Academic Restructuring Consultations (prior to release of the Interim report)

- Deans’ Council - May 20
- Academic Planning Committee (APC) - May 20
- General Faculties Council (GFC) - May 25
- Town hall - June 2, (on UofA for Tomorrow)
- Deans’ Council - June 3
- APC - June 11
- Board of Governors - June 19
- GFC - June 22, 2020
- Town hall - July 8, (including Thoughtexchanges)
- Board of Governors - July 24
- Deans’ Council - July 29
- Board of Governors - August 14
- Graduate Students’ Association - August 17
- Non-Academic Staff Association - August 19
- Association of Academic Staff - August 20
- APC - August 20
- Students’ Union Council - August 25
- Senior Leadership Retreat - August 26
- Town hall with Equity-Seeking Groups - August 27
- Deans’ Council - September 2
- Board of Governors Retreat - September 4
- Academic Planning Committee - September 9
- Council on Student Affairs - September 10
- Chairs’ Council - September 15

May - Sept 15: ~ 30 hours
Academic Restructuring Consultations (since the release of the Interim report)

- APC - September 23
- Senate - September 25
- GFC - September 28
- Townhall - September 30
- Business Roundtable - October 2
- KSR Roundtable - October 5
- Medicine and Dentistry - October 6
- ALES Roundtable - October 7
- Nursing Roundtable - October 7
- Statutory Deans’ Council - October 7
- APC - October 7
- Engineering Roundtable - October 8
- Council on Student Affairs - October 8
- Campus Saint-Jean Roundtable - October 8
- Augustana Roundtable - October 14
- Arts Roundtable - October 14
- Pharmacy Roundtable - October 14
- Board of Governors - October 16
- Rehabilitation Medicine - October 16
- Native Studies - Oct 19
- GFC - October 19

To date: ~ 25 hours
Participants: ~ 1350 roundtables; 3300 town halls

Upcoming Consultations:
- Graduate Students’ Association - October 19
- Students’ Union and Chairs’ Council - October 20
- APC - October 21
- Roundtables: Public Health, Law, Science, Educ
Scenario A: Health Sciences

Bullets indicate a School embedded in the Faculty
Scenario B1: Tri Agency Divisions with USchools

Health + Med Sci
- FoMD
- Rehab
- Pharmacy
- SPH
- Nursing
- KSR

Natural + Applied Sci
- Science
- Engg
- ALES

Social Sci + Humanities
- Arts
- Education
- Business
- Law

32
- CSJ

58
- Augustana

14
- Native St
Scenario B2: Business Variation

- **Health + Med Sci**: FoMD, Rehab, Pharmacy, SPH, Nursing, KSR
- **Natural + Applied Sci**: Science, Engg, ALES, Business
- **Social Sci + Humanities**: Arts, Education, Law

- CSJ: 32
- Augustana: 58
- Native St: 14
Scenario B3: Medicine Variation

Health Sci
- Rehab
- Pharmacy
- SPH
- Nursing
- KSR

Natural + Applied Sci
- Science
- Engg
- ALES

Social Sci + Humanities
- Arts
- Education
- Law
- Business

FoMD
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Scenario B4: Arts + Science Variation

794 Health + Med Sci
- FoMD
- Rehab
- Pharmacy
- SPH
- Nursing
- KSR

540 Professional + Applied
- Engg
- ALES
- Education
- Business
- Law

104 Community
- Augustana
- CSJ
- Native St

605 Arts + Science
Scenario C: Common Division Plus Consolidation

Dashed box indicates a Division which provides common leadership and shared services across the Faculties
Academic Leadership Savings

- Over the next two years, the hiring freeze will significantly reduce our professoriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/Ben</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
<td>$9.4</td>
<td>$14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit costs</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>$19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The resulting savings are essential to meeting our funding cuts
- To sustain our capacity in teaching, research and community service, we need to retask some of the 320+ professors who are serving in leadership roles
- Each scenario frees up professor capacity (indirect savings) and reduces inducement costs (direct savings)
- To achieve this, we must restructure the work that these leaders do
SET with a Faculty Model
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FTE targets for SET are informed by progress made, cost-saving targets and UniForum benchmarks.

- Overall cost-saving targets are informed by initial scoping and progress made to date as well as assumptions of average total cost per FTE in each function (from UniForum 2019).

- PeopleSoft data suggests that $35M in admin FTE savings have been achieved since UniForum 2019 (approx. 423 FTE).

- The program will need to realize another $60M
  - $30M this financial year (approx. 325 FTE) with redundancy costs covered by savings already achieved
  - $30M next financial year (approx. 325 FTE)

- Combined, these savings amount to $95M in total FTE costs, excluding redundancies, which is the target for the SET program.
A new operating model must set the administrative platform for UAT

- The operating model is fundamentally about structuring the university administration for success resulting in sustainable work loads for administrative staff.

- Faculties must be supported to focus on their core mission of teaching, research and engagement.

- The model must be flexible to Academic Restructuring.

- It will drive standardized approaches and continuous improvement.

- Building and maintaining a service culture is critical.
Preferred Operating Model

This model has the following features:

- **Universal front-end service centres** – A contact/service centre and triage, one for staff and one for students.

- **Centres of Excellence (CoEs)** - expert teams in each functional portfolio. Each portfolio has small expert teams to manage non-transactional and more challenging staff/student issues.

- **Function-specific embedded service partners** linked to expert functional portfolio teams. Strategic advice to Deans, Associate Deans and Chairs consistent with overall model of the University.

- It is expected that faculties would require a Faculty Manager role.

- **Universal transaction processing hub** supporting service centre and expert functional portfolio teams. Simple and moderately complex transactions across all administrative functions are managed through this centralized processing hub.
A service centre offers a ‘one-stop-shop’ for enquiries, with the students’ user experience front-of-mind.

It provides users with a central virtual and/or physical point that can address and triage their enquiries according to need and complexity. A model of this process is shown on the following slide.

A service centre often includes a digital platform that is able to resolve most queries virtually, leveraging AI and chatbots to handle first tier enquiries.

It can be complemented by a walk-in location that provides users with access to self-service portals and in person services, when their query requires a degree of human interaction.

For students, a separate space could also be reserved for student welfare (counselling, disability, health, faith).

Examples of activities could be in a staff service centre include leave administration, payroll inquiries, phone activation, on-boarding inquires, benefit inquiries.

Resources for the Staff Centre and Processing Hub combined could be up to 300 FTEs.

Expected benefits include:
- Cost efficiencies and economies of scale
- Reduced duplication
- Standardization of service delivery
- Single point of accountability
- Single set of IT systems
- ‘Any door is the right door’ approach increases awareness of and access to services
- Potential to link service delivery to performance metrics
- Potential to collocate services physically with implications for reduction of required estate.

Examples of activities that could be in a student service center include issuing transcripts, letters of good standing, responding to student enquiries, triage and direct student requests for services to the appropriate service area (e.g. processing hub, centre of excellence),

Student Service Center resourcing would be ~ 50 to 100 FTEs.
Example service centre process

70% of interactions

- Intensive support: Case management for specialist needs. Refer to external services where possible.
- Personalized advice: Give structured, focused personalized advice.
- First point of contact: Try to resolve as much as possible at first point of contact.
- Self service: Encourage self service wherever possible.

When a complex enquiry is received, its solution is recorded. The lesson can then be applied at a lower service level. This means more enquiries can be dealt with at a lower level of service.
AVPs will have the administrative lead for delivery of portfolio services, including Centres of Excellence and Service Partners.

**AVP/Administrative functional lead**
(e.g. Director of Alumni and Fundraising, Director of Marketing, Director of HR, Director of IT, Director of Finance)

**Service Partners**
Service Partners (SPs) report to AVPs in their core function but are embedded in Faculties and Offices of VPs
This includes:
- Lead Partners
- Senior Partners
- Partners

**Centre of Excellence**
(e.g. Talent Management)

Centres of Excellence (CoE/s) are central teams overseeing strategic activities with specialist expertise. These are divisions within the central unit.
In any AVP portfolio, there may be approx. 3-5 teams in CoEs.
Service Partners (SPs) that come from academic units can build credibility. SPs sourced externally can bring useful experience from other sectors.

SPs need to be sufficiently senior to credibly engage with Deans. Some universities have both SPs and senior SPs, depending on the academic unit and the scope of work. SPs should be the “go-to” person for the Deans.

SPs need to have the right mix of political savvy and service-focus. Influencing skills, adaptability and analytical mindset are consistently key attributes.

Service partnering works best when the role and accountabilities are standardized. The customer interaction model needs to be clearly mapped out with interaction and escalation points for different query types, and clearly defined reporting mechanisms.

SPs do not perform transactional work. SP role must be able to focus on relationships and true decision support. Some universities have additional functional expert team specialists/leads also aligned to academic units, who would support the SP as required.

The physical location of SPs can differ. Some may be physically located in the centre, with others in academic units. This can differ within the university depending on the function and academic unit.

Recommendation to explore functional Business Partners in the following areas:
- Finance
- HR
- IT
- Research support
- Communications and external engagement
- Student Services

Examples of potential business partners activities includes providing input and advice on recruitment, maintaining faculty/unit specific IT applications, preparing Faculty/Unit budgets, writing grant applications, developing and maintaining faculty level relationships.

It is expected that there would be approximately 200 Service Partners in the new model.
Deans will be supported by a Faculty General Manager who will manage any administrative resources in the Faculty.

Service Partners* from central portfolios will include:
- Student Services
- Research Admin
- HR
- Finance
- IT
- External engagement

AVP in relevant function

Dean

Faculty General Manager

Unique Faculty administrative resources:
These administrative resources are unique to the Faculty or funded through restricted funds and directly appointed (e.g. medical secretaries, farm hands).

Generalist Faculty administrative resources:
Resources may include roles like Executive Assistants, teaching administrators, and Department administrators in large departments.
Expected benefits include:

- **Cost savings** – economies of scale, higher levels of efficiency through simplification and standardization of processes
- **Lower investment costs** – pooling transactional activities across an organization makes more efficient use of resources
- **Customer service** – faster and more accurate turnaround of many services results in higher customer trust and satisfaction
- **Better information/data** – higher technology investment leading to more reliable, richer and consistent processes, which can enable further financial savings (e.g. procurement)
- **Shifting focus** – the aggregation of transactional processing frees up the time of corporate services professionals allowing their focus to shift towards value-added activities

Potential activities include:

- IT activities like telephony switchboard systems testing and IT desktop support / helpdesk
- Student services like overnight student welfare / helpdesk support, transcript / certificate issuing and marketing and recruitment enquiries
- Elements of finance like accounts payable, credit control, student fees (UCL) and travel and entertainment processes
- Elements of HR services and systems, payroll

**UNIVERSAL TRANSACTION PROCESSING HUB:**

- A transactional processing hub is a predominately technology driven way to automate highly transactional services and processes. They are supported by highly specialized transaction staff.
- Not all activities will be suitable candidates for an automation-focused transaction hub. Typically high volume and low specialization activities (i.e. payroll or expenses) are managed within a transaction hub.
- As a ‘back-of-house’ service, customers or clients (staff, students) do not interact directly with the transaction hub.

Resources for the Staff Centre and Processing Hub combined could be up to 300 FTEs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop preliminary service catalogues to locate services delivery in the new structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct process-level impact assessment to determine scale of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test new model and build support through townhall and leadership forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise Faculty and functional service blueprints and undertake budget assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Functional reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map current roles and draft org structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **STAGE 2** |
| Soft launch the new model |
| Determine direct appointments |
| Further develop position descriptions and org structure |
| Finalise the scale and scope of the student service centers |
| Finalise the scale and scope of the transaction processing hub |
| Announce final structure |

|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |     |

| **STAGE 3** |
| Support functional streams’ transition to new model with ongoing process reviews |
| Pilot the transaction processing hub |
| Staff selection and notification processes |
| Staff transition |
| Engage leaders on new ways of work |

|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |     |
Questions and Discussion