



UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

**Task Force: Academic Portfolio
Subgroup H – Academic Program Support**

Chaired by

Paul Bobrowski, Dean & Helen Reed, Dean
Committee of

Sean Broghammer, Director of Admissions
Monica Coverdale, Administrative Aide to the Dean
Valerie Kalos, Executive Assistant to the Provost
Margaret Kinney, Administrative Assistant III
Jennifer Knock, Program Assistant I
Christine Marston, Associate Dean
Susan Simmers, Assistant VP for Finance

December 3, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. Logistical Support and Efficiencies | page 2 |
| 2. Staffing Levels | page 18 |

Summary of the Charge to Subgroup H

Subgroup H, Academic Program Support, was tasked with two components to the charge:

- A. Propose comparable and/or appropriate staffing levels across departments
- B. Examine logistical support across campus and propose efficiencies (e.g. scheduling, budget management)

Since the second charge contained the phrase, "...support across campus" and our subgroup is part of the Academic Portfolio, we clarified with the Provost the scope of our charge. The Provost limited the focus to classified and exempt staff in the colleges, Graduate School, and University Libraries. Therefore, we concentrated on these units only.

Given the two parts of the charge, the Subgroup gathered data in the two components of the charge separately and subsequently prepared two reports, recommendations, and action plans represented in the reports below

ACADEMIC PORTFOLIO SUBGROUP H REPORT ON LOGISTICAL SUPPORT AND EFFICIENCIES

Charge This portion of the report will focus on the component of the charge *logistical support and efficiencies*.

I. Methodologies

Without any existing data, the subgroup solicited staff input on workload and business efficiencies that would positively affect their work.

A. Colleges and University Libraries Staff: Self-Reported Workload (See Appendix A)

Each college, the Graduate School, and University Libraries was asked to gather each staff member's self-reported percentage of workload for seventeen functions. These percentages were calculated to determine a total estimated FTE designated for the following tasks. Note: not every staff member replied.

1. Accounting
2. Admissions and Applications
3. Budget Management
4. Advising
5. Travel Management
6. Course Scheduling and Evaluations
7. Curriculum
8. Event Planning
9. Grant Support
10. Hiring, HR Functions, and Payroll
11. Office Reception, Calendar, & Scheduling
12. Recruitment and Marketing
13. Student Services

14. Technology, IT, and Lab Support
15. Supervision
16. General Faculty Support
17. Other

B. Qualtrics Survey for Business Practices Inefficiencies (See Appendix B)

On October 30, 2018, a Qualtrics survey was sent to 138 classified/exempt staff members. The survey asked recipients to select up to three choices from a list of nine administrative functions that, if streamlined, would have the most positive impact on their workload. There was a high response with 85 staff (61% response rate) completing the survey selecting from the following activities:

1. Travel
2. Hiring of students
3. Official functions
4. Leave records
5. Course scheduling
6. Curriculum
7. Hiring of faculty and staff
8. On-boarding of new employees
9. Data integrity

In addition, an open-ended question was included: *Identify one inefficiency and suggest a way to correct the problems you see.* Results of the full Qualtrics survey can be found in Appendix B of this report with additional narrative content provided by respondents.

II. Systemic Recommendations

The following observations and recommendations are systemic and apply across colleges, Academic Affairs, and the University and reflect the need for longer-term action plans.

1. Business Practices

Recommendation and Rationale: Since business practice inefficiencies affect the entire campus, Subgroup H recommends addressing efficiencies first. As these practices become more efficient, campus-wide staffing level needs will become clearer.

Actions:

- a. Evaluate current campus business practices to identify inefficiencies, streamline, and implement improvements.
- b. Identify business practices for standardization (e.g. Outlook calendar) and customization.

2. Data: Integrity and Access

Recommendation: Invest in improving transparency and access to institutional data. Provide training on how to access, develop, and use data to support data-driven decision-making.

Rationale: Data integrity and accuracy are imperative to making sound decisions. From the Qualtrics Survey the staff identified Data Integrity and Quality as an area that, if streamlined, would have a positive impact on staff workload.

- a. Data in university reports and data in the units often do not align. Data sources of reports are not clear. Staff develop their own methods of tracking data at the unit level in various platforms (e.g. Excel, Access, FileMaker Pro, or QuickBooks). Further, the staff member's definition of terms (e.g. counting heads versus number of majors), may not match Insight reports.
- b. Currently, very little centralized training is available. Training is often done at the unit level, which results in inconsistencies. Data integrity is compromised when multiple staff are responsible for data input, potentially leading to inaccuracies and compliance risks.

Actions

- a. Clarify and publish sources of data, metrics utilized, definitions of terminology, and common agreement on how to track and manage data, especially at the unit level.
- b. Train employees on how to access, enter (as appropriate), develop, and use data to support data-driven decision-making.

3. University Forms

Recommendation: Perform audit of university forms, and procedures associated with forms, to eliminate duplication of effort.

Rationale: In responses to the Qualtrics Survey staff commented that there are too many forms in a variety of formats. They also expressed concerns about the workflow complexity of the existing routing and approval for forms.

- a. Staff access Banner to find data to complete forms, input data fields into non-interactive forms, print, gather signatures, and scan the completed forms. Staff enter common fields (e.g. Bear ID, name, address, position number, or salary) into static forms in various platforms such as People Admin, Adobe, or Word for the same processes. For instance to close a search and complete a hire staff complete a Position Authorization Form, Search Closing Form, Payroll Data Form, etc. Ultimately, another staff member enters these updated fields into Banner. This process leads to increased staff workload, inaccuracies, and potentially, data integrity issues.
- b. Since forms are not tied to a database, there are no reporting capabilities which requires staff to keep separate databases to track data.
- c. Forms are spread throughout the university websites, making it challenging for staff to process tasks in a timely manner. This also causes the university web presence to be cluttered and less user-friendly for visitors, potential students, and employment applicants.

Actions:

- a. Perform an audit of university forms and processes with the goal of eliminating unnecessary forms and duplication of effort.
- b. Create web-based forms with workflow, linked to a database (e.g. Banner), which auto-populates and allows for reporting functions.
- c. Explore a UNC inter/intra web. Move forms and university business to an intra-web, thereby creating a cleaner inter-web UNC site for external visitors.

4. Design, Updating, and Revisions of Procedures

Recommendation: Design, create, revise, and improve procedures with input from those who will do the work.

Rationale: In a comment from the Qualtrics survey (**Appendix B**), one staff member wrote: "Programs are implemented before they have been completed and tested, leading to a poor experience for the end user and ultimately to resistance in using programs"

- a. Staff members have valuable information about how work is performed. Often, important details and efficiencies are overlooked in the design process. As a result, this leads to staff frustration and lower staff morale.

Action:

- a. Identify and consult with end-users. Utilize focus-group testing prior to roll-out of procedures. If possible, incorporate some end users as design team members.

III. Tactical Recommendations

The following tactical observations and recommendations apply across colleges, Academic Affairs, and the University and efficiencies can be gained in the short term.

1. Hiring: Faculty, Staff, Adjuncts, Students, Graduate Assistants and Teaching Assistants (GA/TAs)

Recommendation: Perform audit of forms, evaluate hiring processes, and determine appropriate organizational staffing assignments.

Rationale: Improving efficiencies in hiring was one of the most frequently selected options in the Qualtrics survey. Further, in the self-reported workload survey (**Appendix A**), 75 staff within the colleges identified hiring tasks as part of their duties, for a total of 6.15 FTE. Improvements in hiring would affect many staff.

- a. Sensitive paperwork (e.g. I9, copies of SSN cards, etc.) is collected by unit staff who may not be thoroughly trained or experts in document verification (including international hiring), is routed through campus mail with copies stored in offices, which may result in compliance penalties and security concerns.
- b. Currently, the hiring process is a cumbersome and paper-intensive process that results in potential delays in hiring and/or pay, errors, and loss of faculty/staff/GA/TA candidates. For example, GA/TA contracting is done via a static PDF form, sent via email, and manually scanned, without a tracking system. Further, often PDIDs are delayed for GA/TAs and staff/faculty, because there is no notification when a new hire is approved in the Banner system. Units maintain separate databases to keep track of hires.
- c. It is difficult to train staff, because the hiring system is so decentralized and rules and regulations change frequently. Payroll indicates that there are over 140 staff across campus who have access to the EPAF system for student employment hiring. There is an increased potential for errors, delays, and inconveniences for new hires.
- d. Currently, staff and faculty are serving as AA/EO representatives on committees within their own units, which has the potential for a conflict of interest and/or a power-dynamic situation. Additionally, staff in units are pulled away from their primary functions.

Actions:

- a. Identify hiring operations that are risk-related (e.g. I-9s) and centralize those processes in Human Resources to mitigate risk.
- b. Perform an audit of university forms and processes with goal of eliminating unnecessary forms and duplication of effort. Create web-based forms with workflow, linked to database (e.g. Banner), which auto-populate and allow for reporting functions.
- c. Identify an appropriate number of staff dedicated and trained per unit, college, or division who can be experts in the hiring documentation process to decrease workload and expedite training.
- d. Centralize and provide AA/EO trained representatives at the Human Resource level to reduce conflict of interest and/or power-dynamic situation.

2. Shared Service Staffing Options

Recommendation: Explore common tasks and consider creating shared services positions, including adjustments for staffing during summer/seasonal work. Investigate dedicating staff for specialized tasks. Consider further coordinating functions that bridge across unit/college levels and university offices (e.g. unit-level recruiters and UNC Admissions recruiters) (see also recommendations in *Report, Part II.*)

Rationale: On the Self-Reported Workload survey (**Appendix A**), for each of the staff responsibilities (aside from "other"), between 33 and 85 staff in colleges indicated that a task was part of their workload. For example, 84 staff in colleges indicated they work on event planning for the equivalent of 5.93 FTE.

- a. Many staff duties have periods of peak activity. Across campus, these tasks are carried out by staff at different levels (e.g. Admin I, II, III, and Program Assistants) and need not be tied to a specific unit.
- b. Currently, staff need to be experts in all processes. Some tasks require specialization (e.g. hiring, grant management).
- c. Some units/colleges have dedicated recruitment, marketing, advising, and course scheduling staff. Others have these tasks spread amongst staff or faculty within their units.

Actions:

- a. Investigate creating shared service staff positions at unit, college, or division levels that could also rotate across areas, based upon peak or low activity periods.
- b. Examine having one/two experts in specialized tasks in appropriate organizational levels (unit, college, or division).
- c. Explore coordination between university offices (Admissions/University Relations/Student Success/Registrar's Office) and units/colleges who have staff who complete tasks related to recruiting, marketing, advising, and course scheduling.

3. Official Function and Travel Processes

Recommendation: Review the official function and travel processes to reduce the levels of approval, expedite the purchasing approval process, and explore reporting capacities of the platform.

Rationale: On the Qualtrics Survey official functions and travel processing were the most frequently selected by the staff.

- a. Number and level of approvals for both official and travel processes seems excessive. Delays

cause increase staff time to process additional forms for reimbursement for both travel and official functions.

- b. Loading of funds and approving employees to use Procurement Cards for both processes lengthens the processing time. Delays cause increased staff time to process additional forms for reimbursement when employees need to use personal cards for either travel or official functions. Further, savings for early registration, airfare, and hotel are lost.
- c. Lack of consolidated reporting feature prevents auditing/tracking of expenses and budgets resulting in staff using time to create shadow databases often in different platforms (e.g. Excel, Access, FileMaker Pro, QuickBooks etc.)

Actions:

- a. Official Function: within academic colleges and University Libraries, move final (non-blanket or non-alcohol purchase) official function approval to the dean level (for grants and Foundation funds especially). Travel authorization: keep level of approval for faculty and staff, domestic and international travel, at the Dean level (for grants and Foundation funds especially).
- b. Eliminate the steps of opening and loading P-cards for Administrative Support Staff official function purchases. For travel, explore having deans submit lists of employees at the start of each semester with approved budgets amounts to Procurement with date-ranges in order to reduce procurement staff time managing requests to open and load cards. Hold all employees accountable to follow procedures and if employees don't adhere to policy, close those individual accounts. Take additional disciplinary action as needed.
- c. Move travel forms to On Base to move away from static forms in multiple platforms. Explore features in On Base for auditing, tracking of expenses, reporting, and budgets for both travel and official function processes, to eliminate duplication of effort and creation of shadow databases.

4. Curriculum

Recommendation: Determine an efficient on-line curriculum workflow process, eliminating unnecessary steps and tedious Adobe form completion.

Rationale: On the Self-Reported Workload survey 48 staff indicated that they work on curriculum submission in some manner. Staff offered many comments of current inefficiencies and suggestions for improvement

- a. Current process is very labor intensive and needs to be completely overhauled.
- b. Use of PDF form process is challenging for editing and routing, as there is no standardized mechanism for workflow. A streamlined process would decrease staff workloads.

Actions:

- a. Evaluate and identify essential components in the curriculum process. Include end-users in developing and revising this complicated procedure, which directly impacts students and their success.
- b. Implement an alternative electronic software system, which allows curriculum forms to be securely routed via a workflow process.

5. Onboarding, Training, and Off-boarding of Employees

Recommendation: Develop consistent procedures and rules for onboarding and training new employees and for off-boarding departing employees. Determine appropriate organizational staffing assignments to handle these duties.

Rationale:

- a. Onboarding has too many account and system access forms (e.g. Xtender, Banner, 25 Live, PDIDs etc.) scattered across multiple UNC sites. For instance, Key Request Cards for employees to gain access to offices/buildings are paper-based and require one form per room per person, sometimes requiring multiple forms per new employee. This causes delays in new employees starting their new roles.
- b. Onboarding of new faculty/staff is primarily occurring at unit level. These processes include providing computer set-up, system access, and often include benefits and related questions that not all unit staff can answer. Eliminate the need for new employees to visit multiple offices.
- c. There is no systematic way to provide comprehensive training for new employees. In response, units have created separate training manuals, which may not be updated or comprehensive. Errors/misconceptions are potentially handed down with each new hire.
- d. During the off-boarding process, staff are frequently, inappropriately given keys, computers, procurement cards, etc. when an employee departs. This places inappropriate responsibilities on the staff.

Actions:

- a. Perform an audit of on-boarding forms, and provide one digital form with checkboxes for all access including keys.
- b. Identify an appropriate number of staff dedicated and trained per unit, college, or division who can be experts in onboarding.
- c. Identify an appropriate number of staff dedicated and trained per unit, college, or division who can be experts in comprehensive training of new hires.
- d. For off-boarding, centralize all processes to Human Resources.

6. Course Scheduling

Recommendation: Evaluate current practices and determine appropriate organizational staffing assignments for course scheduling to improve student success, mitigate risk of compliance issues, and improve data integrity.

Rationale:

- a. Multiple schedulers increase the risk of error and of compliance issues.
- b. Scheduling is handled in a variety of ways at the college, school, department, or program levels.
- c. Student success, retention and graduation rates depend on accurate and timely scheduling.

Actions:

- a. Determine appropriate division of course scheduling task responsibilities between the colleges and the Registrar's Office.
- b. Explore the option of a rolling, four-year schedule model.

7. Leave Approval

Recommendation: Use URSA portal for all staff leave entry and eliminate the paper format.

Rationale:

- a. There is no continuity in the process. Some staff complete leave records in paper format and calculate leave times by hand/calculator, submit to supervisor for hand-written approval, and then submit the paper to Human Resources. A Human Resource staff member then inputs the record into URSA. Other units have staff complete paper forms, and then another staff member in the unit enters the information into URSA. The paper format is an avoidable labor-intensive process, since there is already a feature in URSA.

Action:

- a. Implement existing software functionality and eliminate the paper forms.

Detailed Discussion of Recommendations

1. In what ways do these recommendations align with the guiding principles for all task force committees?

The proposed recommendations by Subgroup H to minimize inefficiencies in processes and procedures is aligned with the guiding principles in several ways. When considering UNC processes and procedures, our subgroup collected data from the personnel most impacted, namely, the staff. The staff from the academic units responded with how they allocated their time across 17 categories of duties and responsibilities. The staff then responded to a Qualtrics survey listing processes that if streamlined would have the most positive impact on their workload. The survey included an open-ended request to identify inefficiencies. These data, both quantitative and qualitative, were analyzed as part of the recommendation process; this is consistent with Guiding Principle #5.

The proposed recommendations look to reduce several types of inefficiencies, such as reducing the number of approvals which is time consuming, eliminating errors, moving decision making and accountability to the dean level or below, minimizing redundancy, etc. With these improvements come increases in staff time that can be devoted to the academic mission of UNC, supporting students and faculty. In short, staff time for recruiting, advising, etc. should lead to enrolling, retaining and graduating more students. These recommended improvements are consistent with Guiding Principle #4 as we consider retention, persistence, and graduation rate improvements.

2. What resources would be saved or required to implement and sustain these recommendations? Remember that resources include human, financial, technology, and facilities.

With our recommendations, the two primary resources saved are human and financial. The human resource saved with these proposed implementations is time. Secondly, eliminating or minimizing the inefficiencies that the staff face in their daily work should reduce frustration and improve morale, i.e. upper administration listened and acted to improve the work environment. Ultimately, this could lead to less staff turnover and higher work performance. There are potential financial risks for work that is not efficiently completed in a timely manner as dictated by Federal regulations. These risks would be mitigated with the streamlining of processes.

3. How would implementation of these recommendations improve existing programs and services?

The recommended changes to inefficient procedures and processes will allow greater opportunity for staff to provide their time and effort to better support the main mission of the university, teaching, learning and research. Further, staff could devote more time to assisting faculty and students (prospective and current), increasing enrollment, retention rates, and graduation rates.

4. What services or programs could be phased out because they would no longer be needed or because implementation of the recommendations would represent a more effective and efficient use of university resources?

Centralizing processes, e.g. Travel Authorizations, PSAs, on fewer software platforms would lead to several benefits. Of course, the reduction in software platforms should reduce expenditures. Other benefits include better and more accurate reporting. For example, TA forms, using Xtender, are static forms that need to be uploaded and results in no reporting capability. As a result, staff and budget managers create their own "homegrown" systems for tracking. These manual processes of going between several platforms to collect data wastes time and creates opportunities for errors. As turnover in staff occurs, training on multiple systems takes more time and often leads to incomplete knowledge of when and how to use the software.

5. Who would be primarily responsible for implementing these recommendations and have those individuals/units been consulted?

The staff, classified and exempt, from the academic units provided the vast amount of data that was analyzed and used to create the recommendations. No staff has been consulted formally regarding these recommendations.

6. **Action Plan – complete the table on the following page outlining the concrete actions required for implementing your committee’s recommendations, performance metrics (how we would know UNC is making progress and/or achieving success), who would be responsible for implementation, and whether implementation would begin in the short or long term**

SYSTEMIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recommendation: Business Practices: Since business practice inefficiencies affect the entire campus, Subgroup H recommends addressing efficiencies first. As these practices become more efficient, campus-wide staffing level needs will become clearer.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Evaluate current campus business practices to identify inefficiencies, streamline, and implement improvements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is long term.
b. Identify business practices for standardization and customization.		
2. Recommendation: Data: Integrity and Access: Invest in improving transparency and access to institutional data. Provide training on how to access, develop, and use data to support data-driven decision-making.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	The plan is long term.
a. Clarify and publish sources of data, metrics utilized, definitions of terminology, and common agreement on how to track and manage data, especially at the unit level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is long term.
b. Train employees on how to access, enter (as appropriate), develop, and use data to support data-driven decision-making.		
3. Recommendation: University Forms: Perform audit of university forms, and procedures associated with forms, to eliminate duplication of effort		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Perform an audit of university forms and processes with goal of eliminating unnecessary forms and duplication of effort.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is long term.
b. Create web-based forms with workflow, linked to database (e.g. Banner), which auto-populate and allow for reporting functions.		
c. Explore a UNC inter/intra web. Move forms and university business to an intra-web thereby creating a cleaner inter-web UNC site for external visitors.		

4. Recommendation: Design, Updating, and Revisions of Procedures: Design, create, revise, and improve procedures with input from those who will do the work		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Identify and consult with end-users. Utilize focus-group testing prior to roll-out of procedures. If possible, incorporate some end users as design team members.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is long term.
TACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS		
1. Recommendation: Hiring: Faculty, Staff, Adjuncts, Students, GAs and TAs: Perform audit of forms, evaluate processes, and determine appropriate organizational staffing assignments.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Identify hiring operations that are risk-related (e.g. I-9s) and centralize those processes in Human Resources to mitigate risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is short term.
b. Perform an audit of university forms and processes with goal of eliminating unnecessary forms and duplication of effort. Create web-based forms with workflow, linked to database (e.g. Banner), which auto-populate and allow for reporting functions.		
c. Identify an appropriate number of staff dedicated and trained per unit, college, or division who can be experts in the hiring documentation process to decrease workload and expedite training.		
d. Centralize and provide AA/EO trained representatives at the Human Resource level to reduce conflict of interest and/or power-dynamic situation		
2. Recommendation: Shared Service Staffing Options: Explore common tasks and consider creating shared services positions, including adjustments for staffing during summer/seasonal work. Investigate dedicating staff for specialized tasks. Consider further coordinating functions that bridge across unit/college levels and university offices (e.g. unit-level recruiters and UNC Admissions recruiters).		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Investigate creating shared service staff positions at the unit, college, or division level that could	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO 	The plan is short term.

also rotate across areas, based upon peak or low activity periods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	
b. Examine having one/two experts in specialized tasks in appropriate organizational levels (unit, college, or division).		
c. Explore coordination between university offices (Admissions/University Relations/Student Success/Registrar’s Office) and units/colleges who have staff who complete tasks related to recruiting, marketing, advising, and course scheduling.		
3. Recommendation: Official and Travel Processes: Review the Official function and travel processes to reduce the levels of approval, expedite the purchasing approval process, and explore reporting capacities of platform.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Official Function: within academic colleges and University Libraries, move final (non-blanket or alcohol purchase) official function approval to the dean level (for grants and Foundation funds especially). Travel authorization: keep level of approval for faculty and staff, domestic and international travel, at the Dean level (for grants and Foundation funds especially).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is short term.
b. Eliminate the steps of opening and loading P-cards for Administrative Support Staff official function purchases. For travel, explore having deans submit lists of employees at the start of each semester with approved budgets amounts to Procurement with date-ranges, resulting in reduced procurement staff time managing requests to open and load cards. Hold all employees accountable to follow procedures and if employees don’t adhere to policy, close those individual accounts. Take additional disciplinary action as needed.		
c. Move travel forms to On Base to move away from static forms in multiple platforms. Explore features in On Base for auditing, tracking of expenses, reporting, and budgets for both travel and official function processes, to eliminate duplication of effort and creation of shadow databases.		

4. Recommendation: Curriculum: Determine an efficient on-line curriculum workflow process, eliminating unnecessary steps and tedious Adobe form completion.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Evaluate and identify essential components in the process. Include end-users in developing and revising this complicated procedure, which directly impacts students and their success.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is short term.
b. Implement an alternative electronic software system, which allows curriculum forms to be securely routed via a workflow process.		
5. Recommendation: Onboarding & Training. Off-Boarding of Employees: Develop consistent procedures and rules for onboarding and training new employees and for off-boarding departing employees. Determine appropriate organizational staffing assignments to handle these duties.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Perform an audit of on-boarding forms, and provide one digital form with checkboxes for all access including keys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is short term.
b. Identify an appropriate number of staff dedicated and trained per unit, college, or division who can be experts in onboarding.		
c. Identify an appropriate number of staff dedicated and trained per unit, college, or division who can be experts in comprehensive training of new hires.		
d. For off-boarding, centralize all processes to Human Resources.		
6. Recommendation: Course Scheduling: Evaluate current practices and determine appropriate organizational staffing assignments for course scheduling to improve student success, mitigate risk of compliance issues, and improve data integrity.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Determine appropriate division of course scheduling task responsibilities between the colleges and the Registrar’s Office.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO • Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is short term.
b. Explore the option of a rolling, four-year schedule model.		

7. Recommendation: Leave Approval: Use URSA portal for all staff leave entry and eliminate the paper format.		
Performance Metric(s): Improvement in staff workloads – Reduction in labor hours, FTEs, etc.		
Action Plan	Overall responsibility for the plan:	
a. Implement existing software functionality and eliminate the paper form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sr. VP for Fin & Admin and CFO Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs 	The plan is short term.

ACADEMIC PORTFOLIO SUBGROUP H REPORT ON STAFFING LEVELS

Summary of the Charge Regarding Staffing Levels

Subgroup H was charged with evaluating Academic Program Support. This part of the report is to make recommendations regarding the component of the charge *to propose comparable and/or appropriate staffing levels across the academic colleges.*

Methodology

The committee used as its data sources a report of filled budgeted positions as of June 1, 2018 from report BUD001. The changes in personnel cannot be tracked throughout the entire year, so we chose a point in time toward the end of fiscal year 2018 and eliminated positions that were vacant or on hold. We chose FY18 so we could compare the support staff of the academic areas to credit hours delivered by program and numbers of majors and minors provided from Insight report ACD131, Program Review. We wrote a report to capture adjunct personnel and GA/TA's stipends paid through payroll and converted the hours worked for the entire year into an annualized FTE basis. The analysis is prepared on an FTE basis, because many personnel are split funded between units within the colleges; therefore, headcounts are not valuable for a comparative analysis.

The administrative support spreadsheet (**Appendix C**) provides an important overview of data. The data demonstrate the substantial variation of administrative support across the Colleges and units to meet their specific needs. We encourage the Provost and Deans to utilize these data when allocating future FTE across the Colleges. We recommend a similar type of analysis for staff FTE across the entire university before making changes in the Colleges as this is where we provide the key component of our mission. The notable outlier in this analysis is the College of Humanities and Social Sciences who has very low staffing levels for their student credit hour production and large number of majors.

Observations from the Data

The committee examined relationships between the FTE of staff (classified and exempt personnel) and faculty, credit hours delivered by program, number of majors, number of minors, and number of graduate students. The observations of the committee are:

1. The relationships for staffing of the Colleges and their Schools do not have a consistent relationship to number of faculty FTE, credit hours delivered, majors, minors or number of graduate students.
2. There are differences in how student services such as advising and recruiting are delivered between the Colleges and within the Schools or departments within the Colleges. Some areas have specialty personnel and others don't perform these functions or attempt to provide these student services through portions of staff time.
3. Certain programs have higher levels of support due to specialty functions.
4. At the College summary level, HSS is the outlier. It has the lowest amount of staff support per faculty FTE, credit hours delivered, majors and minors.
5. The data suggest that an action plan should be developed to determine equitable levels of staffing across the colleges.
6. The data suggest that comparability of services performed in the Colleges should be examined for consistency and the best practices to support student success.

Recommendations of the committee

1. The committee recommends that the University examine the inefficiencies outlined in the other part of the Subgroup H charge before addressing the adequacy of staffing in the academic units.
2. The committee recommends that the academic units examine consistency of staffing in the functions required to support the academic mission such as admissions, advising, curriculum, recruitment, marketing, and student services.
3. Academic units should consider some shared services across the colleges, centralizing expertise in areas outlined in the efficiencies recommendations (see *Report Part I*), such as course scheduling, human resource management, and faculty support in the summer.
4. The committee recommends that staffing data is examined in concert with the review of the University's academic portfolio. Staffing may be increased, decreased or redirected with changes in the academic programs.
5. A multi-step approach to addressing equitable staffing and comparability of services is outlined in the action plan.

Detailed Discussion of Recommendations

1. In what ways do these recommendations align with the guiding principles for all task force committees?

After examining inefficiencies of staff duties performed, re-addressing staffing levels in support of the academic mission will allow the University to redirect staffing to the activities that will promote the academic progression of all UNC students. If we can streamline processes, centralize expertise, and reallocate human resources towards student support services such as recruitment, admissions, and advising, we should see an increase in student retention, persistence, and graduation rates.

2. What resources would be saved or required to implement and sustain these recommendations? Remember that resources include human, financial, technology, and facilities.

Human resources will be required to examine inefficiencies of processes along with technological resources that would likely be required to make these processes more efficient. Space may be required if certain functions are centralized in a shared services model.

The resources saved will be financial resources as staffing responsibilities may be shifted or combined, which could lead to less staffing overall or, alternatively, more staff directed to the university's central mission.

3. How would implementation of these recommendations improve existing programs and services?

Relieving staff from overly time-consuming administrative functions such as travel, official functions, and Human Resources processes to perform activities that directly improve program quality and support of the students, would improve the students' experience at UNC and help to build the reputation and enrollment in existing programs. The mission of UNC to support the first generation and underrepresented students will require more direct support with advising, choosing majors, staying on track to graduate and career exploration.

4. What services or programs could be phased out because they would no longer be needed or because implementation of the recommendations would represent a more effective and efficient use of university resources?

This question is addressed above in the *Report*, Part I: Inefficiencies document. Staffing changes should follow the recommendations of other Subgroups charged with undergraduate, extended campus, and graduate programs

5. Who would be primarily responsible for implementing these recommendations and have those individuals/units been consulted?

- a. These recommendations are outlined in the efficiencies document (See *Report*, Part I) from Subgroup H and the Undergraduate curriculum analysis from Subgroup A.

Action Plan

Address adequacy and equitability of staffing in the Colleges	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
<p>Step 1: Review staff duties and inefficiencies under the action plan of the efficiencies Charge of Subgroup H to utilize human resources more efficiently and effectively.</p>	<p>Deans are responsible for their colleges - refer to inefficiencies recommendations because it involves various departments across campus to address inefficiencies</p>	<p>Refer to inefficiencies recommendations</p>
<p>Step 2: Design a shared services model for staffing of duties requiring specialized expertise and conduct these functions in a more centralized manner.</p>	<p>Refer to inefficiencies recommendations</p>	<p>Refer to inefficiencies recommendations</p>
<p>Step 3: Develop a baseline metric for number of staff support per faculty for a defined set of basic support functions that directly support faculty. (e.g. purchasing, budget, administrative support, travel, etc.)</p>	<p>Deans (appoint appropriate committee to examine steps 3,4, 5, and 6 after steps 1 and 2 are completed through inefficiencies process)</p>	<p>Longer term – possibly in concert with Subgroup A work on examination of programs</p>
<p>Step 4: Define what direct student/program support is to be delivered at the department, school or program level. Develop a metric for number of staff support per credit hours, majors, minors (whatever is most appropriate) for direct student/program support.</p>	<p>Deans (appoint appropriate committee to examine steps 3,4, 5, and 6 after steps 1 and 2 are completed through inefficiencies process)</p>	<p>Longer term – after inefficiencies are address</p>
<p>Step 5: Identify specialty departments and what additional services are needed. (Examples: Sound technical in Music or Lab personnel in Chemistry)</p>	<p>Deans (appoint appropriate committee to examine steps 3,4, 5, and 6 after steps 1 and 2 are completed through inefficiencies process)</p>	<p>Longer term</p>
<p>Step 6: Define and standardize, where appropriate and beneficial, which student services should be performed at the college level in regard to recruitment, advising, and other services and staff these positions in the Dean’s office to serve the entire college. Compare and contrast the responsibilities of these functions at the College level with the functions in Admissions Office, the Graduate School, University Relations, or any other central administrative unit that may provide the services.</p>	<p>Deans (appoint appropriate committee to examine steps 3,4, 5, and 6 after steps 1 and 2 are completed through inefficiencies process)</p>	<p>Longer term – in concert with university-wide review of targets which will impact staffing across the university</p>

<p>Step 7: Establish staffing levels for colleges based on the services defined and the metrics in Steps 1-6.</p>	<p>Deans in consultation with Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs</p>	<p>Longer term</p>
<p><i>Note: In all situations the university needs to ensure that personnel filling the positions possess the skills required to perform the responsibilities of the position in an effective and efficient manner. Appropriate levels of skills with computers, specifically Microsoft Word and Excel are essential. Ability to understand and utilize reports from the University's ERP system is essential to many tasks at UNC.</i></p>		