committee for Implementation Manager
- Deliver team ideas to Sponsors
- Liaise between Implementation Team and other OE Initiatives

Shared Services Design Team:

- Advise Implementation Team (monthly meetings)
- Provide communications support in the form of suggestions and advice to PO
- Provide change management support in the form of suggestions and advice to PO
- Be available on ongoing basis as needed by Implementation Manager and Initiative Manager

Shared Services Implementation Manager (temporary, two-year position with some overlap with the COO)

- Hire and manage Implementation Team
- Create detailed Implementation Plan
- Pilot Centers; phase in processes and units based on readiness and capacity
- Own establishment and functioning of all shared services centers and incorporate continuous improvement practices
- Engage users and guide organic transitions to Shared Service Centers lead by units ready and capable of implementing the change
- Ensure that implementation team works closely with department and unit staff to make the right implementation decisions

Deans and Vice Chancellors

- Collaborate with Implementation Manager in designing shared services plans
- Collaborate with other Deans/Vice Chancellors; explore sharing opportunities across units
- Help lead implementation charge for their units
- Provide input and advice into the development of service level agreements and Shared Service Center staff expectations
- Engage unit chairs and other faculty/staff leaders in adapting to new processes and protocols
- Communicate with the center directors to evaluate user feedback
- Assess and realign their unit staffing structures to compensate for changing local and shared service roles of staff

Functional Owners

- Collaborate with Implementation manager to establish process standards and policy compliance within centers
- Provide formal input into the hiring and performance management of functional teams across centers

- Working with implementation team, actively engage in business process analysis to streamline functionally owned policies and campus-wide procedures to facilitate implementation process
 - Assist in the development of performance metrics
 - Lead formal working groups for Shared Services Center staff in functional areas
-