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INTRODUCTION

The Office of the President restructuring that began in 2007 produced many changes, most dramatically the creation of units to consolidate certain functions so as to reduce redundancies and inefficiencies, and to free up functional units to focus less on transactional matters and more on strategic leadership issues.

The consolidated units all are mostly now at a point in their maturity to gauge how well they are performing as measured against the objectives and expectations set for them during the UCOP restructuring process, as well as to whether they are meeting the challenges of a still-changing organization.

A six-month assessment, described below, has been performed on eight consolidated units. Findings and recommendations follow.

BACKGROUND

The restructuring that began in 2007 was driven by questions and concerns about UC’s management, and by extension about the size, structure and inner workings of the Office of the President. To many, OP seemed inappropriately large and complex. The university’s worsening budget situation placed added pressure on the need to ensure that resources were being managed and utilized appropriately, especially at OP.

External analyses, first by McKinsey & Co. and later by The Monitor Group, concluded that while OP had an important central administrative role to play within the UC system, it was not organizationally aligned to meet its strategic goals. Too much of its activities were focused on transactional business, with essential service functions duplicated across the organization. Performance was found to be uneven.

The resulting recommendation was for OP to create new centralized units and/or service centers designed to serve the entire OP organization. The goal was to reduce redundancies and deliver more consistent and higher-level service to its OP customers. However, due to the external pressures facing OP at the time, the design of virtually all of the consolidated units, including their size and structure, was not informed nor validated by any in-depth needs analysis or workflow testing. As a result, there are some unresolved operational issues, which are explained in this report.

It is also important to note that the OP restructuring process was organization-wide. And while the consolidated units were a key element of the strategy, individual departments also underwent significant structural change. Many have continued to evolve to meet the continuing loss of personnel and/or the assumption of additional responsibilities. These departmental reorganizations each have impacted the operations of the consolidated units either by increasing workload and responsibilities or, in some cases, by creating shadow functional operations that have created ongoing organizational redundancies.

---

1 The eight units include the Business Resource Center (BRC); Communications; Information Resources and Communications (IR&C) Tech Desk; Institutional Research (IR); Issues Management, Policy Analysis and Coordination (IMPAC); Office of Strategic Change Resources (OSCR); OP Budget; and local OP Human Resources
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METHODOLOGY

This is not intended to be a comprehensive evaluation of the OP restructuring, or OP’s current operational effectiveness. On the contrary, it is designed to identify and address the most critical issues that are proving barriers to greater effectiveness among eight discrete consolidated functional units.

It involved two reviews:

- The first was a self-assessment by each unit to capture, as objectively and completely as possible, what each has accomplished as measured against their original objectives and assumptions, as well as outstanding or ongoing operational issues and challenges. Unit leaders consulted with personnel and/or leadership within their respective units in developing their self-assessments. Each self-assessment included scorecards that measured the units against original objectives, assumptions and expected results. The self-assessments are attached.

- The second review was focus groups made up of OP staff recommended by senior leadership. These facilitated sessions included reviews of the self-assessments and scorecards, followed by discussions around the following questions:
  - How has your unit/division interacted with the consolidated units? How has your unit/division adapted to the existence and services of the consolidated units?
  - In your view, are the consolidated units meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?
  - For each of the consolidated units, what do you think is working well?
  - Are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessments? Do you have any suggestions for how the individual consolidated units might improve their operation and/or service to UCOP?

The focus group comments are attached.
KEY FINDINGS

General Findings

• After a period of transition and adjustment, the consolidated units mostly have become institutionalized at the Office of the President. There is a general sense that the units add value, and departments have developed strong relationships with individuals in the units; these have helped to strengthen the structures and improve processes.

• There remain, however, some confusion about the functions, responsibilities, and procedures of each of the consolidated units. In particular, there are concerns about the handoff between units, especially regarding financial operations.

• There remain “gray” area functions which are not being addressed by any of the consolidated units, therefore are either still being performed in departments or not at all.

• Customer service could be improved in many consolidated units.

• There are continuing questions about whether some of the units are adequately staffed to meet their charge; conversely, some units may be overstaffed.

• Departments either never gave up or subsequently have backfilled for some of the functions absorbed by the consolidated units, creating shadow operations that are causing confusion and/or uneven levels of service.

• Departments are frustrated by slow turnaround times, lost paperwork, and the prioritization of projects.

• Levels of service are not consistent across consolidated units, suggesting problems of adequate training and/or individual personnel issues.

• There is widespread belief that consolidated units could be streamlining and/or automating certain procedures, or eliminating unnecessary practices.

Unit-Specific Observations: Business Resource Center (BRC)

• While BRC is generally regarded as adding value to the organization, there remain concerns about consistency across the teams; levels of service results in uneven satisfaction levels with BRC’s responsiveness and efficiency.

• BRC has self-identified staff training and customer service as areas requiring improvement.

• Division of responsibilities between BRC and UCLA remain unclear.

• Division of labor (i.e. reconciliations) between BRC and OP Budget also remains unclear.

• Some departments complain about timeliness and efficiency of travel reimbursement.

• All departments would like to better understand BRC operations and processes.
• Some departments would like ways to track invoices.

• Several departments challenge BRC to better balance audit and control functions with need for
timeliness and efficiency.

• One department raised a question about BRC’s staffing levels – is 50 FTE for a 1,500-FTE organization
too heavy?

• Could BRC automate more of its processes?

Unit-Specific Observations: Communications
• Many departments speak very highly of the higher-level of service now being provided by OP
Communications, though there is some confusion about roles in the unit – who does what and for
whom? What are its processes and procedures?

• Some departments feel that Communications is sometimes too heavy-handed in ownership of content,
message and branding.

• Communications seems unable to meet all internal communications needs; some departments suggest
that the unit ease outsourcing/preferred vendor processes so departments can quickly bring on
consultants to meet their needs.

Unit-Specific Observations: Institutional Research
• IR processes are unclear to some departments: how do they initiate research projects? How can they
track progress? How do they prioritize projects?

• Confusion/disagreement continues to exist over where analysis function should reside – in IR or with
subject-matter experts in the departments? The appropriateness and efficiency of “shadow research
groups” remains an issue to be addressed.

Unit-Specific Findings: Issues Management, Policy Analysis & Coordination (IMPAC)
• Some departments remain confused about IMPAC’s role – is it just legislative analysis? Is it issues
management (and if so, what does that mean)?

• Some departments express concern that the breadth and depth of knowledge of analysts is less than
before when departments had dedicated in-house analysts.

• Some respondents wondered about the extent to which IMPAC does, or should, address federal issues.

• Communications with departments appears uneven

Unit-Specific Observations: Office of Strategic Change Resources (OSCR)
• Unit is not well-known within the Office of the President. The name is confusing.

• Some departments express concern about overlap between OSCR’s project management function and
that which has been created in IR&C
• Most departments don’t know how to engage OSCR or its services.

• Current staff gets high marks from those who have worked with them, but there is concern that the unit isn’t sufficiently staffed to meet growing project management needs: departments would like the unit to ease outsourcing/preferred vendor processes so departments can quickly bring on consultants to meet their needs.

Unit-Specific Observations: Office of the President Budget Office
• Most departments want higher level of analysis, planning and consulting from OP Budget, which is currently seen as too transactional.

• Customer service is broadly seen as insufficient – its reputation is that things, like pre-approvals, get “stuck” there.

• There is a lack of consistency and communications; some departments feel they are not well-served by their coordinators.

• OP Budget is not seen as aligned with OP’s strategic goals.

Unit-Specific Observations: Office of the President Human Resources
• This is a relatively new unit; departments seem willing to wait-and-see whether it can improve OP operations.

• Dedicating “Business Partners” to each department is seen as a positive, though the model may need refinement.

• Clear communications about human resource processes is needed

Unit-Specific Observations: Tech Desk
• There is broad frustration about level of service, consistency of service, and attention to customer satisfaction.

• IR&C in general and Tech Desk in particular not broadly seen as a strategic partner.

• Responsiveness and timeliness are recurring concerns.

• Training appears uneven among technicians; Mac support is particularly lacking.
RECOMMENDATIONS

General Recommendations

1) A coordinated communications effort should be launched to clarify each consolidated unit’s roles, responsibilities and procedures. The communications should provide clarity as to what functions reside with each unit and what remains in departments, how departments can access their services and how services are prioritized. The strategy should encompass written communications, brown bag lunches, one-on-one meetings, and the creation of individual unit web sites and “desk manuals” that clearly define what needs to be done prior to entering the consolidated unit process and what steps are left to the department after the process.

2) Each consolidated unit should address training and performance management needs identified in the review.

3) To ensure continuous improvement of consolidated unit services and to address integration issues between units, the leadership of each of the consolidated units should convene as part of a new Office of the President Operations Council. Its work shall be informed by a more broadly representative OP Operations Advisory Council.

4) To eliminate or justify shadow operations within the Office of the President, a two-phase strategy should be developed:

   - First, facilitate a high-level discussion on what constitutes department need to duplicate services provided by the consolidated units, including in the case of Institutional Research the functional differential between “analysis” and “research” and to what extent the former is an IR function. As part of the review, clear guidelines should be developed to allow for exceptions to OP’s policy of consolidating functions within consolidated units.

   - Second, conduct an organization-wide review as part of the FY 2012-13 budget process to identify and justify FTE that departments either never gave up or subsequently have backfilled for some of the functions absorbed by the consolidated units.

5) All consolidated units should conduct annual customer service surveys to determine areas of continued improvement.

Unit-Specific Recommendations: Business Resource Center (BRC)

6) BRC should undergo a complete review of its processes and operations to identify opportunities for streamlining, automation and efficiency. In its review, it should address these more specific questions and concerns:

   - Systems improvements to provide better tracking of invoices.

   - The balance between its audit and control functions and the desire for more timeliness and efficiency.

   - Current staffing levels.

   - In a joint review with OP Budget, identify and assign “gray area” functions, such as reconciliations. Develop protocols to improve interactions between financial-related units.

   - Is organizational alignment within the Chief Financial Officer’s division still appropriate given strategic shifts in the division?
Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Communications**
7) As part of its own communications outreach, Communications should provide to clients more clarity about its staff roles, processes and procedures, as well as more education about the importance of content, messaging and visual standards.

8) It should develop preferred vendor/master contracts lists to meet department needs that cannot be met by the unit.

Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Institutional Research**
9) As part of its communications outreach, IR should clarify its processes, specifically how departments can initiate research projects, how it prioritizes projects, and how departments can track project progress.

Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Issues Management, Policy Analysis & Coordination (IMPAC)**
10) IMPAC should complete its organizational review, focused on the findings contained herein, already launched under the new interim leadership of Senior Vice President Dooley.

Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Office of Strategic Change Resources (OSCR)**
11) Unit should better articulate and communicate its purpose, role and the services it provides.

12) Based on earlier proposals and findings from the ongoing organizational review of IR&C, Executive Vice President Brostrom should make a determination about organizational ownership over project management – what belongs in OSCR, what belongs in IR&C, and how should the two offices interact?

13) OSCR should develop preferred vendor/master contracts lists to meet department project management needs that cannot be met by the unit.

Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Office of the President Budget Office**
14) Upon hiring of a permanent Budget Director, OP Budget should be reorganized to provide higher level of analysis, planning and consulting from OP Budget.

15) Suspend the pre-approval process upon implementation of new Budget Management and Reporting Tool.

16) Undergo joint review with BRC to determine functional areas of overlap; ways to improve interactions.

17) Explore feasibility of expanding responsibilities to include more financial management operations (i.e. Building Services, Academic Affairs).

Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Office of the President Human Resources**
18) None at this time beyond improving communications on processes.

Unit-Specific Recommendations: **Tech Desk**
19) Recommendations are incorporated in the IR&C organizational review. They include:
   - Reorganize to provide multi-tiered support services, including dedicated executive-level support
   - Provide solution designers/business analysts to work collaboratively with department to develop technology roadmaps
   - Maintain small team of application leaders to facilitate the sourcing and oversight of OP development projects to third parties
Attachment 1:
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1. How has your unit/division interacted with the BRC?
   - We interact with BRC on a daily basis: requesting POs, providing backup for invoices, making acquisitions etc. BRC Gold has typically been very helpful even when we have not been aware of what their procedures are. They have been informative and supportive when we have had ledger questions or purchasing questions.
   - We have a continuous stream of transactions requiring BRC processing: purchase orders, professional services agreements, payroll actions, recharges, travel, etc.
   - To ensure the payroll and non-payroll transactions for the entire department are paid timely and accurately, we have been sending invoices and supporting documents to BRC for processing. The related transactions are:
     - Invoice payments
     - Travel ticket reservations and reimbursements
     - Large meeting/event arrangements
     - PSA/ICA
     - FedEx Labels
     - Contract and Grants payments
     - Monthly Ledger Reconciliations
     - Fiscal Closing clean-ups
     - Set up new employee payroll accounts
     - Employee Timesheet Templates and records
     - Monthly Payroll Reconciliations
     - Payroll transfers
     - Personnel transaction paperwork
     - Solve employees’ payroll problems
   - CMF uses BRC to process expense reimbursements, routine departmental invoices, place office supply orders, and request PTA’s for travel. They’ve provided us airbills for packages that require next day and ground delivery services.
   - Transaction processing (EP transactions account for nearly 7% of the total number of transactions processed by BRC).
   - Issues management/problem-solving regarding transactions.
   - Training/guidance for department preparers.
   - Yes, we all use the BRC. ANR does not use them for processing financial journals. OGC uses them for payroll only.

2. How has your unit/division adapted to the existence and services of the BRC?
   - Our department works well with BRC, although sometimes a process is not defined, usually someone in BRC will help or explain what to do.
   - It was a rough start. But obviously we had to adapt to working with the BRC since delays or dropped transactions are unacceptable.
   - To clarify roles and responsibilities we called meetings with BRC leadership, on more than one occasion as the need arose, so work could proceed.
   - At the beginning of the transition, our department met with BRC staff to understand their services and working procedures to ensure consistency and efficiency in the process. When problems arose, we met with BRC Team Lead and Supervisor to resolve the problems.
• We have been following up closely with BRC on status of invoices and reimbursement payments. It always takes too long to process each payment. The average turnaround time is three weeks. Loss of paperwork by BRC is also another issue. We learn to be patient in adapting to the existence and services of BRC. We have complied with the mandate to centralize the operational functions of our department through the utilization of the BRC.

• Office Orders are placed so that we can maximize the next day delivery option.

• BRC provides an important resource for us. We worked closely with BRC early on to clarify the different roles of the department preparer and the BRC processor and created a liaison relationship with BRC. The transition has been smooth.

3. In your view, is the BRC meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?

• There is not a clear distinction between BRC and the Recharge staff. We have not had training on how to process recharges or who to contact for recharge questions.

• Also, there does not seem to be a strict consistency between BRC teams, regarding procedures.

• There really were no clear expectations set. There were broadly stated goals but the details were left vague. For the longest time there was no SLA, Web site, or even a simple list of services. It seemed that the BRC was allowed to define their own terms and keep the departments in the dark.

• Over time, they clearly stated that they only did “transactional” work, but that didn’t help departments who still needed to get work done in order to inform BRC what transactions to process, and yet who had lost the staff that used to do that work.

• It has seemed that there has been an over emphasis on audit and controls to the detriment of efficiency and streamlining.

• BRC has partially met the expectations set for them during the restructuring process. There is still room for improvements on accuracy, work flow, and communication with internal customers.

• Yes and no. The guidelines differentiate depending who you speak with. You can ask one question and get multiple answers. The parameters of what can be done and cannot be done need better outline so that the BRC can give its internal customers the same message.

• Yes. They are maintaining UC policy and procedure and consistency in terms of accounts payable. They are the office of record, which mitigates risk for the department – this is probably their most important role for us.

4. For the BRC, what do you think is working well?

• It feels like the staff in BRC Gold works well together and is very supportive to its clients.

• The two BRC teams discussed were the “Blue and Gold” teams:
  o Working fairly well; many of the BRC team came from the focus group areas so there was an established relationship.
  o The teams are responsive and informative. Example of this is in the Gold team where the Communications team reached out to the Team Lead for training and understanding of processes. She was very accommodating and together they walked through scenarios and resolved issues.
  o Departments/units are adapting well to this consolidated unit; it works very well when they are informed of changes or news in the process or procedures.
  o Overall BRC was meeting the expectations of the focus groups. Also, it was important to note that they understand some of the BRC constraints are due to the UCLA process and procedures.
  o One member stated that they had their doubts regarding BRC processing travel in a timely manner, but once they expressed to BRC their expectations of this process BRC responded in a timely manner and has met expectations.
• Events group is working very well.
• Payroll seems to be working well.
• Most BRC staff understand UC policies – that helps.
• Some of us have developed good relationships with individual BRC teams.
• After two years, departments and the BRC have found ways to work together well. Again, that isn’t to say that restricting BRC work to transactions-only is the optimal path.
• The Yellow Team (recharges and events group) is exceptionally useful and streamlined. They probably benefited from being formed under less pressure and with greater clarity and focus of purpose. A key difference is that they actually do the background analysis work. They are not transactional only and so they provide real work relief to departments.
• The reviewer process works well. They do catch errors, such as in travel vouchers that can get fixed before going to UCLA, which would cause delay.
• They catch time sheet errors immediately and process transactions quickly.
• Fast response to questions.
• Efficiency in making flight reservations.
• Office supply ordering, payment of most vendors. PTA’s are generally processed and returned in a timely manner.
• Regularly updating publications.
• Assuming full responsibility for the maintenance of the financial aid information on the Web, including alerting Student Financial Aid when potentially out-of-date information needs to be reviewed and/or updated and suggesting verbiage to use.
• Researching, writing, and designing the information on the Web regarding the honorary degree recipients.
• Meeting ad-hoc as well as ongoing communication needs.
• Invoice payments are working well – invoices are paid on time.
• BRC Events planned/executed 6 retirements very well for CFO division.
• Comfortable with office of record and reconciliation process in BRC.
• BRC’s handling of accounts payable transactional work such as travel reimbursement and purchasing has been most useful in freeing up personnel time.
• Provided fairly consistent customer service in terms of instructions to departments on processes as well as responding to inquiries about the status of a transaction.
• Good advice for travel and entertainment policy questions.
• Training classes – example CONNEXXUS.
• Invoice payments handled appropriately and staff available to answer questions, etc.
• Processing travel and other reimbursements, particularly student travel, which BRC is helping us to streamline.
• Processing invoices for payment and processing them in a timely manner.
• Our bills are paid on time – better than we had pre-BRC.
• Coordinating preapprovals with UCLA for events contracts.
• Providing advice on how to get transactions processed as expeditiously as possible –helping users navigate the “system”.
• Providing advice on how best to structure complex, multifaceted pre-approvals so that invoice and reimbursement processing will be as streamlined as possible.
• Responding as best as possible to “urgent” issues.
• Looking up past invoices.
• Advice for compliance.
Support for training to improve compliance.

5. For the BRC, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?

- There seems to be a challenge in purchasing equipment or services in a timely manner sometimes, either items that have to be purchased online or with a credit card, or something that needs to be purchased with a tight deadline.
- When a new employee comes onboard that may need to interact with the BRC there is no high level view of “How We Work”. So an employee may struggle for awhile before understanding or gaining information regarding the process and who to contact.
- Observation was that BRC teams are inconsistent on how they may process their work. It was noted that there may be a good reason for this as they are adapting to the needs of their clients. However, if someone needs to work with two teams or switch from one team to another it can be confusing and they may receive different answers to the same problem.
- There are little issues that are being managed; however, when it does not go well it is usually on large issues. Example given was payment to a keynote speaker was delayed for a long period of time.
- There is confusion of the new Administrative Service Center (ASC) role and how they interact with BRC and the others. A question was raised on why they are not part of this review. We tried so hard to get away from the SiLO organization; yet, it feels like we are heading back to that organization.
- One person added that they don’t know who is in the ASC, or what they do. There has been no communication since they were re-organized. Why are we not reviewing this unit?
- The obvious emphasis on risk and controls needs to be balanced by an emphasis on efficiency.
- The mentality of conducting only transactional work leads to unwillingness to take on responsibility for helping to streamline the continuum of business actions from start to finish. An example is that the BRC apparently chose not to be part of the TAMS design process because they only take items after there’s been a pre-approval. However, once TAMS was launched, the system was sending items to BRC, which didn’t know what to do with them, which in turn caused big delays. That has been resolved now, but it would have been better had BRC seen themselves from the outset as a player in the continuum of actions related to pre-approvals.
- It seems that they have not questioned the purpose of processes and transactions, and have not actively sought to streamline or eliminate unnecessary processes.
- Payroll needs to address more emphasis on accuracy.
- BRC needs to work with our department regarding ledger reconciliation to avoid duplication of work.
- BRC has identified staff training and customer service as areas of improvement that impact processing time. They appear, in their self-assessment, to be aware of this issue.
- The unit seems overly concerned with audits and controls. Asking for backup on a $15 expenditure eats away at their ability to focus on customer service.
- Do all members of the staff have sufficient training? Some things go back and forth several times.
- Staffing: Something is wrong when it takes 50 people to service only 1,500 employees.
- A key issue is the linkages between spending and budget – between BRC and OP Budget. Fingers crossed that the new online budget development system will help with that.
- Travel is a step backwards because it’s been set up for it to be convenient for BRC processors rather than for travelers. For example, the reimbursement form doesn’t compute a total on it.
- Training within BRC for processing of travel reimbursements is inadequate.
- Routine monthly invoice payments are late. This shouldn’t happen if it’s routine.
- No routine online payment capability.
- Another example is that all departments now are on their own when it comes to ordering and managing office supplies. Staffing was taken away but then departments have to order on their own.
• BRC interface with IR&C for computers is very bad and as a result, equipment is often not ready when new employees arrive.
• BRC does not have a client-centered culture.
• Computer procurement is especially bad; too many touches, and neither BRC nor IR&C assume ownership of the process. There have been major delays in receiving computer equipment because of lack of communication between the supplier/vendor/BRC/IR&C. Also, BRC coordination with IR&C regarding software license procurement is problematic (associating a specific license billing with the correct user, especially when there are multiple users, in order to obtain “key” from vendor to use software).
• Travel policies leave very little flexibility for creative arrangements that would save the University money.
• Computer equipment purchases go through a lot of hoops to get to my desk.
• Bifurcation of responsibilities between BRC and UCLA and overall ownership of the process: Particularly problematic for departments is that no single entity seems to have (or want) ownership over the payment/reimbursement process. When things go awry, BRC or UCLA point to each other as the source of the problem. Departments do not understand the bifurcation of responsibilities between BRC and UCLA, and what they are specifically responsible for, and thus are not in a position to anticipate or resolve problems. It is not clear why two units have review/approval (“control”) rights over relatively simple transactional processing. Moreover, is it even necessary that a department need be aware of the BRC/UCLA roles (i.e., shouldn’t that be transparent to the client)? The department desires a service provider that has ownership for the end deliverables (e.g., vendor being paid, travel reimbursement credited to traveler, paycheck going into the correct account). The department needs to rely upon that service provider to have in place processes and controls to ensure that the deliverables have been produced accurately. (Thus, the traveler should not need to keep a separate shadow tracking system to be assured that they will get reimbursed, or that payment has been made to a vendor). It would be great if we could look to BRC to be that service provider.
• Payments to vendors: If UCLA or BRC have questions about any aspect of an invoice, it has been left up to the department to inquire as to why payment has not been made (or, worse, the department is blindsided by complaints/late charges). Based on our experience, we are now telling vendors that it takes a minimum of 6 to 8 weeks to receive payment from UCLA after we have submitted an invoice to BRC. This is an ongoing problem, and has resulted in threatened utility shut-downs to property or imposition of substantial late payment charges, one or more large sales coming very close to failing due to non-payment of invoices for fees (invoices were submitted two months prior to the transaction date; BRC had questions regarding the payment, but never followed up with department staff, and so they were simply left unpaid), and extraordinary amounts of department staff time wasted on the most elemental of bill paying exercises. This issue has very real financial consequences for the University’s business.
• Refusal to pay invoices for small dollar amounts: On several occasions, an enormous amount of the department’s professional staff time has been required to force payment of invoices for small dollar amounts (e.g., under $10). These payments (taxes, fees, insurance) are legally required of the University, yet the invoices go unpaid (often without explanation) until the department is forced to intercede. We believe that it is UCLA that balks at issuing the checks, but BRC has not taken steps to resolve this issue.
• Electronic payment: We find ourselves in a Catch-22, and would appreciate BRC help in resolving this issue. Vendors, such as large utilities, banks, county tax offices, won’t provide the information for us to deposit directly into their accounts. Typically, they ask their customers (such as UC) to provide the customer’s account information to bill; UC won’t provide that information. Thus we are relegated to paper-check processing.
Customer service, training, authority: In terms of resolving problems, staff in the BRC seem to be acting with good will, and, in fact, department staff report that BRC staff are friendly and willing to listen. However, they don’t seem to have the ready channels to take matters up to higher authority levels in order to resolve them in a timely manner. They seem well-trained on routine matters, but seem to lack sufficient subject matter knowledge to produce a real solution to non-routine matters. There has also been a problem with transferring information regarding non-routine transactions (i.e., one BRC staff member may understand how to process a non-routine item, but if that person is out, then another BRC staff person does not know how to process it; this has led to delays in reimbursements).

For our department’s training events, BRC Events has indicated they do not currently handle the recharges affiliated with it (e.g., the interface with the campus participants who are RSVP’ing and paying for the event). Also, we have been told that we cannot count on them having primary responsibility for managing the event details (caterers, set up of rooms, etc.) on the day of the event when it is at other campuses or distant locations. For those two reasons, the Events group is not a useful resource for our training events or conferences.

All members of the focus group said travel reimbursement is the big problem with BRC.

I do not understand the need for the pre-approval process if the money is in our budget. Why is this necessary if we are responsible for our own budgets? Although bringing the threshold up to $1,500 from where it was before was a good idea.

All members of the focus group said leadership of BRC is pleasant to work with and can accomplish things quickly; clerk-level is inconsistent.

Not finding out that things are not getting paid until it’s too late; would like to know sooner if supposed to deal with it

All members of the focus group said that the promise that BRC could be the Start-to-Finish department for processing invoices is not true.

6. Do you have any suggestions for how the BRC might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

One of the major challenges in our work is the ability to hire freelance vendors. There are several departments/divisions with various requirements that have changed and evolved over time. There is no oversight to the process and there is no timeliness to the steps taken to satisfy requirements that have not been fully standardized.

Create a “How We Work” procedure or high level view of how things work with different scenarios. Even better is “How We Work” between the consolidated units. Along with a roles and responsibility definition for each of the tasks. For example: A department may satisfy requirements for BRC but may not satisfy the requirements for the Tech Desk or may cause issues for another consolidated unit. Understanding how the work flows will help educate everyone and understanding why we must follow some procedures.

As the “How We Work” example above, having a “Checklist of Items” to be completed along with a column on “Who is Responsible” would be valued within the departments/units.

Meet with the departments/units on a regular basis to understand how they work and what their issues may be.

Better communication especially when something has changed or there is a new procedure or process. Examples were given when we moved from PAN to PTA for travel and W-9 changes. Understanding “why” is very important. Also in the discussion we discovered that BRC can pay banks directly for bills. This would be nice for everyone to know and as well as when it applies to them.

Regarding Travel, some may want to set and process their own travel because they may not have an assistant or want assistance. Developing an intermediary process would be helpful for this clientele.
FedEx labels: The BRC does not seem to understand that the whole reason to use FedEx is because there’s a time issue! Often they provide the label too late.

W2 forms: Our department does not want any responsibility for delivering paper W2 forms. Even though we convey each year that we will pay to have the forms mailed to the individuals, the BRC at the last minute asks us to deliver the forms.

E-mail approvals: We believe that forwarded e-mail approvals from managers should be sufficient. However, for control purposes, the BRC has stated that purchases we handle outside TAMS, such as software maintenance for which we have blanket approval, must be sent directly to BRC by the manager. This means that our staff person must tell the manager what to do and what to tell the BRC, rather than just forwarding the manager’s approval to the BRC herself. This seems to place more emphasis on control than efficiency. Plus it seems that the risk of fraud is low.

Airline ticket approvals: BRC requires the manager of the traveler to send an e-mail approving an airline ticket quote, and this must be done within 24 hours or we lose the quote. This means that IR&C admin staff has to explain to the manager what the request is and what to do. We would not have even begun the process without the manager’s approval. It would be better if the admin person could approve the quote directly, forwarding the approval we already have from the manager.

Conference payments: It is very difficult to register and pay for a conference. BRC needs to find a way for the University to cover this cost. As it is now, the attendee or manager must front the cost, which is a real burden for some people. The BRC solution of having people use a corporate card does not work for people who rarely go to conferences or do not want a card.

Service credit. People attach a great deal of importance to having their vacation accruals change right on time when they meet a service milestone. Our experience is that this is still greatly delayed.

BRC should be automating more so they can focus more on customer service.

There may be a need for weeding-out of policies that BRC enforces, especially given that we have the additional complication of abiding by UCLA policies.

Many things seem to have an answer of, “You do it – you’re the department.” May need more clarity on who is responsible for what, and why they can’t do it, since they took all of the financial people in our department.

Improve turnaround time - it always takes too long to process the invoice and reimbursement payments. The average turnaround time is three weeks.

Improve efficiencies – office supplies had been received within two business days of ordering directly, before the transition to the BRC. Now it takes more than ten days and up to several weeks to receive office supplies.

Improve accuracy - errors in supply orders are not unusual, necessitating return of items caused further delays. Payroll information is incorrectly entered into the system.

Maintain tracking log – loss of paperwork by BRC caused delays in payments.

BRC staff should be encouraged to attend more training on UC policies and procedures.

Additional training for BRC staff. There needs to be an overall pamphlet with a condensed policy on travel and travel reimbursement. What is acceptable by one person in BRC isn’t by another and depending on who is processing your paper work you do something one way but if you try and do it the same with someone else, you are told that it is not the policy.

Working with departments to develop an overall strategic communication plan.

We would like to see travel reimbursement processing time improved, and a processing procedure established that ensures that travelers who are waiting for high dollar reimbursements receive some priority in the processing queue.

Meet with the departments/units on a regular basis to understand how they work and what their issues may be.
One respondent finds that interactions with the BRC often require her to provide the same information as provided in initial request a second and sometimes third time but in different forms.

The self-assessment was not structured to consider interactions and systems issues between consolidated units. However, exploration of this should lead to some real benefits for BRC staff and UCOP as a whole. Work in the Budget Office affects Payroll and vice versa, so coordination on workflow, timelines and work product would be very beneficial to the Payroll Office. This is especially important at fiscal close.

It would be helpful to have published turnaround times, submission templates and workflows for fiscal close activities such as changing of payroll distributions.

If the BRC has the capacity to do an internal audit of transactional accuracy, it might help with ensuring that work quality is consistent.

**Slow travel reimbursement:** The time between when a traveler submits an expense reimbursement request to BRC, and when they actually receive funds have ranged from a few weeks up to 2 to 3 months. Travelers are not contacted in a timely manner if additional information is required. Department users who have tracked each point in the transaction, have found that the time between submittal to BRC, receipt of proxy notice, and credit to traveler’s account has varied widely. It is unclear why there is this disparity in processing time. For executive travel, it used to be the case that executives’ assistants received notifications when payments were entered into the system as well as when deposits were made; with the BRC consolidation, the assistants no longer have the ability to track reimbursements or provide their supervisors with assurance of timely repayment.

**Responsibility for obtaining W-9/taxpayer IDs:** Tax identification information is currently the responsibility of the department to track down, but should it be? There are privacy concerns (department is not set up to provide the level of security required, not only during the transaction, but in terms of purging records). This exposes the University to risk; if a centralized unit such as BRC was responsible for obtaining and providing the info to UCLA, this would streamline the process as well as address the privacy concerns. Also, as a sub-issue, “UCLA” requires their unique version of the W-9 form (vs. the IRS form). Vendors don’t understand why the IRS Form is not sufficient. The department would like to look to BRC to negotiate reasonable changes with UCLA (i.e., accept the IRS form), as an advocate for all the OP departments.

**Quality assurance by BRC payroll:** It is unclear that BRC follows up immediately to ensure that critical changes that are requested are correctly transacted by UCLA. One example: there was a checking account change, wherein information was provided to BRC-Payroll requesting a paper check be cut for the current month, with the following month’s check to go into the new account. The paycheck did not appear in the new account, and BRC later determined that there was a data entry error. This was not caught until the employee noticed the missing deposit. Staff has experienced numerous problems with deductions, etc., and often times are told that the error is with UCLA. In these circumstances, would it be possible to set up controls such that BRC can judge UCLA’s performance and hold them accountable? In another example, a staff person on disability was advised not to make a required payroll change because UCLA has such a bad track record of errors. So they were advised to wait until the University billed him/her for the overpaid disability amount. What a poor financial practice.

**Recommends BRC Events look at ANR Program Support Unit at Davis as a model:**
[http://ucanr.org/sites/psu/](http://ucanr.org/sites/psu/)

BRC is just layering on additional process and we’re the ones accountable in the end. Departments still need someone in department to track down where things are because the BRC doesn’t have final copies of things. BRC is implementing policies that are problematic. For example, they want a receipt for a bridge toll. But sometimes they do not. Consistency would be best in order to determine what is required and what is not. The amount of time spent nickel and diming if small ticket items complied
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with policies is not worth it. For example, if a staff member requests reimbursement for a soda bought in the airport, but they question whether it is considered a “meal”. BRC would do better to focus on big ticket items.

- I agree with the above statement. I have been told that I cannot pay for two people on business trips; that each person has to pay for their own meal. This is not efficient either.
- There should be room for reasonableness. More accommodation for individual parameters would be nice.
- CFO group bills the cost of the bond into travel reimbursements. So, we have to do reimbursements twice. This is inefficient.
- Maybe more training is needed?
- Catalog supply orders – BRC will order but not process returns.
- Orders for goods and services – would like a PAN notice for items ordered.
- Timeliness of payments – need to follow to status submitted paperwork.
- Need to be more proactive in assisting department with follow-up issues such as in the case of tracking down and resolving a possible missed payment.
- Developing a more efficient system for processing travel reimbursements, particularly student and non-employee reimbursements.
- Developing a more efficient system related to pre-approvals, particularly for scheduling events using outside venues.
- Creating a user manual for each “operation” or “process” managed by BRC.
- Expanding service level agreement to include preparing paperwork/forms for processing or management recognizing the resources/expertise departments need to complete this step for each transaction.
- Increasing accountability for completion of work given to BRC (i.e., departments should not have to maintain lists and/or copies of every document given to BRC to ensure that every transaction is keyed and/or processed).
- Providing reliable and timely notification to the department when transactions go “into suspense” in the UCLA system to ensure that all transactions are processed completely in a timely manner.
- Initiating workarounds for UCLA system bugs (e.g., NPEAR “error” messages; such problems should be transparent to the department).
- Notifications of stuck transactions early before they become issues.
- A way for departments to monitor their own transaction progress.
- Clarify, in writing, procedures to be used when operations overlap with UCOP Budget, RPAC, SRCT.

1. How has your unit/division interacted with Communications?

- Very little, except when we ask them to publicize a systemwide awards announcement. They’re very helpful with this.
- We have worked with on various media inquiries.
- Consultation with the Student Affairs communications liaison regarding accuracy of messaging and review of documents.
- Training/guidance from Student Affairs communications liaison to EP managers regarding media and story placement, use of social media.
- Style consultation (new UC color scheme, fonts) with production group.
- Consultation regarding outsourcing for graphic design and editorial work.
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- Consultation with web design group regarding new web sites (UCOP, UC wide, internal).
- Academic Planning uses Communications for Accountability Report, press releases; ANR uses Davis; As far as we know, CFO Division does not work with Communications.
- Uses Communications for mass-produced publications, Working Smarter website, photo of staff for brochures, news releases.
- Advice and guidance on departmental Annual Report, Legal Advisories, etc.

2. How has your unit/division adapted to the existence and services of Communications?
- We try to work with them to expand how we publicize new IT services, such as through Link.
- Well – it is great to have a consolidated go-to for media issues.
- Mostly smooth, because we already had strong working relationships with the staff who had previously worked in Student Affairs.

3. In your view, is Communications meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?
- Yes, generally. We work with Steve Montiel and Lynn Tierney mostly. There was one hiccup where there was a public statement that differed from our bond disclosure. It is important that the Office of the President has a consistent message.
- The expectations were very lofty and hard to measure, such as “stronger story telling.”
- For the most part. They have been very deliberate about branding, internal communications, and general marketing. The new messaging and new approach seems fresh and vibrant, and disruptive in a good way.
- Ironically, the communications department isn’t very transparent in its own operations. Who does what is somewhat unclear (what is the Creative Director responsible for? How is that different from what the Multimedia Director does, or the Marketing/Communications Director? Who are all these directors?!). It’s sometimes hard to keep track of the status of major projects, as well as the protocols for working with the various units within the department. I’d like them to communicate more about contacts, projects, changes in personnel, etc. – a detailed topic/function directory would be useful, a blog on SharePoint, etc..

4. For Communications, what do you think is working well?
- The work is probably more apparent on a systemwide level.
- One point of contact has been important.
- Our communications liaison – Victoria Irwin – continues to provide exemplary support. She’s proactive on issues impacting our teacher preparation and student academic achievement work, and reaches out to us to help us improve the ways that we communicate. She attends our meetings and “follows” our programs using social media.
- The work that is beginning to unfold – new branding/marketing, new web presence – is promising.
- Working very well and one stated they were very pleased.
- Team is very responsive and example was given where a team needed to rebrand a product or service and the communication team did a great job.
- It was stated that the Communications team is designed to be in a consultant role.
- UC Link is a good way to communicate; this is working well
- Talented people, but not enough of them. They must have added staff because things are better now than when they were first formed.
- Their staff is approachable. They have good skill sets and they come up with good, creative ideas.
- Level of expertise and professionalism. Outreach from our communications contact – keeping abreast on what we’re working on and to understand content.
• Media Relations is responsive and seems to be getting out positive messaging.
• Yem Ling is fabulous in facilitating the production process. She needs more people.
• Link is a good newsletter and is helping us feel a sense of community at OP.
• With respect to helping with news releases, developing the Working Smarter site, and arranging photo services for a brochure, our department staff have reported that the Communications group has been very attentive, professional, provided high quality services, and had good follow-up.
• Two respondents thought responses to media are good. The fact that they are Generalists and not Specialists is a good thing.
• UCOP News messages (Internal Communication) is good.
• Jason Simon’s group came to PT’s & NB’s staff meetings.
• Regularly updating publications.
• Assuming full responsibility for the maintenance of the financial aid information on the Web, including alerting Student Financial Aid when potentially out-of-date information needs to be reviewed and/or updated and suggesting verbiage to use.
• Researching, writing, and designing the information on the Web regarding the honorary degree recipients.
• Meeting ad-hoc as well as ongoing communication needs.
• UCOP news clips.
• Link newsletter to keep employees apprised of UCOP events and issues.

5. For Communications, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?
• The assessment mentions the need for departments to follow new protocols, but those protocols are not clear, nor are they available anywhere for reference (other than the graphic identity style guide).
• There is still a need for departments to do their own, local communications for their various constituents, and there is not yet a mechanism in Communications to ease that process for departments. For example, Communications maintains a list of graphic designers, but does not have any of them on retainer so that departments can choose one and begin to work. Instead, departments must go through the entire ICA/PSA process just as they had to before.
• Team seems to be more reactive than proactive; “we have to come to them with things.”
• They’re clearly focused on the president’s needs, but it’s not clear how others of us can access them, what you can go to them for, who you go through. Nothing on the website. Also not clear how they are prioritizing projects – who gets high-priority status and why?
• There were some initial areas where we needed to backfill because Communications did not take on things we thought they would, but most of that is now resolved.
• The idea of “Link” (the internal OP e-newsletter) is great, but the format is not effective. It requires a lot of clicking from page to page, and people are missing a lot of information as a result (including events they otherwise would be interested in).
• There is still no ability to update content on departmental websites without going to IR&C. This is a big step backwards for departments.
• Increased cost, so a little reluctant to use them. We needed to buy a font in order to make their revisions. We were also recharged for copy editing.
• Availability to do work for departments is a big issue.
• What must go through Communications and what is optional? This is not clear.
• Website rollout has been very delayed and as a result, no one is able to update content directly. This means departments continue to go through IR&C to post content updates. This is inefficient and we are recharged for this service.
• Things are not getting updated on ucop.edu/affordability website because Communications does not have enough time. This means their message is inconsistent.
• The one person that we deal with is knowledgeable. However, there was an issue when the normal person was not there and the backup got a press call. This person spoke freely about a bond, which was not good because they did not have subject matter expertise.
• Policy management is an issue. We need to know what this group is doing.
• Agrees with the above statement. Different websites have different delegations and so we’re not sure who’s working on what.
• Three respondents thought the timeline for the website message was vague. When will they release the updates?

6. Do you have any suggestions for how Communications might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?
• The Link should be reconsidered. It’s a great idea but the tool/format used is difficult to navigate and so discourage readership. The sections in Link overlap – it’s not clear what the distinction is between In the Spotlight and Applause, for example. A concern is that many people will miss anything put in Link. Even if they open Link, they don’t navigate to or see everything. A simpler newsletter would serve the small UCOP population better.
• Communications should clarify what services it offers, and what it’s scope/purview is.
• In this era of tight budgets, everyone will be critical when something is changed for looks only. There has to be real value added.
• Employees think that in today’s technology driven environment that OP should have some sort of internal intranet board for its employee’s to communicate, share, etc. This system could be managed by the Staff Assembly if Communications felt that it couldn’t manage with a dedicated employee.
• More transparency about where major projects stand – go beyond presentations and meetings and make project status updates available online.
• Ease outsourcing processes for departments – production, graphic design, editorial. Manage the outsourcing process for departments as a service; charge us if necessary, but ease the burden!
• Meet with the departments/units on a frequent basis; this is working for Health and Sciences where Communications comes to their Bi-Weekly meetings.
• Bring to the departments/units suggestions regarding communications.
• The branding people need to figure out what the boundaries are for changing documents from clients. Their attitude is that “they’re going to fix us,” which doesn’t go over well. They lack flexibility with addressing things that are not broken; should not completely re-engineer reports for specific/narrow purposes; should provide options to choose from rather than decide what it will be; and generally be more sensitive to the unit’s timeline and regulatory requirements.
• Concerns that format and content of a publication had been altered without consultation after it had been sent in to Communications. Department clients wondered why Communications hadn’t come back to them to discuss changes. Perhaps the client (Academic Programs, Planning & Coordination) is being overly resistant to change? But we do need to sort out who is the owner of the publication/message.
• Our department, too, has experienced an issue around ownership of content and message delivery with our publications. It would be helpful to have a clearer boundary with regard to who is the owner of content and the message that we desire to deliver.
• Regarding, “reluctance to follow new protocols” referred to in self-assessment (page 11, last paragraph), what are the new protocols? And with departments being unaware of the new protocols, could this be an indicator that more outreach to the departments is necessary, to provide documentation as to roles/responsibilities/processes of this unit? It is difficult to locate even the home page of this unit on
the OP web pages. In the same vein, it would be helpful to understand what palette of services this group offers (and what it does not offer) – see recommendation below regarding establishing an SLA.

- It would be useful to have a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the departments and Communications.
- Pool of approved vendors that are managed with some oversight with the Communications department (where it would add value) would go a long way to meeting needs of an expanded client list.
- An employee intranet.
- Working with departments to develop an overall strategic communication plan.
- Provide photography support. We need a bank of useable photographs. One example—photos of high school and college graduates who represent the diversity of the state and of the campuses.
- Convene communications colleagues throughout OP. 1) Let departments know what services are available through external communications. Currently it is almost impossible to understand who the communications people are and what services are available. 2) Let departments know where they fit into the external communications strategic plan. 3) Hold at least two meetings a year so that departments can become acquainted with the many communications personnel at UCOP—what they do, what needs they have, priorities for the External Communications division, where we fit (or do not fit) in the priorities, etc. This is critical if we are to ensure placement of work we are doing in the various external communications outlets.
- Printing/Fulfillment services. Provide university-negotiated printing/fulfillment services. Keep all of us apprised of changes in major printing/fulfillment/design policies or accessibility.
- Offer press release writing services.
- Develop standard ICA/PSAs for design services using freelance designers so that departments do not have to initiate these on their own. University-negotiated agreements with designers will save departments time and increase efficiency and transparency.

1. How has your unit/division interacted with the Tech Desk?

- My unit interacts with TechDesk on a daily or weekly basis, requesting equipment quotes, computer support, purchasing advice, network support, and e-mail support.
- There is a frustration when you make a request and it is always assigned a low priority without consulting us. Also, we have a challenge with support since our unit uses Macs primarily, and most of TechDesk staff are not Mac experts.
- Computer support by Tech Desk for our department by phone or email includes:
  - Establishing email addresses and computers for new employees in our department.
  - Assistance regarding computer problems.
  - Purchase of software licenses.
  - New desktop and laptop orders.
- CMF has interacted with Tech Desk for a number of different reasons. New Employee setup (CPU quotes, email activation, voice services, PDA’s) and computer issues.
- The Tech Desk was involved in the hiring process of the new finance officer. The computer and mobile phone for the Finance Officer was requested prior to his start date and were received in approximately two weeks since his first day at UCOP. Tech Desk then set up the computer and phone immediately upon availability. The Tech Desk has also been involved with ticket items regarding any computer issues.
- General troubleshooting for individual laptops and desktops.
- Purchasing (devices, PDA, cell phones).
• Equipment set up.
• Everybody in this focus group uses them. Because it appears there has been a restructuring and a consultant is coming in to give advice, it seems there is already awareness about the issues.

2. How has your unit division adapted to the existence and services of the Tech Desk?
• Our unit has adapted fine to TechDesk, although we do experience some frustration with timeliness of requests.
• We have been following the procedures to set up IT tickets with Tech Desk even for very minor issues or problem. The IT ticket process is handled slowly. It takes a while for the department to get used to this protocol.
• Capital Markets Finance has been utilizing all services offered by the Tech Desk.
• There was no specific method; we just did it (we didn’t have a choice).

3. In your view, is the Tech Desk meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?
• At times it is felt that IR&C is not a strategic partner; more focus could be placed on creating solutions for common issues across departments. There is some frustration with requesting web services and support; staff should be thought leaders rather than presenting scenarios of what can’t be done. When new tools are introduced, there is a lack of training offered.
• The Tech Desk has consolidated IT support services under a centralized Help Desk. Identification and support of department applications has not been completed.
• The level of service provided for non voice service issues, differs solely on the TSA assigned to the ticket. Some TSA’s give a comprehensive analysis of the user’s issues and others who require continued request to fix each issue separately, while claiming the ticket has been closed.
• Interactions with Voice Service Analyst are generally resolved fairly quickly and any delay or issue is communicated with the user or users’ representative.
• Comprehensively the two groups that make up Tech Desk do meet expectations.
• Services have been consolidated, and Tech Desk seems to function as a one-stop shop, as was intended.

4. For the Tech Desk, what do you think is working well?
• In general the technical abilities of TechDesk staff are good and meet expectations.
• They have provided standard services.
• For the most part their notices for software updates, notifications of systems issue.
• Tech Desk efficiently resolved any issues brought up by CMF. For example, a stolen BlackBerry was quickly replaced, ensuring no problems with the workflow and allowing the employee to tackle his responsibilities on schedule. Other opened tickets are always addressed and the department employees are very personal when dealing with any situations.
• Providing tech support for desktops.
• Providing tech support for upgrading or replacing equipment.
• Being proactive with the renewal of SAS licenses.
• Providing software updates in an efficient manner.
• Providing services that are generally responsive to user needs when those needs are clearly identified.
• Maintaining inventories for desktops/laptops and providing information on which machines have maintenance agreements that have expired, or will soon expire.
• Completing web update service requests in a timely and responsive manner.
• Providing website development.
• Service levels have improved. Staff seem to be taking more time to troubleshoot potential problems rather than just putting a bandaid on the problem. They are also providing advice to departments about needs, and they are tracking inventory on our behalf.
• The departments/unit understands the process and service request.
• Service is great if you’re high-level/high-priority.
• Some have gotten better service at lower levels - timely responsiveness – not perfect but very good.
• TechDesk has done well with standardizing the UCOP desktop images and configurations.
• They’ve been great. Super responsive to my questions and repairs/updates when I need them.
• All in the focus group: Tech Desk people are good when they are able to show up.
• All in the focus group: Current method of Communicating outages is via e-mail is good.
• Troubleshooting computer issues.
• Generally quick to respond.
• Work is good.
• Good prompts in phone system for separate requests (phone, computers etc.).
• Website is informative.
• Forms can let some things be handled remotely – this is good.
• Providing tech support for desktops.
• Providing tech support for upgrading, replacing or installing equipment.
• Being proactive with the renewal of SAS licenses.
• Providing software updates in an efficient manner.
• Providing services that are generally responsive to user needs when those needs are clearly identified.
• Maintaining inventories for desktops/laptops and providing information on which machines have maintenance agreements that have expired, or will soon expire.
• Fixing routine problems.
• Addressing issues with email server.
• Helped to fix the virus attack and computer failure problems on several staff computers in a timely manner.

5. For the Tech Desk, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?
• Willingness to act as partners on projects.
• As an observer from the outside looking in, it seems that a good portion of TSA interactions are with repeat offenders (by that I mean OP users who need better training on day to day applications, they claim aren’t working properly). Tech Desk might find it useful to identify the number of requests they receive and by whom, and then set up classes to better train these users and thus free up their time dealing with actual Tech Desk issues.
• The issues raised (by this question) are appropriate.
• Why is everything a service level 3? We are very frustrated with the low priority especially if it has to do with your laptop or desk top. Before we had that interaction and could go to one person that would treat this issue as a high priority.
• Mac support is lacking along with the expertise.
• If someone is out of the office, the service request does not get worked on and therefore the response or resolution is extremely delayed. So the Tech Desk workflow and/or resource assignments’ are an issue.
• Responsiveness and timeliness is an issue.
• Some departments/units rely on e-mail for processing and communications. For example when delivering information to the Treasury department to meet daily deadlines. So many times we are
unaware there is a connectivity issue or an e-mail outage and in the case with the Treasury department the information was not received in time, which delayed scheduled financial transactions.

- In the self assessment there was nothing mentioned about customer service and yet that is their main business. There is a lack of customer service mindset.
- Closing tickets without resolving the issue, with no explanation to the unit causes the departments/units to re-open them. This is inefficient and frustrating for the user.
- No training is given when we introduce new tools; example is SharePoint.
- Service is slow if you’re low-level/low-priority. Frustrating for departments that gave up FTEs devoted to employee tech support.
- They are nowhere near as customer friendly as they should be. We respect their technical knowledge in most cases, but the interpersonal/customer service aspect needs to improve. They are working on that.
- Asset centralization should help. Currently they’re trying to do the impossible; everyone has a different system, so it takes longer.
- Inconsistent quality in the technicians.
- When Heat Tickets are classified as “low priority”, it is demoralizing to the client. “Low priority” gives the impression that there is not a recognition of the importance of the request to the client.
- Turnaround time to resolve issues is unacceptable.
- With regard to resolving technical issues, there seems to be a lack of training/experience. Technical proficiency, at the level of a “power user”, for the core suite of OP applications (MS Office) should be a mandatory requirement. We have experienced major dissatisfaction in resolving technical questions that go just a little beyond the superficial functionality of the standard apps. Furthermore, if the TechDesk cannot resolve an issue, then a few weeks of indecision go by, and requests are dropped without satisfactory resolution.
- The review of departmental applications and the definition of a support strategy has seemed to languish. We defined it for our department with IR&C partners about a year ago and to date there has not been a permanent solution.
- The objectives focus on cost-savings and not service enhancement or even service quality. While cost-savings are important, ultimately, a high level of service will ensure productivity of all employees across the organization. This is simply not happening currently.
- There also seems to be a disconnect between the TechDesk and other IR&C groups. Changes are made to the computing environment that have consequences for users’ desktop apps. Not only is the user not made aware of potential repercussions (especially with regard to Outlook functionality) but it appears that the TechDesk is not made aware of the potential problems, either. Moreover, the TechDesk does not seem to be empowered to be an advocate for the department user, in reporting functionality issues back to the other IR&C groups that control our computing environment. By way of example, for SharePoint, there is a different log-on procedure in Firefox and IE. No background was provided on this, and thus when three of our department staff had unsuccessful attempts at logging in to SharePoint, they were blocked from the entire OP network. Department staff suggested that the logging procedure be made consistent for all browsers, and that SharePoint be separated from the network log-on, but the TechDesk said that did not have the authority to consider that recommendation.
- Communication on status of tickets would be nice: Priority 1-2-3: Who decides this?
- How are priority tickets determined? I currently bypass the system because it’s too slow. I have my assistant call Parm because they’re friends and I know he will get it done. I shouldn’t have to do this.
- Migrating to e-mail was a problem. Upgrades were not completely rolled out. Since these problems were not anticipated, it exacerbated problems and caused all tech desk issues to get backlogged. Inefficient.
6. Do you have any suggestions for how the Tech Desk might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

- A willingness to address Mac support, training and equipment issues which are needed by our unit for our day-to-day operations.
- Improve communication, update department on status of their orders.
- Improve turnaround time.
- Our department is not aware of which software licenses that UC has and someone should provide the licensee information to us.
- Provide support to all programs under the UC License.
- The response time is not always communicated. Tech Desk services might be better understood if their customers had a short list of what is considered P1, P2, P3 and so forth. In addition, rotation of phone representative’s ability to help is the same level of services answer that was provided in question number one, depending who answers the phone will depend on how thorough a TSA delves into your issue.
- A noted suggestion would be to reassess the current staff and then dedicate their work.
- Phone Resolution Specialist
- Field TSA Specialist
- Additional TSA III’s to help with higher level issues.
- Providing more straightforward turnaround time communication regarding HEAT tickets. It is unclear when the support will be forthcoming; rather than use a “low,” “medium” or “high” classification for the applicable guaranteed time for addressing the problem, the actual level of agreement time frame should be displayed, e.g., within two hours, by the next day, within five days, etc., so that the user has a better sense of what to expect.
- Providing a means by which the reported time line for addressing the problem can be appealed, if the user feels that the reported problem warrants a higher priority rating for resolution
- Allowing more email memory for OP staff, regardless of title.
- Providing more expert knowledge on Macs and a comparable level of support services, i.e., staff should not have to take their Macs to the service center.
- Making it easier for the user to have direct communication with a HEAT ticket tech person
- Initiating the check for Eudora email files and then ensuring that they are transferred to a new computer or re-imaged desktop/laptop; users should not have to request that this be done
- Problem-solving more effectively in situations when the cause is unknown to the user
- Maintaining more accurate inventory data for desktops/laptops
- Adding requestor information with the recharge detail
- We look forward to continued improvements in service levels and more consistent training on computer use – e-mail storage advice, file set up, maximizing use of software, etc.
- They might consider establishing some regular brown bags for department operations managers and department leadership to preview upcoming issues and projects instead of using Link and e-mail blasts to everyone in UCOP. Sometimes we’d like to know things in advance so that we can prepare others and answer questions.
- Meet with the departments/units on a frequent basis to understand their business and special software support. Having that face to face conversation is very helpful for both parties.
- Communicate to employees when there are issues with e-mail, by phone if necessary to critical areas such as Treasurer’s office. Better communication regarding tech desk ticket items such as estimate of when they will get to the ticket – provide an estimated timeframe.
- There is a need for tips on tools from Microsoft applications to other day to day tools. If this exists, then working on communications to let the employee know where they can find this information.
- More management of the staff is needed – when they get tickets, how much time it takes.
They don’t provide expected resolution times for routine or escalated problems. They don’t conduct random, follow-up surveys with their customers.

House someone (or even 2 people) in Kaiser for rapid response. The new laptop loan program is a good example. For someone at Kaiser to borrow a laptop for a meeting at Kaiser we have to run back and forth to Franklin – not very efficient when you have an early morning meeting.

Oftentimes users in the Kaiser Building feel that their issues are grouped and assigned when a technician is in the building which results in prolonged delays.

Can we get Instant Messaging (IM)? We should have this throughout the building. It’s 20th century technology.

I suggest printers be taken over by the Tech Desk however it would not work because they are already understaffed.

Low priority items often take weeks to complete (hooking USB cables to VP computer)

Often confusing as work is requested of one person and often transferred to another (tech desk request).

Things that aren’t for tech desk or need iRequest are not easy to identify (give advice about existing printers, can’t maintain them).

Need improvement in service -- both timeliness and quality.

Would like for them to have flexibility to be responsive to department needs when they fall outside the official list of services.

Providing more straightforward turnaround time communication regarding HEAT tickets. It is unclear when the support will be forthcoming; rather than use a “low,” “medium” or “high” classification for the applicable guaranteed time for addressing the problem, the actual level of agreement time frame should be displayed, e.g., within two hours, by the next day, within five days, etc., so that the user has a better sense of what to expect.

Providing a means by which the reported time line for addressing the problem can be appealed, if the user feels that the reported problem warrants a higher priority rating for resolution.

Allowing more email memory for OP staff, regardless of title.

Providing more expert knowledge on Mac’s and a comparable level of support services, i.e., staff should not have to take their Mac’s to the service center.

Making it easier for the user to have direct communication with a HEAT ticket tech person.

Initiating the check for Eudora email files and then ensuring that they are transferred to a new computer or re-imaged desktop/laptop; users should not have to request that this be done.

Problem-solving more effectively in situations when the cause is unknown to the user.

Maintaining more accurate inventory data for desktops/laptops.

Increased training on the latest technology.

Customer services skills could use some improvement.

Data backup needs to be improved.

Imaging new computers for staff has taken longer than one would like. We’ve had at least one instance where the individual to receive the new computer waited over one month to actually get the computer. Perhaps there’s a way to standardize the way that computers get imaged so that departments know that these processes will be completed within a certain time frame.

1. How has your unit/division interacted with IR?
• We have had limited relations with IR but have been pleased with the work done with Jenna’s group in creating legislative maps for our SGR colleagues.
• We aren’t customers of IR.
• Our department has requested IR by email or through meetings to provide institutional research and reports regarding students, faculty, schools, programs, enrollments, admissions and other areas that are needed for our work assignments.
• Capital Markets Finance has sought the assistance of the Institutional Research team to provide statistical information to outside entities. The information includes, but is not limited to, student enrollment information, admission and student demand data.
• Capital Markets Finance has also worked with IR to provide data for institutional and individual surveys.
• Data and analysis for accountability reports.
• Faculty data requests.
• Development of the data repository.
• BCR and Academic Affairs uses; CFO Division, OGC and ANR do not.

2. How has your unit division adapted to the existence and services of IR?
• No problems.
• To ensure mutual understanding of the request, our department has become more proactive and taken the initiative to meet and discuss with IR about our requests.
• We have been following up closely with IR on the status of our requests.
• Being patient with the turnaround time.
• Our unit has worked well with the IR team, and has adjusted well to their existence and services.
• In our initial assessment with IR, it was determined that EP needed to retain some capacity within the department for data analysis that was not within IR’s scope of work. This early agreement has enabled us to work collaboratively and cooperatively with IR. We maintain a research and evaluation unit as a result, and maintain regular communication with IR to ensure that EP analysis and reporting meets IR standards and is consistent with IR expectations regarding quality/consistency of presentation.

3. In your view, is IR meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?
• To our knowledge, yes.
• Yes, to some extent.
• The IR team has been, on the whole, pretty responsive to the data requests of our unit, and has tried to meet the data requests in a timely and efficient manner.
• Yes, for the most part, and in large measure because of the early work we did – and continue to do – to ensure that we are all on the same page regarding roles and expectations.

4. For IR, what do you think is working well?
• The data visualization unit has some good potential.
• IR conducts research and analyses reports in a professional manner.
• The IR team is responsive and cooperative. The team members have worked cooperatively with Capital Markets Finance to provide the necessary information.
• Providing data stewardship for financial aid and registration databases
• Meeting ad-hoc and regular ongoing support needs
• Quality of analysis is high.
• Some areas are not utilizing this unit but recognize that there is an opportunity here.
• The Financial Services and Controls group has used this unit and think they are doing a fantastic job. They have a great process, are well organized and approach requests with good customer service.
• They are very responsive.
• The team recognized that IR is an outward facing department; meaning, they interact with the campuses.
• Doing a great job of creating a systemwide repository of data.
• Filling an important role of trying to standardize the way the University looks at issues and presents data, rather than different departments reporting different things.
• Our department reports that it feels well-served by the IR unit.
• IR provides data to CFO for disclosure purposes to outside entities. Pleased once found out about this service; did not know it existed.
• Thinks they are good for providing data. We are currently going to them as source for raw data. Always going to this source provides consistency as opposed to going to the Budget Office for data and then another office for data, which will of course yield different results.
• Many potentially useful applications have been previewed but not yet been implemented.
• Providing data stewardship for financial aid and registration databases.
• Meeting ad-hoc and regular ongoing support needs.
• Provided data stewardship of Education Partnership data including data collection, cleaning, and validation. IR also is data steward of UC’s Corporate Student System, which includes admissions, enrollment, and degree files. These files are a necessity for analysis of EP student outcomes.
• Provided analytical support for Education Partnerships data including data matching, file matching and merging, and student outcome analysis.
• Provided technical and database support for EP in designing the new EP data repository.

5. For IR, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?
   • Unknown.
   • The primary issue is that the IR team does not fully understand the business of the various units, and sometimes it takes time for the department to comprehend the intricacies of the data request.
   • Timelines for report/data delivery.
   • Unclear how to access/initiate something with them. They seem to do good work, but we don’t have a sense of “what is possible” with them.
   • Service has not been what was expected in some areas (data to support labor negotiations, compensation issues, etc.)
   • Not much in our office has changed since the implementation of IR. We continue to do the bulk of the reporting we did before but with fewer FTE as we provided FTE to IR in the restructuring.
   • Working with them remains a challenge because IR services remain not clearly defined or poorly articulated.
   • The times I was directed to them, or went to them on my own for data, they sent me back to Benefits Info Systems (in HR). Better coordination with HR’s BIS unit to ensure consistent methodologies and agreement on how data should be best displayed to meet our business needs and reflect the nuances we are aware of.
   • Unclear if people know where to find the work produced by this unit.
   • No outreach from the group and collaboration can be difficult at times.
   • Use heavily; good product. Main issue is whether subject matter experts in departments or generalist analysts in IR should do analysis of the data. For example, “Shadow research groups” referred to in self-assessment are needed because content expertise is required.
   • Believes there will be more resolution around this issue when their Decision Support System (DSS) is in place. However, would like to know when it will be available.
• On individual level, responsive. But what is their overall mission? Are they a service unit? They emphasize how they want to control the message and data so we are confused as to who should be controlling the message.

• For what data should we be going to IR for?

• Content Managers are great. But we are not always aware of everything they are doing. Are they Interpreters of the data, or are they just data gatherers?

6. Do you have any suggestions for how IR might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

• Not at this time.

• We suggest IR should do the following for improvements:
  o Analyze our requests with our department to get mutual understanding of what is needed in the requests.
  o Create plan starting from data research through completion of the report.

• Consider all departments as customers and prioritize work based on actual time sensitivity, rather than only looking at who originates the request.

• Update our department on status of the request.

• Provide more detailed analytical information on the data report rather than just providing the standard information.

• Assign back up staff to handle the jobs in the absence of the other staff.

• The IR team is functioning well. One suggestion on how to improve its service would be for the department to assign “Client Service Managers” to various OP units so they may be able to develop relationships with their “clients” and specialize in providing information for that particular unit.

• Providing more service-oriented support. The work between Student Affairs and Institutional Research is more collaborative than service-oriented. IR’s ability to provide SA data and data analysis is based on our needs, which the IR works to always meet as well as provide advice on other useful data to help meet our needs.

• Clarifying how IR prioritizes its work so we can shape our expectations about the kind of support SA will receive.

• Completing the implementation of the decision support system (DSS).

• Clarifying their role with regard to survey support.

• Sometimes the timelines for delivery of information is a bit slow, and we want to work with IR to develop a standard protocol for addressing external (including faculty) requests for data.

• Reach out to departments/units that they are not using their services to see how they may be able to help.

• Increase the communication, education and self promotion regarding IR.

• Meet with key users annually to assess workload and user needs – clearly tell the user what service they can provide and when, then stick to the project timeline.

• They always have competing requests and our requests lose in this competition. It would be helpful to have a policy or guiding principle for the production of more informal analysis and data that isn’t dependent on IR’s approval.

• Interaction has almost entirely been one way – providing advice and input on a regular basis. Would be nice if this were reversed and unit was indeed providing service to the department (should happen with sufficient time).

• Providing more service-oriented support. The work between Student Affairs and Institutional Research is more collaborative than service-oriented. IR’s ability to provide SA data and data analysis is based on our needs, which the IR works to always meet as well as provide advice on other useful data to help meet our needs.
• Clarifying how IR prioritizes its work so we can shape our expectations about the kind of support SA will receive.
• Completing the implementation of the decision support system.
• Clarifying their role with regard to survey support.

## ISSUES MANAGEMENT, POLICY ANALYSIS & COORDINATION (IMPAC)

1. **How has your unit/division interacted with IMPAC?**
   - We have had limited relations with this group but hope to engage them in helping to develop web site content. Also, we designed and produced the COTF report with them.
   - We interact very little but in an important way – to provide analysis of proposed legislation and potential impacts on the University.
   - Our unit has worked with IMPAC on policy issues that could affect CMF.
   - Subject matter contributions to bill analyses and testimonies.
   - Consultation on bill status.
   - Limited interactions.

2. **How has your unit/division adapted to the existence and services of IMPAC?**
   - To my knowledge, it’s been fine.
   - IMPAC serves us well.
   - Well – but we have interacted with them very little – but the quality of interactions has been good.
   - The IMPAC Director for our area previously worked on these issues on our behalf, so no adaption was required.

3. **In your view, is IMPAC meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?**
   - Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
   - Yes.
   - Yes.
   - Responses appear to be coordinated across departments/divisions.

4. **For IMPAC, what do you think is working well?**
   - Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
   - We are assigned a partner, who is very proactive in triaging legislation before sending it to us for review and who conducts her own thoughtful analysis first. She also takes responsibility for writing the final analysis, so we can provide information and perspectives and she puts it together in a coherent piece. This is extremely helpful and time saving for us.
   - One point of contact has been very helpful. The quality of staff is very good.
   - Alerting us to state legislation in our subject matter area.
   - Coordinating the use of our analysis with the Sacramento Office for routine matters.
   - Providing a strong collaborative relationship among the IMPAC Coordinators: Kimberley Peterson, Heather Kopeck, and Jenna Fahrner.
   - Our area director keeps us informed about the status of major bills as well as marginal bills that might impact our area.
   - Has done a good job of “triaging” legislation, determining what is most worth a detailed review, and thus lessening the burden on busy subject-matter departments.
Legislative Analysis activities: Initially, there were questions about roles, responsibilities, process, and the timeframe for responses and deliverables. We did not receive a “service level agreement” or documentation. Recently, however, IMPAC has made a major effort to reach out to the department, and we have experienced significant improvements, and a better “partnering” between our department and IMPAC. The roles and responsibilities of SGR, IMPAC and department subject matter experts were clarified.

Legislative Analysis activities: Our department relies on early notification of bills. In the past, we did not receive early enough notification about Marginal Impact (MI) bills. IMPAC recently worked out a process to provide the department with earlier MI notification (unfiltered and without review). This is working well and the department appreciates IMPAC’s willingness to modify their procedures to meet departments’ needs.

Issues Management activities: Self assessment says they hadn’t had a chance to do policy development or issues management. However, they should give themselves credit because they did staff COTF.

Matt Perry is attuned to state bills that can change CFO world.

Matt Perry is responsive in certain areas.

Staying current on pending legislation and distributing this information to appropriate departments.

Coordinating the use of our analysis with the Sacramento Office for routine matters.

Providing a strong collaborative relationship among the IMPAC Coordinators: Kimberley Peterson, Heather Kopeck, and Jenna Fahrner.

Maintaining relationship with legislature.

Staff is responsive to inquiries.

5. For IMPAC, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?

- Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
- It is unclear what the relationship with IMPAC and the FGR office is. Our IMPAC partner does a wonderful job of managing the sporadic and urgent requests for information that come from DC. But it’s stressful for everyone.
- Is IMPAC a service unit or a recipient of service? Either is fine, but our primary department role is to provide information to IMPAC; we don’t look to them for support beyond consultation on the status of current legislation.
- There is no communication from this group on what is going on with legislation; what should we know?
- We are unclear on IMPAC unit’s role with legislation and how someone can use their services.
- Legislative Analysis activities: Interaction with IMPAC and Academic Affairs is good. But breadth and depth of knowledge of analysts is less than before when department had their own dedicated legislative analysts.
- Legislative Analysis activities: IMPAC does well at following up on bills, but ANR does not have any internal resources to respond to the requests.
- Legislative Analysis activities: In the past there was no need for translation about the legislative process, etc. Now there is because there are no legislative analysts in the divisions.
- Mission not understood/capabilities are what?
- Unevenness in analysts’ ability to provide what she needs.
- Correlation between IR & IMPAC?
- IMPAC drafts up position on legislative analysis. However the value-added not great on single-issue stuff; only on cross-divisional issues. IMPAC is supposed to be able to answer the question, “What is the University’s position on ______?”
- I don’t know how to use them.
- I interact with them in reactionary way (only when problems come up).
The concept of IMPAC was supposed to be if an issue was controversial and needed multiple perspectives, IMPAC would come up with policy recommendation. However, the President doesn’t make decisions the way this group is set up.

6. Do you have any suggestions for how IMPAC might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

- Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
- Having IMPAC assume lead responsibility for legislative analysis and using department staff only as a resource
- Clarifying IMPAC’s role particularly with regard to matters that extend beyond legislative analysis
- Implementing policy coordination on cross-cutting issues
- It would be helpful if IMPAC investigated adopting some sort of off-the-shelf software that would allow more automated bill tracking and allow subject matter contributors to view the input provided by others. Such a system would allow us to determine whether we needed to weigh in or not so as not duplicate input and ultimately save us time.
- It seems from the self-assessment that the Issues Management work is not going to happen. Maybe the unit should be re-designed to focus on policy analysis coordination exclusively, especially given the number of FTE and the expanded scope of work in the policy area. (Managing issues may be more effective within the locus of control of the VPs and the subject matter experts, with IMPAC providing consultation as requested.)
- Reach out to departments/units that they are not using their services to see how they may be able to help them.
- Increase the communication, education and self promotion regarding IMPAC.
- They don’t reach out to the units very much. Unclear what they’re analyzing and what their conclusions are that may matter to us. Do they meet regularly with the VPs?
- What’s their relationship to federal issues? They don’t seem to have much knowledge of, or do much proactive outreach on, federal issues.
- Legislative Analysis activities: Interviewing subject matter experts has been helpful and has added value. Suggestion for improving process:
  - Training @ beginning of session because many subject matter experts are new at process. Include Significant Impact, Marginal Impact, the legislative process and when to elevate the level of concern.
  - Following a legislative session, debrief about what went well and what didn’t go well during the session.
- Having IMPAC assume lead responsibility for legislative analysis and using department staff only as a resource.
- Clarifying IMPAC’s role particularly with regard to matters that extend beyond legislative analysis.
- Implementing policy coordination on cross-cutting issues.
- Prior to requesting responses directly, it would be helpful if prior similar responses were reviewed and drafts were compiled to send to the department to review and edit as necessary. Having to respond numerous times to almost identical requests is tedious and inefficient.
- Maintaining a policy repository for departments to review the status of particular legislation and past documents would help departments stay abreast of policy actions.
- Departments should be kept informed of policies throughout the year, not only those that require immediate response.
- Related Comment from OGC:
“I was on the design team for IMPAC. I agree with IMPAC’s self-assessment. The work regarding legislation is exceeding expectations given the way the unit was short-staffed. The issues management function is something that the President and the Regents said that they wanted, and which the design team felt the institution does actually need, but that the President must actually make it happen himself. If he continues to be committed to the concept, then he should assign IMPAC to manage significant issues, even if doing so ruffles the feathers of his SVPs.

It may be that as the leadership team that reports to the President has evolved and developed with regard to its ability to meet his expectations to that point that the President no longer really feels the need for a cross-discipline issues management office. Even if that is so, it may be wise to retain high level issues management as part of IMPAC’s charge, so that the capacity is there if needed (for example, to manage a crisis), but do so with the understanding that giving IMPAC jurisdiction over any specific issue is a leadership decision. Jenny Kao is a strong leader and she has hired an extremely competent team. Most of the people that she hired already knew the institution, and the rest were atypically fast learners. That capacity for rapid analysis and project management is an important capacity to leave close at hand for the President, particularly for potential management of a crisis. It’s easy to imagine a crisis involving an issue that a SVP might be invested in to the point that the President would find it desirable to bring in a cross-discipline team to provide arms-length policy analysis. Jenny has the experience and staff to do that work.

I’m glad that OP is doing this assessment of the consolidated units. I think the information that comes out of this process could be useful to the campuses as they proceed with their consolidations. There seems to be a consistent theme in the self-assessments that operational groups that have accountability for delivering results in a particular area are not willing to give control over what they perceive to be a core function to a staff person who resides completely outside of their chain of command in a consolidated unit -- and is therefore not accountable in any meaningful way to the operational unit. This reality may be a practical bar to the efficiency that can be realized through consolidation. (It was an issue for the IMPAC design because Dr. Stobo essentially drew a line in the sand and said he was not going to have people working on his legislation who do not report to him. In this particular case, given the reality of how the medical centers lobby through hospital lobbying organizations instead of through OP, his position actually makes a certain amount of sense.) Consolidations that aren’t perceived by the operational units as helpful aren’t as likely to actually result in efficiencies, because people will work around the system (and duplicate effort) in order to timely deliver the quality of product that their own superiors are demanding. Blaming a centralized unit for missing a deadline or providing bad data is not something that most employees are going to be willing to do, period, because blaming someone else does not satisfy one’s boss. One lesson of the OP experience may be that consolidations that are suggested from the bottom up may create greater realized efficiency than those dictated from the top down based upon an idealized structure that doesn’t necessarily correspond to the reality of people’s work and responsibilities. What works to make necessary change in a highly regular and hierarchical corporation may not work in an academic environment, where responsibility, power and money are not so centralized.”

1. How has your unit/division interacted with the OSCR?
   - Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
   - OSCR project managers manage some projects for IR&C. They do a good and useful job.
• Please refer to other co-workers who are more familiar with OSCR for input.
• Support for staff interested in project management.
• Participation in work groups around work processes/work flow in UCOP.
• Consultation on projects within the department.

2. How has your unit division adapted to the existence and services of the OSCR?
• Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
• We use their services, which did not exist before! They fill a need.
• Please refer to other co-workers who are more familiar with OSCR for input.
• N/a.

3. In your view, is the OSCR meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?
• Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
• Our sense is that OSCR evolved from helping the consolidated units to examine and streamline processes – and to connect processes among units – into a project management office. It’s not clear what the initial expectations were.
• Have the time-consuming business processes documented by OSCR been re-engineered to streamline work?
• Please refer to other co-workers who are more familiar with OSCR for input.
• Yes, for the most part. Staff are available to consult and provide tools necessary for effective project management, and work groups on work processes in UCOP served both as training mechanisms for our staff and allowed for a broad range of input into how work is managed.

4. For the OSCR, what do you think is working well?
• Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
• How does OSCR differ from the IR&C project management group? What type of project management does OSCR do?
• They manage projects well.
• Please refer to other co-workers who are more familiar with OSCR for input.
• Projects seem to be initiated, carried out and completed as intended.
• Karla is a great project manager. Rob Judd very good as well.
• Helpful to keep the trains running on time for projects that are cross-departmental.
• Limited interactions.
• The Financial Services and Controls group commented that this group is very responsive, delivers high quality of work.

5. For the OSCR, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?
• Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
• It’s not clear at all how a department engages OSCR, or what the services are.
• Please refer to other co-workers who are more familiar with OSCR for input.
• The name of the unit is not good and doesn’t reflect their work. At some point we have to refer to our units using terms that the layperson understands. “Strategic Change Resources” means nothing to the average UCOP staff member or manager. How about calling it the Project Management Office?
• OSCR as a unit/service suffers from lack of clarity: What’s a project? What is an initiative? So, for example, if OSCR is charged with providing professional-quality project management services to UCOP, why wouldn’t we be relying on this office to provide project management services for the Working Smarter initiatives? Also, if they were formed to provide change management services, perhaps they
could be tasked to address the problem, identified by the consolidated units (within the Assessment of the UC Office of the President Consolidated Units report), of departments resistance to change and need for expectation management?

- Who does OSCR serve? How do we get access to OSCR?
- What are the objectives of this group? Does it provide resources to all of UCOP? Are we recharged for it?

6. Do you have any suggestions for how the OSCR might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

- Unknown, not familiar enough with the unit.
- Definitely the two-project-office issue needs to be cleared up.
- Change the name.
- Improve the website so that it is clear the services the unit provides, and how to access those services, and where to find PM resources and tools.
- Develop a training program for UCOP staff so that the office serves UCOP by building the capacity of existing staff to manage projects to completion, on budget.
- Reach out to departments/units that they are not using their services to see how they may be able to help them.
- Increase the communication, education and self promotion regarding OSCR.
- Utilize the “First Friday Breakfast” to reach out to show the services offered.
- Communicate through UC LINK on this group and the services offered; even if it is broad strokes.
- What is the entry point? How do you access them?
- What is the relationship to the IR&C Project Office? Needs clarity.
- In at least one case, the work of this office has seemed to add bureaucracy without adding much value to the actual management of the project. In this individual experience, there was a lot of focus on what color to code a “risk,” how to justify a delay in the project to the management of OSCR (not the actual sponsoring departments), and other things that were important to OSCR’s role in the project but not to the project itself.
- It would be helpful to have guidelines surrounding when it would be appropriate to ask OSCR for assistance with managing a project.
- Because project managers within OSCR do not report to project owners, accountability may be problematic. Thus, rather than the project owners being able to hold these project managers accountable for the project deliverables, it seems that the office is set up as “consultants” providing advice on how to run a project. Is this a core service that OP should fund?

OP BUDGET OFFICE

1. How has your unit/division interacted with the UCOP Budget Office?

- Responding to questions about funds, carry forwards, salary savings and approving preapprovals.
- We work with the UCOP Budget Office on annual appropriations requests, budgets for large projects or activities, transfers of funds as needed throughout the year, and preapproval requests.
- We are currently working with the UCOP Budget Office and other departments to implement a new budgeting system.
- Our department works with OP Budget Office:
  - To ensure accurate production of budget submissions.
  - To develop the annual budget proposal for the department.
  - To compile the staffing list for the department
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT – CONSOLIDATED UNITS REVIEW

- To process inter-campus transfer of funds.
- To coordinate on fiscal closing process.
- To review and analyze budget reports to ensure accuracy of the accounting transactions for the department.
- Budget adjustments.

- Our interaction with OP Budget pre and post TAMS hasn’t changed much.
- The approval process and request of changes aren’t done as expeditiously as their services were marketed. While they are required to be thorough, items which are sent to OP Budget they linger past the stated time the department says it needs to process a request.
- Annual budget preparation
- Problem-solving/troubleshooting
- Transfers of funds

2. How has your unit division adapted to the existence and services of the UCOP Budget Office?

- As with the BRC, we have had to adapt to working with the UCOP Budget Office as it defined itself over time, and certainly we work well with the individuals there.
- Often meets with OP Budget Office and our Program Offices (by phone) to discuss budget plans and process.
- In order to adapt, the department generally labels items RUSH unless, the business need has sufficient lead time that it will not have an adverse affect on what is needed.
- We adapted by meeting with the budget group to determine how well their scope of work encompassed our needs. Where there were gaps (daily budget operations, contracts/grants pre-award preparation), and then we worked with them to figure out the best way to fill them.

3. In your view, is the UCOP Budget Office meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?

- There was a real disconnect between what was initially promised departments and what was delivered. This was not the fault of the personnel but of the design and staffing. However, it appears to the departments that the UCOP Budget Office is primarily transactional. They do not provide analysis, planning, and consulting to department heads. We have had to retain this expertise in-house. It’s also likely that departments that have complex financial needs simply will always need in-house experts for analysis and planning, rather than a centralized group that may have a different charge.
- After giving up headcount for the formation of the Budget Office, our ability to manage and understand our budgets is much less than what it was 3 years ago.
- Each budget year has been rocky, forms change, are not relevant to our budget, and are hard to translate from past years; mistakes are made; guidance on what to do is vague; and we get no clear response about what has been approved or not. Our department is left to work around or supplement what has come from the Budget Office.
- The self assessment on the OP Budget scorecard is fairly correct.
- Taking into account what they are tasked to do, and the volume of work which passes their desks, that volume may greatly exceed the current number of people it takes to meet the customers they serve.
- They appear to be meeting expectations for preparation of the budget.

4. For the UCOP Budget Office, what do you think is working well?

- The new budget system will improve access to information for department managers, streamline the annual budget call, and encourage more timely transfers of funds so that reports are meaningful. The UCOP Budget Office is providing valuable leadership in this area.
• One missing piece in the new budget system is how to integrate narrative information with the financial data. Budget numbers don’t exist for their own sake; we should be budgeting to accomplish our mission and strategic objectives. A database of numbers tells an incomplete story.
• Budget Coordinator works closely with our department in the development of our annual budget proposals.
• Prior to TAMS being implemented the preapproval process was antiquated in how documents were given to Budget, how they were logged into a system, then tracked and sent to the next level of approver. Having the TAMS system in place does put more accountability everyone involved in the process. It also allows management to identify inefficiencies and quickly fix them. TAMS if used correctly by the requestor can prevent documents from being lost or misplaced, thus impeding the approval process.
• Processing funds transfers.
• Providing troubleshooting support.
• Developing processes for better accountability
• They are proactive in helping to resolve budget problems, and work diligently with us to clean up accounts.
• They’ve created an actual OP budget, getting control of OP’s finances.
• They’ve been helpful in getting certain large transactions done.
• In contrast to some comments below, at least one department’s experience with the service has been very positive this past fiscal year.
• Staff made themselves available to train.
• More budget data was available to departments.
• On-line access to data and forms appreciated.
• Providing troubleshooting support.
• Developing processes for better accountability.
• Interlocation transfers.
• Staffing list updates.
• Transfer of Funds processes worked well. Also, Budget coordinator responded to inquiries in a timely manner.

5. For the UCOP Budget Office, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?

• Yes, self-assessment on developing the 2011-12 OP Budget using the new Funding Stream Model is not addressed.
• No self-assessment provided. However, they appear to be understaffed for their scope of work.
• There seems to be a lack of leadership in this group and a lack of confidence.
• Health and Sciences indicated they had to hire a Budget Manager to handle their complex budget needs because this service was not being provided.
• The communication is poor and limited from the Budget Office. This creates a bunker mentality among staff.
• If the problem or budget is complex then the support is even less. Example was given for Grant funding; this is a complex budget issue and needs solid budget expertise.
• Recharges are a huge issue, especially for Health Sciences and Services, regarding process communications and complexity. There is a lack of support, expertise and communications for this process. Also, there is confusion on roles and responsibilities regarding this process.
• It feels like a “bit of the black box”. One stated that “If asked where you are on your budget I can honestly say that I don’t know.”
• As caveat to the five comments below: This unit is not sufficiently staffed.
Customer service is seen as poor, though this is somewhat individualized based on who in the unit you’re dealing with.

Things get stuck here. They sit in TAMS. Action is slow.

Responsiveness is a huge problem. It often is difficult to get my budget person to even acknowledge receiving an inquiry and giving a timeline of when there might be an answer, let alone actually getting a useful answer.

They don’t really know what is in our budgets and thus can’t help us very much. Most questions/issues are thrown back to us – “fill out this spreadsheet within one week” – instead of them actually giving us strategic budgeting advice.

More spending authority should be given to departments. If a VP is authorizing a use of money from his/her budget (in TAMS), why does this office then also need to approve it? They know far less about our budget than we do.

Lack of consistency, lack of communication; no consultation with department

Because of lack of consistent processes, problems with communication and lack of consultation, there is no ability for departments to manage accounts properly.

Lack of continuity in Budget Office requires that departments have their own budget people.

There is a lack of (consistent) direction from the Budget Office, e.g., procedures for submitting fiscal year budgets have changed each year that the Budget Office has been in existence. For the budget call this FY year, the directive as to what the department needed to fund (increased health costs, retirement contributions, merits) was unclear and then changed direction at a critical time during budget planning. As another example of changes in direction, the Budget Office introduced a “new” reporting system a year and a half ago (and, those reports are not useful to the departments for budget projections, especially because the expense categories are not sufficiently customizable or detailed), but it seems we are now abandoning that system, and moving to a new reporting system?

As was mentioned in the narrative, the resourcing of the UCOP Budget Office is problematic and results in delays in hiring and purchases that negatively impact the ability of the departments they serve to meet their goals.

Responsiveness has been a problem, including lengthy delays (spanning over a year) to establish FAUs, and make budgetary transfers. There is a lack of communication back to the department as to the reason for the delays. There is a lack of documentation of methodology and guidelines; guidance is ad hoc in nature and appears to come out of a “black box” (i.e., lack of transparency regarding the basis for directives/advice).

Lack of alignment between UCOP strategic objectives and the Budget Office. There is a lack of evidence of strategic partnering between OP leadership (setting objectives) and the Budget Office (developing the resource plan); this is not articulated to the departments. For example, OP leadership provided budget training this last year that emphasized strategic budget planning. However the FY 11-12 budget process did not incorporate those strategic budget concepts (e.g., the case that needs to be made for new initiative funding, the link to corporate culture and critical mission objectives), and, additionally, the new budget system seems to lack the critical functionality requisite for strategic budget planning (unable to handle the difference between one-time and permanent funding, multi-year budgeting).

It is impossible to set up accounts at local level

I had to keep following up with office on joint NACUBO membership with another organization. (This should not be that difficult, and the office should have been more customer service focused).

It is not clear why Nathan has to approve all expenditures if the $ has already been approved for us to spend in our budgets. If we are responsible for our budgets, let us be responsible.

Things are supposedly changing with Toshi Shibano so that we don’t need NB’s signature on all expenditures over $1,500 but travel restrictions and smart phone approvals are onerous.
6. Do you have any suggestions for how the UCOP Budget Office might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

• The pace is slow. They often hold up TAMS items. We suspect this is just a staffing workload issue. But it’s real.
• There’s no clarity about what needs pre-approval, especially after the last note from EVP Brostrom was issued. We will follow any process, but need specifics. Right now we follow our internal sense of what needs approval.
• The budget process is obscure. There’s no clarity about who analyzes submitted budgets and makes decisions about them. We still do not have official word that our FY12 appropriation request was approved, much less evidence of the funding. No one’s closing the loop and the only information we have to work with is what we provided.
• The Budget Office needs to develop a process so that, once personnel items are approved, they can take the actions necessary, such as updating the staffing list or transferring funds. What happens now is they claim they do not know if something was approved. Then they come back to the department many months/year later for reconciliation information (replacements, provision #s), asking the department to recreate information that the Budget Office already had. A better continuum needs to be designed.
• Better communication with the departments; provide more information about the new FY2011-12 Funding Stream Model and the new budget system, before we were asked to do the mapping project.
• Provide better customer services to all customers.
• With the TAMS system in place, more timely response in processing preapprovals would be helpful. A recent request for a hire sat for over a week in TAMS before going forward.
• Developing an efficient and effective process for receiving funding owed by campuses to Student Affairs as well as transferring funds to campuses, particularly during an administration year of UCUES. Currently, there is no mechanism for collecting campus financial support except through a reminder notice from SA to the VCSAs (and EVCs) asking for their contribution.
• Improving the effectiveness of the budget process so that expenditure needs are reflected and not limited to just expenditures that are permanently funded.
• Providing clarity on the rationale for fund source and account function.
• Providing a comprehensive approach for appropriations for the department’s entire budget (i.e., eliminate split appropriation responsibilities between OP Budget and BCR)
• They need more staff.
• The new budget system will help eliminate current problems with budget reports, so we are looking forward to that. There are currently not enough management reports to support department accountability.
• Develop and deliver training that improves the capacity of departments to develop and manage operating budgets.
• Reach out to departments/units that are not using their services to see how they may be able to help them.
• Increase the subject matter expertise in this group.
• Communicate more frequently and be proactive on budget issues with department/units. Go to them instead of having them come to the budget office.
• Part of the job description, if budget analysts are assigned to specific areas/accounts, should be to communicate on a regular and proactive basis with their clients.
• It is not clear whether the UCOP Budget Office’s charge is to serve solely as a control function, or whether the aim is for them to have sufficient resources and authority to provide value-added services such as identifying potential funding sources, negotiating and facilitating agreements between
departments and campuses, etc. Having sufficient resources to guide departments in the budget development and particularly in the funds administration process would be extremely beneficial.

- Documentation of budget-related policies, procedures, practices, and processes is needed desperately.
- Reconciliation form confusing to move expenses (listed multiple times on form).
- Difficult to know if department is within or over budget.
- System not intuitive to staff now trying to reconcile.
- Developing an efficient and effective process for receiving funding owed by campuses to Student Affairs as well as transferring funds to campuses, particularly during an administration year of UCUES. Currently, there is no mechanism for collecting campus financial support except through a reminder notice from SA to the VCSAs (and EVCs) asking for their contribution.
- Improving the effectiveness of the budget process so that expenditure needs are reflected and not limited to just expenditures that are permanently funded.
- Providing clarity on the rationale for fund source and account function.
- Providing a comprehensive approach for appropriations for the department’s entire budget (i.e., eliminate split appropriation responsibilities between OP Budget and BCR)
- More budget tools.
- Training for line managers who are responsible for preparing expenditure reports.
- More capacity for advising and proactive budget management.
- Faster service on requests, primarily the pre-approval process. Forms take too long to get approved and we’ve also experienced pre-approvals getting lost as they moved through the process.
- Would like to see training in budget processes, development, procedures and a manual with necessary information available to assist staff. With staff taking on completely new roles it’s crucial to at least have some training in the fundamentals of budget and expenditure processes, including definitions of what things are (i.e. PAN, FAU numbers, etc).

**OP HUMAN RESOURCES (OP HR)**

1. **How has your unit/division interacted with UCOP HR?**
   - We have recently gone through hiring process for several positions. We also support HR Communications so we work with several HR staff in developing new materials or revising materials.
   - We use UCOP HR for all our HR needs – consultation/strategy, hires/separations, performance management, leave etc.
   - Our department works with UCOP HR:
     - To arrange for posting of job openings and job classifications for our department in the CAT system as well as closing job openings.
     - To ensure personnel transaction paperwork for our department is prepared for new hires and employee’s change of status.
     - To arrange for academic appointments (as may be made by EAP, UCDC, Sac Center) and graduate student internships (as may be created and filled by any of the Programs and the Immediate Office).
     - To coordinate on completion of the annual performance review, merit and recognition programs.
     - To ensure employee service awards are ordered and delivered on time.
     - To assist in filling some positions from TOPS.
   - The newly formed HR group is one of the better restructured units within OP. Its evolution from SRCT to Local HR has very customer orient driven.
• All HR matters – recruitment/hiring, separation, layoff, benefits, employee relations.
• ANR still has an HR person because ANR classifications are unique.

2. How has your unit division adapted to the existence and services of UCOP HR?
• To my knowledge, it has been fine.
• Very well, especially now that SRCT transitioned to UCOP HR. It’s been good to bring services back from UCSF that weren’t working well, such as labor and benefits. Also, there are more resources dedicated to HR now.
• We worked with SRCT in regards to HR matters before the new local HR unit was formed in January 2011. During the transition, we met with the SRCT Coordinator and our HR Partner to discuss the HR-related functions. Now, we are still adapting ourselves in coordination with the services of HR.
• In the last fiscal year the department has used them for a variety of services, including on-boarding, off-boarding and benefit analysis.
• We didn’t have a choice.

3. In your view, is UCOP HR meeting the expectations set for them during the restructuring process?
• Yes, though there’s still a staffing work load issue. To really provide HR support, they need more HR Generalists to free up the Business Partners to focus more on strategy.
• To my knowledge, yes.
• It is too early to comment on this since the new local OP HR was formed a few months ago. At the moment, there is room for improvements in HR.
• Local HR has seamlessly resolved several CMF issues and concerns since inception. They’ve been communicative with the department head and its employees regarding a wide range of services needed. Our experience has been that the department has collectively come together to support one another in resolving issues and matters that come up, thus meeting expectations.
• As the newest consolidated unit they have a long way to go to reach their goals, but they appear to be working purposefully toward them. They have identified some of the major challenges that departments face: lack of transparency about protocols; whom to contact; outdated systems; absence of training for managers/supervisors to improve capacity and mitigate risk.

4. For UCOP HR, what do you think is working well?
• The hiring process has been working well since we have been assigned a staff member and an assistant. They are normally very supportive about the process.
• The business partner relationship is excellent!
• TAMS really moves the Post and Fills along and relieves our administrative person from processing and tracking the paperwork.
• The new OP HR unit has arranged some training topics in the monthly HR Advisory Group meeting for the OP managers and supervisors. The training is helpful and informative.
• Knowing who our dedicated Business Partner is as well as their dedicated analyst in their absence has been very helpful in meeting our HR needs.
• Assisting with job descriptions and classification processes.
• Shepherding “Post & Fill” paperwork through completion.
• Serving as liaison with other units/departments for HR related issues.
• Recruitment.
• Labor relations.
• Health Sciences and Services and the Financial Services and Control department/unit stated their service is outstanding. They have a good HR Rep and it is working well.
• Coordination and internal operations are good.
• HR Rep is the “key” in the relationships with the department/units and the staffing model is well designed.
• Weekly communications that John Fox sends out are good.
• Doing a great job so far.
• It’s much better dealing with local people whom we know than working with UCSF. That whole experience felt like HR had been outsourced.
• The “business partner” concept. It’s good to have one point of contact for any/all HR issues.
• BCR monthly meetings with HR Business Partner work well. These meetings were proactively sought by Local HR. This outreach is a best practice that other consolidated units might seek to implement. We share information about planning, retirements, re-orgs, etc. OP Local HR appears to be able to perform a wider scope of services than what we received under the UCSF affiliation.
• Classification and employee relations are very service-oriented and have provided added-value repeatedly. Recruitment has recently made a turnaround under the new local HR structure. Under the previous incumbent, training and development was a strategic partner with our department.
• The following comment may be about SCRT rather than Local HR: I only worked with Trish Hare on a couple of executive searches. She was FABULOUS!! Super responsive and new exactly how to direct me to get the information we both needed to move thru the hiring process quickly. She’s truly an asset!

5. For UCOP HR, are there any specific issues you think are not addressed by the self-assessment?
• Not at this time.
• This is a new unit. Agreed with the self-assessment that some areas still need to be improved.
• The recent training on Employee Self Appraisal was a good offering. If additional classes and training’s are offered, more saturated marketing should be done to ensure employees know about various opportunities.
• The HR Business Partner model needs refinement – it’s a good idea, but if the Business Partner is to be part of a department’s strategic planning, then it’s going to be important to reassess Local HR’s role, staffing levels and staff competencies in carrying out department-level HR transaction/operations management. Too many things fall through the cracks, and service levels get compromised.
• The service request intake system has to move beyond e-mail into something more formal and consistent.
• Hiring process takes longer than it should.
• UCSF role with classification holds up the hiring process. Example was given where UCSF reached out to the department because they were not able to find a similar job to do some comparison with regarding the job description. The department had to tell them how to do market research; this resulted in a lack of department confidence in our UCSF partners.
• None beyond what they’re already working on.
• Service level may depend on who the department is working with. At least one department’s service was quite sketchy at first, although it is improving.
• Communication about on-boarding process from HR was inadequate.
• Because UCOP HR has gone through what is the equivalent of two restructurings, there has been little chance to put effort into focusing on improving the delivery of services and for HR to fulfill its potential as a strategic partner.
• I do not see any objectives related to designing strategic HR programs, although that charge may be in systemwide HR instead.
New Business Partner is good; helpful. However, their policies need to be written down. For example, their response on FMLA was awful because I needed to have a consistent response when was taking disciplinary actions for an employee. There are different rules for represented vs. non-represented employees and the backup for my Business Partner could not provide answers.

My Business Partner does not know much. The person who reports to them is gone and they usually know more.

6. Do you have any suggestions for how UCOP HR might improve its operation and/or service to UCOP?

- Consistency in new employee orientation presentations. More information and updating on a regular basis regarding status of open positions. More consultation regarding external advertising and timing of external advertising placed to coincide with standard job site posting. Most importantly, more timeliness to the entire hiring process; it seems to take too much time.
- We are concerned that HR is not staffed to support us during the creation of expanded IT Staff to support common systems. We will require dedicated support.
- Holding Brown Bag meetings is a good way to improve communication with staff and to inform them about the functions of HR and how to access HR services.
- A policy guide on HR policies needs to exist. There have been times where we have received inconsistent information. This is particularly important in a disciplinary situation.
- Coordinating all aspects of catastrophic, family medical, and disability leaves, including coordination with UCSF.
- Providing a “case worker” (i.e., a single point of contact for employees) who is responsible for coordinating all aspects of catastrophic, family medical and disability leaves and associated paperwork, and ensuring that accurate and timely information is communicated to the processing units, e.g., BRC payroll, HR, supervisors, etc.
- Providing a more uniform level of service among staff (e.g., better internal back-up systems).
- Providing clarity on level of service details.
- On-boarding and off-boarding checklist that is consistent for all departments/units with roles and responsibilities. Also, it is important to follow up with departments on where we are in this process. Clear communication on who is responsible for each aspect of the process.
- Bring back compensation. There’s still a bottleneck between OP HR and UCSF for job evaluation, posting, salary approvals, etc.
- Want partnering to provide strategic program design and implementation such as succession planning but not sure that local HR is charged with or resourced for that. It would be extremely useful if Local HR could move beyond being a “transactional partner” to serving as a “strategic partner.”
- There is a need to address retention and career development, and provide departments with guidance as to how to develop and identify talented staff and training opportunities.
- There is major unease regarding the planned “forced rankings” (leveling of performance ratings). It is not perceived that this will facilitate an improved performance assessment process, and quite the contrary, could be damaging to employee development. More discussion with staff needs to occur regarding this, and any other, OP HR initiatives.
- There is a resource issue when HR Business Partner has 2-3 departments to cover. More knowledgeable Business Partners are needed.

1. What suggestions do you have for this review process?
• I think the self-evaluations are a good assessment exercise, and the focus group should enable an active discussion and dialog that others can process and report back to their units.
• The key point is to make sure that, this time, there are outcomes, and that they are broadly publicized across UCOP so people know what’s being done.
• Don’t rush it. These units have to work, so the process here is as important as the product.
• We should stop focusing on the restructuring of 3 years ago. Focus on our issues today.
• The initial report (self-assessment) on the consolidated units seems too much like an attempt to declare victory and disguise defeat. It should be more frank and include comments on the shortcomings and failures of the changes.

2. Do you think a broader survey – on the consolidated units or the overall functioning of UCOP – is necessary, or would be helpful? If so, what questions should be asked of other staff?
• As long as the findings of these focus groups are relatively consistent, the next stages of this process should focus on action, not further information-gathering. A survey is likely unnecessary and may just create internal anxiety about another wave of restructuring.
• UCOP has conducted repeated surveys and work groups around process re-engineering of the UCOP business operations with limited improvements. We need to move forward. Charge and empower the units to take the actions they know are needed.
• The survey should be conducted among a broader group of OP staff, at least 2 staff in each department and unit. As such, more information and ideas can be collected for this review process of the consolidated units.
• I think that if another survey is done, it should be on the overall functioning of UCOP, not just on the consolidated units. Perhaps this would inform departments on what is working well and what isn’t, or help to encourage reviews of other departments. I think it would be helpful for every department to have a mission statement, and a self-evaluation should be done in order to assess if the department is meeting the needs of other departments or campuses.
• No. People know what needs to be done. Stop the surveying and take action!
• Additional question: What do you think is the most helpful service that your unit/division gets from these consolidated units?
• It may be better to start implementing suggestions with the group versus spending additional time on additional surveying.
• No. Not everyone interfaces with a consolidated unit, knows what a consolidated unit is, or cares what a consolidated unit does.
• Unless there will actually be a plan to improve the overall functioning of UCOP, then don’t survey people and get their hopes up. Use the existing mechanisms – Operations Council, How We Work group – to determine next steps.
• Yes a broader survey would be helpful; using the themes identified above as the focus of the questions. This survey will:
  o Let the customer feel that we want to hear what they have to say
  o Allow groups to get independent feedback
  o Help set priorities
• As an example, the BRC survey can be found on their website: http://www.ucop.edu/brc/documents/brc_customer_survey.pdf.
• There should definitely be a broader survey beyond this phase. It shouldn’t be limited to the consolidated service units. (They were an attempt to deal with sudden demands for reduced staffing.) That attempt may or may not have succeeded; however, the broader appropriate question should be “What matters most?” Engineers have a slogan saying “Good, fast, cheap; pick two.” It isn’t feasible to
have all three, so what is it appropriate to sacrifice? Since the decision hasn’t been made or justified at OP, negative effects keep cropping up.

- The form for the broader survey isn’t particularly important. A box in the lobby to receive anonymous suggestions and complaints would be usable. The main point would be to make it universal and to give appropriate (public) consideration to all comments. People were turned off by some earlier surveys that allowed only a limited range of responses; they seemed to be seeking approval for decisions that had already been made. That’s entirely the wrong approach.

3. General Comments for all consolidated units:

- **Customer service** must be a focus and executing it with a customer service mind set. So, it is important for all the consolidated units to understand what each one does so you may help guide the process from your area to another. Timely responses are the key.

- **Communications** – clear, frequent, face to face and understanding what your business partners do and how they process work.

- **Training** is needed for departments/units on consolidated units process, procedures and policies; along with, training for the Consolidated Unit groups increasing the subject matter expertise in all areas.

- **Self Promotion** – promote your areas especially ones mentioned that had limited interactions with the departments/units.

- **Managing expectations** is important to manage the relationships with the department/units.

- **How We Work** – a diagram or explanation on how we work along with roles and responsibilities.

- The “action steps” should focus first on the financial functions (OP Budget and BRC). Frustration/confusion seems highest around our financial processes. One piece of that should be more education/information for OP employees generally about our financial structures and processes. There needs to be more understanding of which units do what. A “glossary of financial terms” and “flow chart of the financial process” also could be helpful for many customers of the BRC and OP Budget.

- Across all of the consolidated units, there needs to be more information about how to access a particular unit and what you get when you engage with it. What service does a particular unit offer me, how do I get it, how does the unit prioritize the importance of my project relative to others, what does the unit commit to doing (and not doing) with my project, and what metrics does the unit use to report its effectiveness?

- Many of the units could benefit from a basic re-orientation to the customer service imperative. One department at UCSF includes the line “Did this solve your problem?” at the bottom of all its emails. We should consider something similar.

4. General Comments on the Re-Organiztion that generated the consolidated units:

- The consolidated units (especially BRC) lack familiarity with departmental business requirements and processes. We have business operations in our department that require simple, straight forward, consistent procedures to receive operating income, pay normal/recurring operating expenses, and enter into contracts for services. The department perceives that it is receiving a substandard level of service that adds costs to its business operations. Some of this problem could be remedied by the consolidated units proactively reaching out to departments to understand the nature of their business, and therefore appreciate the significance, importance, and unique requirements of transactions they are handling on the department’s behalf. Without this understanding, the burden falls upon department personnel to “orient” staff in the consolidated units; and this is even more inefficient because it happens on a case-by-case and individual-by-individual basis for each consolidated staff member/transaction.

- Furthermore, if it were not for “legacy” administrative staff in the department, the burdens of processing transactions through a consolidated unit would fall to professional/managerial staff, which
would result in an even more costly method of operation. The “legacy” administrative staff seem to have developed unique/ad hoc methods of interfacing with the consolidated units in order to get transactions through, which is not a sustainable replicating model.

- Subsequent to the time that the consolidated groups were formed, it has appeared that they have been mushrooming in staffing. Thus, while the staffing to provide our core mission services is declining, we continue to witness growing staffing for the OP administrative support function. Something is wrong with this picture. Is it evidence that the consolidated model is not, in fact, an efficient model? Has anyone evaluated the ratio of the number of support FTE to core mission staff before and after the re-organization?
- Consolidated units (especially the transactional ones) seem to be set up to deal with routine matters, but have insufficient authority/infrastructure to manage anything unexpected or out of the ordinary. Perhaps this could be addressed by proactive consideration of the types of issues that would require additional authority and establish protocols and explicit efficient channels for “desk” staff to send unresolved business up to people at a higher level of expertise or authority.
- All groups should be asking “How are we doing? How can we improve?”

5. General Comments about a related consolidated unit – Administrative Services Center (ASC):
- Departments needs for contract (PSA, ICA, materials procurement) development and administration have not been addressed in a satisfactory manner.
- Departments are not provided with a set of procedures/flow charts, expectations as to what the department is responsible for and what the ASC provides, or policy documentation.
- The department has also experienced a lack of consistent approach, depending on the staff member providing the service (or the UCLA procurement agent being consulted). This is an area that requires major attention for service upgrade.
- A method that might be effective at improving service, on an ongoing basis, would be for each transaction (Techdesk request, invoice payment, travel reimbursement, payroll change, HR request) to conclude with a customer satisfaction question (e.g., just like on-line shopping surveys). The results should be sent to a third-party for analysis.

6. General Comments about a related consolidated unit – Strategic Resource Coordination Team (SRCT) HR-functions:
- Useful:
  - Assisting with job descriptions and classification processes.
  - Shepherding “Post & Fill” paperwork through completion.
  - Serving as liaison with other units/departments for HR related issues.
  - Benefits tracking and monitoring, especially FMLA.
  - Troubleshooting and advise for employee relations issues.
  - CATS closeouts and support for CATS entries.
- Would like to improve:
  - Coordinating all aspects of catastrophic, family medical, and disability leaves, including coordination with UCSF.
  - Providing a “case worker” (i.e., a single point of contact for employees) who is responsible for coordinating all aspects of catastrophic, family medical and disability leaves and associated paperwork, and ensuring that accurate and timely information is communicated to the processing units, e.g., BRC payroll, HR, supervisors, etc.
  - Providing a more uniform level of service among staff (e.g., better internal back-up systems).
  - Providing clarity on level of service details.
7. General Comments about a related consolidated unit – Strategic Resource Coordination Team (SRCT) Non-HR functions:

Useful:
- Providing ad-hoc, temporary, and back-up assistance has been useful.
- Troubleshooting and serving as a resource point of contact has been useful.
- Coordinating all aspects of Independent Contractor Agreements & Professional Service Agreements has been useful.

Would like to improve:
- Providing better oversight of temporary assistance.
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INTRODUCTION

In response to a request from President Yudof, members of the UCOP Operations Council performed an assessment of the functional units that were consolidated as part of the 2007-2009 reorganization of the Office of the President. The purpose of the assessment is to gauge how well these consolidated units are performing as measured against the objectives and expectations set for them during the UCOP restructuring process. This report summarizes the evaluations of each unit, as well as the approach that was used. Background information about the drivers and goals of the UCOP restructuring is provided as context for the design and mandates of the consolidated units, as well as ongoing operational challenges.

The consolidated units that were evaluated are:

- Business Resource Center (BRC)
- Communications
- Information Resources and Communications (IR&C)
- Institutional Research (IR)
- Issues Management, Policy Analysis and Coordination (IMPAC)
- Office of Strategic Change Resources (OSCR)
- UCOP Budget
- UCOP Human Resources

THE ASSESSMENT APPROACH

This is not intended to be a comprehensive evaluation of the UCOP restructuring, or UCOP’s current operational effectiveness. Such an evaluation would require expertise beyond the Operations Council’s capability, presumably by an outside consultancy, and significantly more time. To respond to the President’s request in as timely a manner as possible, both the Operations Council and the larger Operations Advisory Group agreed that the consolidated units would perform self-assessments, and those evaluations would then be reviewed by the Advisory Group before being submitted to the President. It was also agreed that additional organizational assessments (e.g., climate surveys and third-party evaluations) could be pursued subsequent to the self-assessments as leadership desired.

The goal of the self-assessments is to capture, as objectively and completely as possible, what each unit has accomplished as measured against their original objectives and assumptions, as well as outstanding or ongoing operational issues and challenges. Council representatives consulted with personnel and/or leadership within their respective units in developing their self-assessments.

THE UCOP RESTRUCTURING

The UCOP restructuring that began in 2007 was driven primarily by two, coinciding factors: controversies surrounding UC’s executive compensation practices and a worsening budget environment. The issues concerning UC’s executive compensation practices raised questions and concerns about UC’s management, and by extension about UCOP – its size, structure and inner workings. To many, UCOP seemed inappropriately large and complex. The university's worsening budget situation placed added pressure on the need to ensure that resources were being managed and utilized appropriately, especially at UCOP. Additionally, the serious and public nature of the executive compensation issues was embarrassing and
painful for UC and its leaders, especially the Regents who are ultimately responsible for UC’s governance. Swift action was required in order to restore confidence in UC’s management.

Before the 2007 restructuring, UCOP had not been reviewed for decades and had grown in size and complexity. Part of this growth was a natural result of the growth of the university itself. But under the scrutiny placed on UCOP as a result of the executive compensation issues and budget pressures, questions arose about the size, configuration and role of UCOP. To help answer these questions, several organizational reviews were conducted, first by McKinsey & Co. in 2006 and later by The Monitor Group starting in 2007. Several internal organizational reviews were also performed. These reviews resulted in a clarified role for the Office of the President within the UC system, and also recommendations about restructuring and resizing UCOP in accordance with that clarified role.

The key goals of the various operational reviews and subsequent UCOP restructuring were:
1. To better define roles among the Regents, the Office of the President, and the campuses.
2. To achieve greater operational efficiencies and better customer service at UCOP.
3. To achieve cost savings that can be redirected to academic priorities.
4. To meet the Legislature’s demand for such an organizational review.

It’s important to note, for purposes of understanding the UCOP reorganization and its effects, that the OP restructuring was an imperfect process. Change needed to happen quickly, and although a lot of good and careful thinking went into the design of the new UCOP organization, much of the detailed restructuring work was done by OP staff, most of whom were not trained in organizational design, process reengineering or change management. The ultimate redesign of UCOP represented the best thinking that the circumstances at the time allowed. It was known that it would take time, and some refinements and adjustments, before the “new” UCOP realized its full potential.

An additional consideration is that the restructuring process was organization-wide. And while the consolidated units were a key element of the strategy, individual departments also underwent significant structural change. Many have continued to evolve to meet the continuing loss of personnel and/or the assumption of additional responsibilities. These departmental reorganizations each have impacted the operations of the consolidated units either by increasing workload and responsibilities or, in some cases, by creating shadow functional operations that have created ongoing organizational redundancies. An open question is whether an organizational review should be expanded to include the broader reorganizational effort.

**THE CONSOLIDATED UCOP UNITS**

The basic idea behind the consolidated units was to concentrate dispersed personnel performing like work under one roof so as to reduce redundancies and inefficiencies, and create more potent functional units. By creating new centralized units serving the entire UCOP organization, it was also expected that the consolidated units would help to break down UCOP’s “siloed” culture. The rationale seemed to be sound, and is working today to a substantial degree. At the same time, one of the issues with the design of virtually all of the consolidated units was that their size and structure was not informed nor validated by any in-depth needs analysis or workflow testing. This was not the fault of leadership or the people involved in designing the new units -- the pressure UCOP was under to reform itself simply didn’t allow time for it. As a result, there are some unresolved operational issues, which are explained in this report.
OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

In general, the consolidated units are performing as intended and realizing most of the objectives and expectations that were established for them when they were formed. Many of the goals, estimated benefits and expectations for each of the consolidated units have been realized (or are ongoing), and many of the assumptions underlying the design of the units have been validated. The specific accomplishments of each unit are outlined in the following pages.

At the same time, there are some ongoing challenges that are preventing the consolidated units from realizing their full potential and/or fully meeting expectations. Some of these challenges are unique to individual units, while a few are common to all (or nearly all) of the units. Two key issues common to virtually all of the units can be summarized as follows:

**Service levels/expectations:** One of the biggest ongoing issues for nearly all of the consolidated units concerns trying to set appropriate service levels and expectations, given the original staffing levels and charges established for the units. When the consolidated units were established, it was assumed they would serve the entire UCOP organization. However, comprehensive needs assessments were not performed for the new service areas, so staffing levels were not informed by actual organizational needs but were determined primarily by the need to make UCOP smaller. UCOP’s size and structure were downsized, but not the work.

Additionally, many of the consolidated units are being asked to do work their original charge and staffing plan did not take into account. This is not a criticism of the workgroups that designed the units. The consolidated units were designed based on the workloads at the time, and projected needs as best the design teams could estimate them.

As a result, many of the consolidated units currently are still working to define appropriate service levels and priorities, and to identify work that can be eliminated, in order to align service levels and expectations with their mandates and the realities of their current staffing levels. In some cases, unit charges and staffing levels may need to be adjusted.

**Cultural issues:** The creation of the consolidated units represented a loss of personnel and local control for many departments, and UCOP is still getting used to operating under this model. Although UCOP has generally accepted the new consolidated approach, the loss of personnel and local control has created some frustration and even resentment among some staff. In some cases, departments have not fully relinquished authority to the consolidated units, and have backfilled with personnel and/or activity in reaction to the loss of FTE and local decision rights. Examples of some of these occurrences are detailed in the following individual performance assessments.
PERFORMANCE SUMMARIES BY UNIT

The following are performance summaries for each unit in narrative form. They are based on the self-assessments performed by each council representative (in consultation with unit colleagues) and are intended to synthesize key accomplishments and ongoing challenges and/or needs.

The narrative summaries are followed by more detailed performance “scorecards.” These are intended to provide an at-a-glance summary of how each unit is performing as measured against original objectives, assumptions and expected benefits. In addition to the qualitative measures, the following numerical scale was also used to score performance:

- 0 – not done or attempted
- 1 – began but maybe only 25% complete
- 2 – about 50% complete
- 3—about 75% complete
- 4 – completed successfully
BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER (BRC)

The BRC was formed in 2008 and was charged with three primary objectives:
- Centralizing transaction processing for administrative functions, allowing departments to focus on their core duties in support of the President and the campuses;
- To the greatest extent possible, standardizing procedures to ensure maximum service to departments and efficient processing;
- Ensuring standardized processes incorporate adequate and effective internal controls over transaction processing.

The original scope of the BRC’s services was to provide payroll and non-payroll transaction processing and ledger reconciliation services to UCOP departments (excluding the Officers of the Regents offices), and to serve as the office of record for the documentation supporting the related transactions. In addition, the BRC was to serve as the UCOP cashiering office, preparing and depositing checks using remote deposit software. The BRC was established with a staff of 49.

Almost immediately after the BRC was established, the BRC payroll team was tasked with the additional responsibility of providing payroll transaction processing services to the Officers of the Regents offices, and a new BRC team was created to process recharge activity and to prepare purchase orders and process payments for sub-awards, subcontracts, and other sponsored agreements. No additional staffing or resources were provided for these expanded services. The BRC was recently given four new staff to provide event-planning services to UCOP departments.

As one of the first consolidated units, the BRC faced a number of culture-related challenges:
- A strong resistance to change;
- A strong resistance to rely on work performed outside of one’s own department, and
- Customer expectations that were not fully aligned with a central service model.

Other ongoing key challenges and/or priorities include:
- Sufficient funding for critical technology upgrades and enhancements, as well as salary inequities that exist relative to other departments.
- Working with departments that continue to re-do or duplicate work that is performed by BRC staff, primarily with respect to monthly ledger reconciliations.
- Availability of relevant data for purposes of measuring and improving BRC performance.
- Continuous development and training of staff – one of the benefits associated with the creation of the BRC is providing a career ladder for administrative staff. Staff came to the BRC with, and continue to exhibit, varying levels of competence and understanding of systems, policies, and procedures, so it is important to continue to address this with training at our monthly all-BRC staff meetings and through other mechanisms.
### BRC Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralize transaction processing for administrative functions.</td>
<td>Realized 4</td>
<td>BRC established in 2008; UCOP departments were transitioned to BRC processing during FY 2008-2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize procedures, to the greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing 3.5</td>
<td>Standardized processes were established for all BRC lines of business; standard process flows were documented and are available on the BRC website (<a href="http://www.ucop.edu/brc">www.ucop.edu/brc</a>); processes are periodically reviewed and reassessed for improvement, streamlining, and efficiency opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure processes incorporate adequate and effective internal controls over transaction processing.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing 4</td>
<td>Standardized processes were designed to include adequate and effective internal controls; audits conducted by both PwC (for FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010) and UCOP Internal Audit (audit report issued in November 2010) disclosed no control weaknesses, processing exceptions, or recommendations for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train and develop staff to ensure accurate transaction processing and consistent delivery of quality service.</td>
<td>In-process / Ongoing 3</td>
<td>Staff came to the BRC with and continue to exhibit varying levels of competence and understanding of systems, policies, and procedures. To address this, we provide training at our monthly all-BRC staff meetings and through other mechanisms, which have included mandatory training in Excel and customer service skills. Additional training offerings, such as the use of analytical tools and techniques and other aspects of delivering high quality customer service, are being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously improve processes.</td>
<td>In-process / Ongoing 3</td>
<td>Using limited available data and other established processes, BRC performance and productivity are measured and analyzed to identify process changes or staff training needs. Establishing mechanisms for ongoing communication with/feedback from customer departments and contacts; a Customer Feedback Survey was distributed in December 2009, which indicated an overall satisfaction level of 89%; a second Customer Feedback Survey is close to being finalized and distributed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNICATIONS

The creation of a consolidated communications unit merged communications personnel from three separate departments: Strategic Communications, Student Affairs and Human Resources. The central mission of the consolidated communications unit is to provide (1) strategic leadership of institutional communications efforts, and (2) creative support for university-wide and individual department communications. The design of the new communications unit included the creation of a marketing and creative services team and a new internal communications group, reflecting the unit's primary goals: stronger storytelling capabilities, strengthened media relations and communications issues management, stronger internal communications, and a marketing orientation. All of these goals and expectations have been realized, and are detailed in the performance scorecard.

While much has been accomplished, there are several ongoing restructuring-related issues. One challenge involves the expectation of equal service levels across all of UCOP. The workgroup that designed the new communications unit anticipated that unit resources would be allocated based on priorities, however it is unclear what those decisions should be based on. And although the new communications unit does, indeed, serve all of UCOP, it does not have the resources to provide the same level of service to everyone. This tension is magnified by the fact that the original design of the unit underestimated the graphic design and web resources needed to meet demand. Fortunately, the original assumptions for the unit acknowledged that additional investment may be required in order to fully meet operational needs. Unit staff are also working to set appropriate service levels and internal expectations.

Another ongoing challenge involves changing the culture within UCOP regarding communications. On the one hand, departments are recognizing the value of strategic communication, and they are accepting and relying on the Communications office's authority and expertise. At the same time, some departments still seem reluctant to cede control of their communications to a central unit, or follow new protocols. As a result, some departments continue to produce and distribute their own communications on their own, outside of the guidelines and mechanisms being established by the central Communications unit. Other key outstanding needs include (1) strengthening the unit's design and web teams, (2) retiring/reconceiving ineffective communications, and (3) establishing a pool of qualified external resources to handle overflow and specialty work.
# COMMUNICATIONS SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stronger media relations.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing - 4</td>
<td>New media team working effectively with reporters and UC leadership. UC positions timely and clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger issues management.</td>
<td>In-process 3</td>
<td>Progress made; challenges = internal UCOP decision-making and intra-unit coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger internal communications.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing - 4</td>
<td>Measurable progress; breaking some new ground. Value of internal communications elevated. Working on new tools to address distribution/awareness issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger marketing orientation.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing - 4</td>
<td>Good progress here in short time and without many new tools. New positioning + visual/editorial helping to articulate UC’s value/positions and effect action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic leadership of institutional communications.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing - 4</td>
<td>Unit recognized and being relied on as communications leader/source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative support for U-wide and departmental communications.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing - 4</td>
<td>New design team providing high-quality design leadership and services + enabling strategic thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More services available to more departments.</td>
<td>Realized; need SLAs + vendors 3</td>
<td>Unit serving significantly expanded client list. Still need (1) clarified priorities and service level agmts., and (2) pool of approved on-call vendors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent brand identity, integration and execution of UC messages.</td>
<td>Realized / in-process - 3</td>
<td>New branding/positioning setting baseline for all communications, clarifying key messaging/tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential savings from reduced outsourcing, strategic sourcing.</td>
<td>In-process - 2</td>
<td>Some savings realized due to consolidated contracts, econ. of scale, etc. Will have clearer financial picture once priorities and service levels are clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define priorities/service levels.</td>
<td>In-process - 0</td>
<td>Still need to define. Should have clearer picture by 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify Comm./IRC relationship.</td>
<td>In-process - 2</td>
<td>MOU underway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit of communication vehicles. | In-process - 1 | Happening on an ongoing, individual dept. basis. Clarified priorities will help define what work should stay/go.

**INFORMATION RESOURCES & COMMUNICATIONS (TECH DESK)**

Even before the UCOP restructuring, IR&C embarked on a mission to consolidate IT support services to gain productivity efficiencies and reduce overall support costs for UCOP. Prior to the consolidation, OP departments maintained internal support staff to manage their own Active Directory service, desktop support, servers and departmental applications. Servers were not located in a secure location and uneven skills among departmental IT staff required IR&C to provide ad-hoc support. Approximately 38 staff within UCOP provided varying levels of support in each department.

IR&C implemented a two-phased approach for the IT consolidation:

**Phase I** – consolidate IT support services under a centralized Help Desk (“Tech Desk”).
**Phase II** – identification and support of departmental applications.

During Phase I, the Monitor Report was released and fully endorsed the consolidation plan. The purpose of the consolidated Tech Desk was to provide the following benefits:

- Implementation of a secure desktop configuration to ensure compliance with new minimum standards for network connectivity;
- Standardization of the OP desktop “image” (i.e., operating system, configuration, and programs) to enable automated back-up and deployment of software updates and security patches;
- Deployment of common anti-virus and anti-spam tools;
- Centralized account management (this also addressed a 2009 audit finding);
- The ability to provide data encryption services to all electronic information;
- Migration of 1600 employees to Microsoft Outlook;

Additional benefits realized included a technical support team providing consistent support to all UCOP departments, elimination of duplicate devices (ex/network firewalls), and the ability to standardize services such as file and print sharing.

IR&C completed the majority of Phase I in terms of the mechanics of the consolidation. What was not addressed was the change management/expectation management for UCOP which is an important activity when removing dedicated department IT support staff to a shared services function. Additional and/or remaining challenges include:

- Identify departments that still provide varying levels of their own IT support;
- Complete Phase II, which was initiated several times but has not been completed;
- Continue to assess and improve support services to move to the next level of service maturity;
- Develop a plan to provide end-user training on IT user tools;
- Continue removing local user rights to prevent malware, virus and spyware incidents;
- Continue to implement stronger security solutions at both the network and desktop level;
- Establish customer relationship managers and IT architects to develop and enforce common platforms and align our strategy with business objectives.
### TECH DESK (IR&C) SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate IT support and create a centralized Help Desk.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing - 3</td>
<td>Most of the support is centralized. There are still a few pockets where department staff with varying skill levels is providing Level 1 support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of 8-10 FTE positions.</td>
<td>Realized - 4</td>
<td>Consolidation reduced FTE positions at UCOP by 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review departmental applications and define a support strategy.</td>
<td>Outstanding - 1</td>
<td>Slated for Phase II and has had a number of starts and stops. To date, meetings have been scheduled with each business unit to identify their departmental applications. Next step will be to review the entire portfolio to address ongoing support or recommend alternative solutions that are already supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH (IR)

The IR workgroup established in 2007 was charged with designing a consolidated utility to provide institutional research and reporting, which led to the creation of the existing IR unit. The primary mission of IR is to support the President and the UC community through: timely, accurate, and relevant institutional research, analysis, and reporting; appropriate data stewardship; external monitoring; and leadership on data and analysis policy and practice. Upon his arrival, President Yudof established an overarching Issues, Policy and Analysis group of which IR is an integral part. This represents an expansion of the original charge to IR and reflects the President’s expectation that the new unit would: strengthen the quality of the current level of analysis at OP, establish a culture of evidence-driven decision making, provide integrated management support with in-depth cross-functional analyses, and directly engage in support of policy.

The unit has been successful on many fronts since its inception. It provides both routine reporting and ad hoc analyses for many units, and has made great progress, working in collaboration with IR&C, to improve access to high quality data, reports and information through development of the Decision Support System. The unit has produced integrated reports in support of high priority projects and/or issues (Commission on the Future, furlough program, differential student fees, admissions policy changes, Regents presentations etc.), has introduced new approaches and standards for the presentation and display of information (e.g., COTF documents, legislative maps for UC Day, and interactive dashboards), and has vastly improved the timeliness and accuracy of data provided to external agencies. Efforts to make data and reports more readily available to a highly diverse array of constituents (self service and one-stop shopping) are underway but have not yet met expectations. Several key reporting areas have not yet been addressed (e.g. replacement of Statistical Summaries), but IR plans to tackle these remaining integrated reports as resources allow, balanced against the need to reserve capacity for in depth analysis to address pressing issues.

The design workgroup clearly anticipated the challenges that remain today. The workgroup's final report noted that IR's success would require ongoing efforts by the senior leadership to:

- Affirm and promote efforts to improve the quality of data, analysis, and reporting;
- Not undermine the new IR unit by creating shadow research groups or systems and will not accept products from such groups;
- Adhere to the prioritization process and support the denial of requests that are not aligned with the roles of the President;
- Support IR staff content knowledge by maintaining active participatory relationships, including inclusion of appropriate IR personnel at unit staff and systemwide meetings.

Many units work in full cooperation and collaboration with IR. Yet in a few remaining areas, several key to the core mission of IR, either passive or active resistance to the centrality of the role of IR persists. As a result, departmental analysts lost during the consolidation have been replaced and significant duplication of effort remains. These “shadow” research groups may produce analyses that lack rigor and quality/consistency of presentation, and most critically, results distributed can run counter to key information and messaging already vetted by leadership and released to the public. We will seek guidance from executive leadership to resolve these discrepancies in perception of roles and responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely, accurate analyses and reporting.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing 3</td>
<td>Improved efficiency, accuracy and timeliness of many externally mandated reports: consolidation of all IPEDS, NSF research expenditures, AAUDE, wage reports, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem assessment, design, implementation of routine and non-routine analysis and reporting; Assessment of data and reporting needs; Functional req’s for data structures/systems.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing 3</td>
<td>Developed vision and strategy for Decision Support System; working closely with IR&amp;C, campuses, and functional units, now have fully developed infrastructure and many reporting areas are currently utilized and/or under active development (payroll-personnel, student, admissions, fin. aid, contracts and grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive content scope including all of the Corporate Data Systems, related datasets, and new data collections relevant to institutional decision support.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing / outstanding 3</td>
<td>Responsible for significant portions of OP data collection, reporting and analytic needs, particularly re: integration across content areas. Provides in-depth analyses and reports for student admissions, longitudinal data, enrollment planning, diversity, graduate student success, finances, contracts and grants etc; Supports acad. personnel reporting and analyses, and staff compensation and profiles; established a survey unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a unifying voice with authority to make appropriate choices among competing demands across content spheres.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing / outstanding 2</td>
<td>When included in discussion/development of issues, IR has been successful in facilitating development of a unifying voice; when IR is bypassed, that role cannot be executed effectively, and inaccurate/conflicting reports may result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted source for timely interpretation of data in support of decision-making.</td>
<td>Realized / Outstanding 3</td>
<td>Many staff rely on IR for public release info., decision support, leg. responses, policy assessment. Some units still resistant to IR; built shadow resources w/ own analysts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit staff organized to facilitate a flexible team-based approach and management of content area priorities; maintain high standards for data stewardship</td>
<td>Realized / outstanding 2</td>
<td>Established highly collaborative relationships with many OP units; IR staff embedded in support of Acad. Senate cmtes. (e.g. BOARS); works cooperatively with other units on high priority projects (accountability reports, economic impact report, COTF, etc.). Duplication still exists in some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and analysis.</td>
<td>areas which requires much rework and deeper analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex analyses including surveys, modeling, projections, and forecasting; Coordination and synthesis of cross-divisional reporting and analysis.</td>
<td>Realized 3</td>
<td>Routinely assumes/completes complex analyses including: analysis of potential impact on student diversity of entitled to review admissions policies; unintended consequences of differential student fees by discipline or campus; comparative profiles of state higher education systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of a report repository and public access</td>
<td>Outstanding 1</td>
<td>Collaborating with Communications on central info. center; much infrastructure in place but final realization still elusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor external reporting requirements, data standards, and policy issues; Collection and evaluation of info. from external sources; Environmental scanning to facilitate proactive analysis.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing 3</td>
<td>Collects data from/provides data to a wide array of external agencies. Proactively incorporating changes in IPEDS race/ethnicity reporting; engaged key constituents to adopt new protocols; worked with IR&amp;C/campuses to modify databases and collection forms. With IMPAC, monitors pending legislation re: data and reporting requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership on institutional data and analysis policy and practice.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing 3</td>
<td>Active with other CA higher ed. segments, CDE and CPEC re: K-20 data sharing. Serves on statewide advisory councils re: data security. Advisory to WASC on retention data; presents DSS best practices nationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent and comprehensive consultation with OP, campus, and external clients and data providers.</td>
<td>Realized/ ongoing 2</td>
<td>Works directly with AAUDE, IR directors, Acad. Senate Cmtes., ITLC, Planning/Budget officers, OP units on priority issues and info. needs. Established Sharepoint site for U-wide distribution of materials of common interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUES MANAGEMENT, POLICY ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION (IMPAC)

IMPAC was designed with a dual charge: 1) analysis of and position development on legislation and issues of interest to legislators and other elected officials; and 2) position development to inform decision-making on larger issues at the leadership level, also known as “issues management”. IMPAC has exceeded expectations on the first charge with fewer resources than were dedicated to this activity before the UCOP restructuring and with half the FTE (7 instead of 14) initially recommended by the design workgroup. Prior to IMPAC, positions on legislation and other issues were not always coordinated across divisions to account for and bring to a unified, strategic stance differing perspectives and interests. IMPAC has also taken on functions not originally conceived, such as producing collateral materials, testimony, and other work products in support of legislative advocacy, Presidential and Regental priorities, and the Regental confirmation process.

The issues management function has not been fully realized due to (1) lack of clarity regarding procedures and IMPAC’s authority in this area (i.e., there is no mechanism for issues to flow from leadership to IMPAC so it is nearly impossible to manage issues that are unknown or for which the unit lacks authority), and (2) cultural issues: VPs would need to cede management of issues to IMPAC which would require a sea change in how issues are currently managed. The IMPAC design workgroup stated that the success and effectiveness of the issues management function “will ultimately rely upon decision-makers to make unified, strategic decisions for OP,” which would require “a culture and process currently lacking at OP.” It is unclear how this culture change was to occur. The workgroup also identified resistance to change as a challenge, which persists.
## IMPAC SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conduct rigorous, timely and well-informed analysis on legislation that synthesizes information across divisions and weighs risks and trade-offs to inform position development and decision-making. In particular, improve coordination across divisions on legislative positions. | Realized / Ongoing 4 | • Analysis and positions coordinated, integrated across divisions in a manner previously lacking.  
• Informed by subject matter expertise yet synthesized and coordinated so that work product is final and usable by clients (e.g., SGR and FGR).  
• 100% on time with fewer resources than before.  
• Unable to self-assess to what extent IMPAC’s legislative analysis informs policy positions or decision-making.  
• Need to improve communication flow (e.g., UC and MGY publicly support a program whose funding, unknown to IMPAC and SGR and in spite of thorough vetting with all parties, was cut as part of OP budget cuts). |
| Develop well-informed, coordinated and timely responses to inquiries from legislators and other officials. | Realized 4 |       |
| Triage legislation to determine appropriate levels of analysis. | Realized 4 | Resource constraints necessitate this triage, done in coordination w/SGR as originally conceived. |
| Enhance and standardize process for legislative analysis and response. | Realized / Ongoing 4 | Greatly enhanced, standardized process. Ongoing refinements, informed by feedback from SGR and OP units. |
| Promote flexible analytical core working across subject areas (“matrixed unit”) by staffing unit with generalists and preserve subject matter expertise in OP units. | Realized 4 | Some OP units still confused about IMPAC role; sometimes critical of IMPAC’s reliance on them for subject expertise and input. |
| Greatly improve cost analysis function (via dedicated cost analyst). | Realized (but not via dedicated analyst) 4 | • Cost analysis function improved; all IMPAC staff trained to perform this.  
• Unrealistic and ineffective to have one dedicated staff perform cost analysis for every bill that requires it. |
| Consider current implementation process once legislation becomes statute. | In-process 2 | • Review currently underway.  
• Unclear roles and responsibilities (e.g., is IMPAC charged with monitoring or enforcement of law?). |
<p>| <strong>ISSUES MANAGEMENT</strong>                              |                |       |
| Develop a proactive policy agenda for UC and the President authorize IMPAC to develop a policy | Outstanding 1 | Seems unrealistic. Would require that “UC” and the President authorize IMPAC to develop a policy. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President.</th>
<th>agenda.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Execute consistent process for quickly developing/communicating unified positions on key issues; negotiate resolution on cross-divisional issues to arrive at a unified, strategic position; reform OP decision-making process.</strong></td>
<td>Outstanding / in-process 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear where authority to do this resides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear how culture change and process for reforming decision-making at OP were to occur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear how to garner buy-in from actual decision-makers for “reforming decision-making process at OP”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regularly convene key parties to address emerging issues and develop early positions before response is needed (i.e., proactive vs. reactive).</strong></td>
<td>Deferred/ Outstanding 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would require many challenges associated with “issues management” function (above) to be addressed, particularly getting authority to develop positions on key issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish analytics to inform decisions on issues regardless of origin (not just bills) so as to influence issues as early as possible.</strong></td>
<td>Deferred/ Outstanding 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unit’s leg. analysis and position dev. work can inform decisions, but unclear which emerging issues to scan for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unable to self-assess extent leg. analysis informs development of OP positions and decision-making, other than on legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL HUMAN RESOURCES

The delivery of HR services for UCOP departments and employees has undergone a series of significant changes since 2007. Early in the restructuring process, OP’s local HR functions were transferred to UC San Francisco. Services not provided by UCSF were absorbed into a central administrative unit, along with responsibility for providing departments with a range of other services, which previously had been performed by administrative staff within departments.

Two years into this model, operational realities surfaced several issues. First, the bifurcation of HR responsibilities between Oakland and San Francisco proved confusing to OP employees; departments and employees often did not know where to go for their HR needs. And second, it was determined that OP’s local HR needs were greater than initially realized and there was a need to develop a dedicated HR team in Oakland in order to properly support OP’s needs.

In Fall 2010, a decision was made to develop a new, Oakland-based HR function charged with improving the delivery and coordination of services, and providing OP with the infrastructure it needs to effectively function as a central administration in support of the campuses and the University’s mission. The new Local HR unit was formed in January 2011.

Five months into the transition, a number of key priorities have been identified that are being addressed (or will be addressed) through action plans:

1) Educate OP community about how to access HR services
2) Develop consistent practices and processes; streamline administrative tasks
3) Train HR staff and UCOP managers and supervisors to mitigate employment risks
4) Shift mindsets and skill sets of HR staff from “order takers” to “decision influencers”
5) Existing HR systems are old and configured to support manual processes (Note: the inadequacy of HR systems was one of the primary findings during the operational reviews of UCOP administration prior to restructuring. While there is an effort to develop a systemwide Human Resource Information System, UCOP continues to rely on outdated and incompatible systems).
## LOCAL HR SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition HR-related functions from SRCT to local OP HR.</td>
<td>Realized 4</td>
<td>New local HR unit was fully staffed as of March 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the UCSF agreement and revise, as needed, to transfer certain services to UCOP HR.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing 3</td>
<td>Employee and Labor Relations, Talent Acquisition, and Employment functions have been successfully transitioned from UCSF to UCOP. Assessment of remaining UCSF functions is ongoing (including Learning and Development, Compensation, and Disability Management Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve delivery and coordination of services.</td>
<td>Ongoing 1</td>
<td>Process improvement priorities include: • New employee orientation • Approval process for salaries and hiring • External advertising • Welcoming/on-boarding • Background checks &amp; fingerprinting • Off-boarding/exit Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit current systems and identify opportunities for improvement and enhancement.</td>
<td>Ongoing 1</td>
<td>Audit of compensation and application tracking system (CATS) initiated in May 2011. Also developing case tracking application in SharePoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train HR staff and UCOP managers and supervisors to mitigate employment risks.</td>
<td>Ongoing 1</td>
<td>Partnering with OGC on monthly training for departmental HR contacts. Need to create individual training and development plans for HR staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICE OF STRATEGIC CHANGE RESOURCES (OSCR)

OSCR was established in December 2008 with three FTE to provide change management and project management services to UCOP. The initial charge of OSCR was to provide support to the UCOP restructuring effort as well as to lead future change efforts at OP and on the campuses. The primary mission of OSCR is to serve as an objective resource, and to lead and guide change and project management initiatives, in consultation with senior and department leadership. The unit is also expected to identify best practices and standards, and apply these to UCOP by working closely with departments on their day-to-day activities.

As UCOP completed its restructuring, OSCR’s focus switched from change management to project management. Demand has been high and the major challenges are funding and resources. OSCR utilizes a combination of in-house FTE and contractors to help with its ever-changing workload. However, a more stable organization model is needed to meet our customer requests. Without a stable organization model, the impacts could be an increase in consultant fees, a loss of institutional knowledge, and possibly more project management FTE positions being created by departments (which will undercut the value and effectiveness of a central unit).

Project management expertise is a new skill set that is being developed at UCOP. This skill set has proven to add value, as demonstrated by a number of recent successful projects – e.g., the UC Student Health Insurance Program (USHIP). In today’s environment, organizations need a formalized and effective way of managing projects and expectations. It has been documented by the Project Management Institute (PMI) that project management offices can reduce the number of failed projects by 31 percent. They also set processes, standards, and track projects and performance in support of informed senior management decision making. It is important to ensure that services and authority of the Project Office matches our mission and expectations senior leadership has established for this unit. A clarified project management office governance structure is needed to meet these expectations and to effectively help drive organizational strategies.

Another key challenge is the lack of role definition between OSCR and the IR&C project office. The IR&C project office was created to help triage, plan and execute IT projects. However, there are many projects that do not have an IT component and need project management expertise. Also, many of business partners have asked for assistance in managing the “bigger picture” of the project along with managing the IT component along with client expectations. The overlapping roles are confusing to our customers and Project Office governance is needed.
### OSCR Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage the full change lifecycle, from concept to value-added operational integration.</td>
<td>Realized – 4 In-process - 2 In-process – 1</td>
<td>Created change lifecycle roadmap for departments. Resolving funding issues to offer broader services. Defining roles/responsibilities with IR&amp;C that align to the business need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalize project execution through use of standards, methods, and best practices.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing - 4 In-process - 2 In-process - 2 In-process - 4</td>
<td>Offering training, facilitation, mentoring, consultation and end-to-end project/change management services. Partnering with HR to develop a mentor program for UCOP specific to project management. Working with UCOP Communications to create a plan to better articulate/publicize OSCR’s role and services to UCOP clients (and possibly extend to campuses). Created an intake process for services offered by OSCR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/utilize new framework for providing integrated project info. to help facilitate executive decisions.</td>
<td>In-process – 3</td>
<td>Need to identify tools and reports to assist OSCR and departments in a portfolio view of their projects to ensure alignment with strategic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and utilize framework for facilitating change that returns value to the organization.</td>
<td>Realized / Ongoing – 3</td>
<td>This service is being offered, and being strengthened through both “hands on” and formal training. Need to improve communication regarding these services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UCOP BUDGET

The mission of the UCOP Budget office is to (1) systematically align UCOP’s resources with its strategic needs and goals, (2) provide UCOP senior leadership and department heads with regular updates regarding actual expenditures against the budget, and (3) provide support and technical expertise to UCOP departments on budget-related issues.

Key accomplishments to date have included:
- A new budget system to facilitate budget planning, forecasting, monitoring and accountability;
- Collaboration with the systemwide budget office to establish policies and best practices for managing the OP budget;
- A new process for compiling and reporting the OP budget;
- Improved tracking and reporting of expenditures.

As with other consolidated units, one of the key challenges facing the OP Budget office is that customer expectations may not be fully aligned with the model that was adapted. The FTE currently budgeted is insufficient to provide the much needed level of customer service while carrying out the other necessary responsibilities to manage the extremely diverse fund groups at OP.
## UCOP Budget Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Original expectation / Assumed benefit</th>
<th>Status / Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish policies for budgeting and forecasting.</td>
<td>In-process 3</td>
<td>A new budget system is under development that will facilitate budget planning, forecasting and monitoring. During the design stage of this new system, there is collaboration with the system-wide budget office to establish policies and best practices for managing the OP budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and coordinate annual budget process.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing 3</td>
<td>Over the past few years the Budget office has developed a process for compiling and reporting the OP budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and distribute annual appropriation letters.</td>
<td>Eliminated 1</td>
<td>In order to accomplish a zero-based budgeting model, a budget call is issued and the units initiate their proposed budgets. There is no annual allocation letter that is generated by the OP budget office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align annual budget appropriations with authorized spending levels.</td>
<td>Ongoing 3</td>
<td>This fiscal year the OP budget office collaborated on a strategic plan to meet the upcoming FY11/12 budget reductions as well as reviewing the appropriate use of OP’s diverse fund groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and maintain budget reporting systems.</td>
<td>In-process 4</td>
<td>The design of the new budget system is under way and on schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate fiscal closing process</td>
<td>Ongoing 3.5</td>
<td>The OP Budget Office is working closing with System-wide Budget and the Business Resource Center to make certain all necessary deadlines are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform regular and ad hoc financial analysis as directed by management</td>
<td>Ongoing 4</td>
<td>Every effort is made to provide accurate data in a timely manner when requested of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on status of budgeted funds.</td>
<td>Realized / ongoing 2</td>
<td>The budget office created a report using Cognos that tracks expenditures against the budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial planning and analytical support to department heads in support of budget development.</td>
<td>Ongoing 2.5</td>
<td>Budget coordinators work closely with their units in the development of their budgets. The new budget system is intended to facilitate this process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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