

SPBAC

January 27, 2016 Meeting Notes

In Attendance: RCaulfield, PSchulte, MCiri, JNelson, MHaavig, K Krein, CConnerton, KJames, PMartin, JDumesnil, VWilliams, DLo, ETomlinson, PTraxler, BHegel, MDeaCastillo, KGerken, JVigil, EScott, BEwing, MMoya (recorder)

FY17 BUDGET OUTLOOK

MCiri provided the SPBAC an update on the FY17 budget outlook. He cited a Juneau Empire article which focused on the legislature's economic consultant who essentially said, when you look at the size of Alaska's sovereign fund, Alaska would be the envy of many oil-rich nations. Therefore, there is reason to be hopeful. MCiri went on to say it's currently too early to know what's going to happen with the FY17 budget. Since last November's SPBAC meeting the governor's FY17 budget has been released; it includes the numbers the university anticipated – including a \$3.4 M budget reduction for UAS. MCiri stressed the governor's budget is only a starting point for discussions with the legislature. He added the President and Board of Regents held a retreat last week. The Chancellor explained the Board as a whole supported three separately accredited universities (but better aligned); each with its own strategic pathways. (A draft of this plan is expected to be released in February.) The Chancellor cautioned that budget-related discussions are active and things are moving swiftly; UAS senior administration will continue to endeavor to keep SPBAC informed.

BUDGET EXERCISE & PROGRAM REVIEW

PSchulte reported a number of academic programs are undergoing regular program reviews (with slightly modified deadlines). She added President Johnsen asked each university for academic and non-academic reviews. MHaavig asked if any non-academic programs were included. PSchulte explained the president specified he wanted a specific list of expedited program reviews for the academic programs. MCiri said this is because Board of Regents policies and regulations require a specific notification and approval process. He added that reviews of non-academic functions are currently underway. RCaulfield said he sees both the academic and non-academic reviews as expedited reviews; a balanced approach. JDumesnil asked if criteria exist for the reviews. RCaulfield explained seven criteria are in place including centrality to mission and duplication within UA system. He added the intention is to have reviews fully completed by the end of June 2016.

GROUP WORK SESSION: ACHIEVING ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCIES

Exercise Introduction

MCiri explained the UAS Faculty Senate sent the chancellor a letter asking the university to look for administrative efficiencies. [Letter included in meeting packet.] MHaavig said the intent of the memo is to encourage cross-departmental administrative/operational changes which could gain efficiencies and/or reduce costs. She added consideration should also be given to identifying current operations which should be discontinued because they do not add sufficient value.

The SPBAC broke into three working groups to begin brainstorming administrative efficiency ideas.

Groups Report Out & Discussion

The groups reported the following ideas. (Not presented in priority order.) The SPBAC stressed these are just first takes and have not been evaluated in any manner:

- Reduce # of Dean/Director positions
 - Move from 6 Dean/Director model to 4 or 5 Dean model
 - Move from Administrative Dean to working/involved Dean (reduce other staff positions)
 - Schools share deans
 - Campus Director also being Dean
 - If we stay with current model, Deans must fundraise
- Shared services / Administrative specialization
 - Create areas of expertise/efficiency; Consolidate small workload percentages (e.g. 10% travel from 3 positions into 1 position)
 - Travel (TEMS) training, processing – centralize; travel processing – reduce burdensome processes
 - Common Administrative Services across campuses
 - Business office model – centralized versus decentralized
 - Evaluate how to coordinate “same” processes among schools/units; Assign a working group (by end of February) to consider how to implement
- Other
 - Enhance Financial Aid Office
 - Evaluate recentralization of Academic Record Files
 - As we implement PageUp, look to centralize “low value” activities for new hire paperwork (e.g. I-9, appointment letters, etc.)
 - Review processes and forms; review “authorization” and seek efficiency
 - Leverage automation; particularly in reporting and data
 - Evaluate BOR policies and regulations to consider what can be reduced and/or eliminated to reduce workload and improve efficiencies

The SPBAC agreed to have this list publicly posted on the UAS SPBAC website. It also agreed that members should elicit additional brainstorming within their units and the broader UAS community. The SPBAC also agreed to meet again in February to start fleshing out suggestions.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND TIME: February meeting date: Feb 24 from 2:00 to 3:30

Move from 6 Dean/Director Model to 4 or 5 Dean Model

Move from Administrative Dean to working/involved Dean (reduce other staff positions)

If we stay w/ current 6-7 Dean Model - Deans must Fund raise

- Schools share Deans
- Campus director also being Dean
- Enhance Financial Aid office
- Common Admin Svcs across Campuses
- Travel Processing (TEMS, Easy Biz)
- Review processes: forms
- Business office Model
 - ↳ Centralized vs Decentralized

Group 3 IDEAS

1. Travel (TEMS) - ^{training processing} - centralize
2. As implement Page Up, look to centralize "low value" activities for new hire paperwork.
eg. I9, etc...
eg. appt letters
3. *leverage automation
3. Evaluate how to coordinate "same" processes among Schools/units.
(by end of Feb)

4. Consolidate small workload percentages
...ex. put 10% travel from 3 positions into 1 position
- create areas of expertise/efficiency
5. What constitutes "authorization"?
6. Leverage automation in reporting + data.
- 7.