



Administrative Services  
FY14 Program Review

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
Strengths	4
Weaknesses	4
Opportunities	4
Threats	4
<b>Customer Service</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Summary of Changes in Labor</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Comments from Individual Departments</b>	<b>8</b>
Organizational Change Over Time	8
Revenue Generated	8
Remaining Efficiency and Effectiveness Opportunities	9
Comparison with Other Units or Organizations	9
Processes That Work Particularly Well	10
Potential Process Improvements	10
Opportunities for Shared Service Models	11
Impacts of Reduction in Funding	12
Impacts of Reduction in Non-Personnel Funding	13
Administrative Performance Metrics	13
<b>Facilities Services</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Improvements to the Process for Next Year</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>18</b>
Complete Questionnaire	18
<b>Appendix 2: Changes in Labor FY08-14</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Changes in Labor FY13-14</b>	<b>20</b>

## Executive Summary

At the request of the Chancellor and as an opportunity to look for ways to improve efficiency and identify cost savings, all units within Administrative Services (except Facilities Services) conducted a self-review during FY14. Facilities Services undergoes an external review on an annual basis by a national firm, Sightlines. The facility review includes operations performance, costs and customer service. Additionally, UAF has a space utilization review in process with an expected completion in December 2014. The reviews provided valuable information for decisions necessary to meet the FY15 budget reduction.

All Administrative Services departments were sent the same questionnaire to complete and the information provided was compiled into this report. While each department reviewed itself, the goal is to create a comprehensive picture of Administrative Services. This information provides additional insight to determine where to invest and where to streamline and has informed FY15 budget actions. The Administrative Services Division budget reduction in FY15 totaled \$1.5M. The Administrative Services Review includes:

- Financial Services
  - Office of the Bursar
  - Office of Finance & Accounting (OFA)
  - Office of Management & Budget (OMB)
  - Printing Services
- Human Resources (HR)
- Office of Grants & Contracts Administration and Office of Sponsored Programs (OGCA-OSP)
- Procurement & Contract Services (Procurement)
- Environmental Health, Safety & Risk Management (EHSRM)
- Fire Department
- Police Department
- VCAS Office
- Facilities Services
  - FS Operations, Maintenance and Services
  - FS Division of Design and Construction (Capital Project Funded)
  - FS Utilities (Combined Heat and Power Plant Operations)

Overall the division is running smoothly and departments collaborate. Thus far OGCA, HR, procurement, and travel have all implemented process improvement efforts for increased efficiency. A substantial amount of work has already been done to improve operations and reduce staff. Office of Finance and Accounting, OGCA, Auxiliary and Dining, Office of the Bursar, Parking/Shuttle, and Polar Express have all undergone major reorganizations. Administrative Services is substantially leaner than it was in 2008 due to tighter budgets and major process improvement efforts. In 2008, there

were 391 employees (FTEs), in 2014 there were 341 FTE, and by spring 2015 we expect there will be 330 (a 16 percent reduction since 2008).

Administrative Services is the focus for proportionally larger reductions as UAF continues to face a tight budget environment. This reality is a threat, but given the competing budgetary choices (i.e. protecting core mission programs) deeper cuts in administrative areas are expected. Cuts are balanced with the understanding that the central mission of the University is fully dependent on effective administrative services, a safe environment and quality facilities.

Administrative Services' overarching opportunity is to provide effective and timely services and demonstrate improvement over time through performance metrics. As with many other program reviews being conducted throughout UAF there were a number of things learned about how to improve the process for its next iteration; the primary improvement will be incorporating a small set of quantifiable yet meaningful performance metrics for each department.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widespread willingness to improve processes</li> <li>• Willingness to collaborate across units</li> <li>• Willingness to reorganize to increase efficiency</li> <li>• Provide student jobs that result in high quality job training and staffing to effectively conduct departmental operations</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inability to implement technology improvements in a timely manner</li> <li>• Limited quality performance measures (and sometimes non-existent)</li> <li>• Outdated equipment in transactional offices</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue streamlining of processes (more paperless billing, business transactions etc.)</li> <li>• Strengthen customer service culture</li> <li>• Build strong alignment across functions regardless of operating unit</li> <li>• Increase collaboration between departments (OMB + OFA, OMB + UA, etc.)</li> <li>• Enhance delivery of employee training campus-wide and identify clear pathways for professional and career development</li> <li>• Identify best practices and provide tools to standardize processes across departments</li> <li>• Better and more consistent performance measures among departments</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to meet compliance obligations</li> <li>• Constrained time and access for training standard functions, career development, and process changes</li> <li>• Slower responsiveness from and to programs with loss of administrative personnel</li> <li>• Limiting travel reduces professional development, and allows for less effective networking and business coverage especially at rural sites</li> </ul>

Seizing the opportunities highlighted above and working to address threats all fit well within the unit's core values:

- We foster an environment of trust and accountability;
- We understand that our "team" is the university and encompasses more than individual departments;
- We create the next generation of leaders through a culture of continual learning and development;
- We take calculated risks to move UAF forward; and
- We communicate our goals and values through the clarity and consistency of our words and actions.

The Vice Chancellor's expectations for the future of UAF's administrative and facilities operations and employees include:

#### Broad Expectations

- UAF's administrative and facilities employees at all levels and locations within the institution (Administrative Services, schools, colleges, institutes, and community campuses) support teaching, research and service/outreach and shall strive to provide the highest level of service to students, faculty, staff, and other customers.
- UAF's administrative environment is lean, progressive, and highly effective and efficient as we critically examine and refine our processes, invest in technology solutions, pursue organizational partnerships, and streamline functions in order to reduce administrative burden and deliver excellent customer service while ensuring accountability and compliance.
- UAF's organizational culture promotes robust training and development opportunities that assure all administrative and facilities employees are highly competent, respectful, responsive, and helpful.
- UAF's administrative and facilities functions are viewed as responsive, customer service and solution oriented, and cost effective in the delivery of all services.

#### Specific Expectations in the next 12-18 months

- UAF will embrace and implement shared services models that result in improved customer service and productivity.  
*Result: At least three shared services operations shall be implemented.*
- UAF's Comprehensive Training Initiative will be fully implemented.  
*Result: At least 50 employees will be actively utilizing the tools to systematically manage and effect their career development and advancement goals.*
- UAF will actively influence and support system-wide process improvement efforts and implementation of technology solutions identified in the July 15, 2014 Admin/IT action plan from the Chancellors and endorsed by President Gamble and the Summit Team.

*Result: Implementation of improvements to IT Governance, E-payments, a One card system (travel and procurement), improvements to electronic travel management tool(s), etc.*

- All administrative departments will actively promote/pursue employment of undergraduate students to provide meaningful on-the-job training and earnings opportunities to supplement educational expenses.

*Result: OFA and Procurement will increase student employment opportunities. Increase advertisement of existing opportunities. Celebration of student employee successes.*

- Administrative services will make appropriate investments in equipment and other technology that increase productivity and ultimately timely, responsive customer service, especially in high volume transaction units.

*Result: Updated equipment in the Office of the Bursar that results in timely and efficient services to students.*

## Customer Service

Two customer satisfaction surveys for all the Administrative Services units have been conducted, one in 2008 and a follow-up online survey in 2012 to assess progress. The 2012 survey was distributed broadly to Deans/Directors, Finance Officers, Staff Council, Executive Officers, Faculty Senate and PPAs, with a request for them to forward the link to others who have regular contact with ASD. Almost 240 staff and faculty responded to the 2012 survey. Items were scored on a five point Likert scale (1=needs improvement to 5=outstanding). The chart below shows the mean scores for items by department for the 2012 survey. Green text reflects items that had improved between 2008 and 2012, red text reflects items that had declined since 2008. Black text are data where there was no comparison available for 2008.

Item	Fire	Police	Facilities	EHSRM	Financial Services	Procurement	OGCA	HR
Effectiveness	4.45	4.17	3.56	3.37	3.30	3.21	3.20	2.89
Efficiency	4.26	3.84	2.82	3.12	3.11	3.06	2.95	2.72
Service to others	4.30	4.07	3.54	3.25	3.19	3.16	3.16	2.79
Clarity of roles/ responsibility/ authority	4.39	4.00	3.23	2.95	2.98	3.09	3.18	2.73
Ease of workflow process	4.26	4.02	3.16	2.94	2.75	2.74	2.72	2.42
Timeliness of response	4.52	4.26	3.31	3.46	2.98	2.98	2.93	2.56
Mean of all item scores	4.34	4.07	3.39	3.21	3.12	3.09	3.09	2.73

More than half of the items for which there were comparison data available had improved scores between 2008 and 2012. Two departments (procurement and EHSRM) accounted for most of the decline in scores.

## Summary of Changes in Labor

For a comparison of the organizational changes FY08, FY13, and FY14 updated data from OMB and OFA have been used for the number of employees and labor costs (salary and benefits) from the spring of 2008, 2013 and 2014. For more information, please visit <http://uaf.edu/finserv/omb/>.

### Summary of Changes in Employees (FTEs) and Labor Costs

VCAS	Change	Change FY13-14	
	FY08-14 FTE	FTE	Labor (x1,000)
<b>Administrative Offices</b>			
Financial Services	-26.8	-0.9	-\$66
Grants & Contracts Administration	1.0	-1.3	-\$95
Human Resources	-4.0	-1.5	-\$285
Procurement & Central Receiving	-3.8	-2.8	-\$66
Environ Health, Safety & Risk Management	3.5	-0.5	\$19
Fire Department	-2.3	-1.0	-\$10
Police Department	-0.5	0.0	-\$108
VCAS Office	-1.0	-1.0	-\$123
Administrative Offices	-33.8	-8.9	-\$734
Subtotal	<i>% Change</i>	-19.8%	-6.1%
<b>Facilities Services</b>			
Operations, Maintenance, & Services	-49.7	-0.1	\$205
Design & Construction	11.0	5.0	\$545
Utilities	6.6	1.5	\$109
Facilities Subtotal	-16.0	6.4	\$860
	<i>% Change</i>	-7.3%	3.2%
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>-49.7</b>	<b>\$125</b>
	<i>% Change</i>	<b>-12.7%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>

From FY13 to FY14 the total number of employees was reduced by 8.9 (6.1%) with a corresponding reduction in personnel costs of \$734,000 (4.7%) for Admin Services (excluding Facilities Services). The FY13- FY14 shows a one-year impact, while the staff reductions from FY08 total 13%, or 49.7 fewer FTE, from Administrative Services and Facilities. Facilities Services operating components such as grounds and labor, maintenance shops such as plumbing, electrical, and housing, and services like the post office were flat from 2013 to 2014. However, there was employee growth (5 FTE) in UAF's capital project related Division of Design and Construction as a result of the significant number of deferred maintenance and other capital project funded work and an increase of 1.5 FTE at UAF's Combined Heat and Power Plant as vacancies were filled. More detailed data is available in Appendices 2 and 3.

## Comments from Individual Departments

### Organizational Change Over Time

- **Restructuring/Mergers**

Financial Services has gone through several organizational changes. The accounts payable function and the travel function were consolidated under the Office of Finance and Accounting (formerly the Office of Budget and Cost Records). Financial Services recognized the need for a more structured approach to institutional budget development, reporting and process improvement efforts and created the Office of Management and Budget. The original staffing level was created based on existing and reallocated staff positions. FY14 is the first budget year with all updated positions hired where labor and operational regularity is known and can be budgeted in accordance with expectations and plans. Effective July 1, 2014, the Leasing Office moved from Facilities Services to Financial Services. The PolarExpress Office merged with the Office of the Bursar (formerly the Business Office). Parking Services moved from Facilities Services to the Office of the Bursar. Note: although Shuttle Service operates within Facilities Services it is reported in the Bursar's office due to its connection with parking.

- **Outsourcing**

UAF Bookstore was contracted out to Follett in fall 2009, a reduction of 14.5 FTE from Financial Services. Custodial Services were contracted out to ABM prior to FY12; this change accounts for most of the staffing reduction in Facilities Services (33.9 FTE). Printing Services will be contracted out in early 2015; staff from Financial Services and Procurement are working with key printing customers to develop an RFP for preferred vendors to ensure that UAF design standards continue to be met with the use of outside vendors.

- **Staff reductions**

Administrative Services (not including Facilities Services) reduced the number of employees by 8.9 FTE from the spring of 2013 to 2014 through resignations, retirements, and mergers. The majority of departments decreased the number of employees. Procurement decreased by the most, 2.8 (16.4%), HR decreased by 1.5 FTE (9.7%) and Grants and Contracts decreased by 1.3 (8.9%). OMB increased by 1.0 FTE (33.3%).

### Revenue Generated

- **Fee Revenue**

The Office of the Bursar generates fee revenues from payment plan enrollment fees, parking passes and citations, PolarExpress card renewal and replacement fees, and late fee assessment.

- **Service and Sales Revenue**

Printing Services, Dining Services, the Bookstore and Trademark operations generate revenue.



- **Other Revenue**  
Procurement receives proceeds from the auction or sale of surplus property items, which supports the Central Receiving surplus pickup and disposal program.
- **Grants for Fire and Police Departments**  
Two-thirds of the Fire Department's overall budget is comprised of a contract from the Fairbanks North Star Borough to provide fire suppression and emergency medical services to 18,000 borough residences and businesses in the University Fire Service District. An agreement between UAF and the State of Alaska Division of Forestry regarding forestry fire protection services generates some revenue as well. The Police Department charges overtime costs directly associated with special events, assesses fees for family housing unlock requests, receives minimal and unpredictable drug forfeiture funds from court decisions based on investigations, and is paid approximately \$16,000 for Fairbanks North Star Borough School District and local government offices alarm monitoring.

### Remaining Efficiency and Effectiveness Opportunities

- **Streamlining Processes**  
Many departments are continuing to streamline processes. This speeds up process time and frees up staff time associated with document handling and applies to all areas from billing to ordering processes. Travel, JV processing, vendor payments, and student transactions are all being improved.
- **Collaborating**  
OMB is collaborating with OFA for regular projection updates and reporting. UAF administrative offices are building stronger relationships with the UA System Office (and other teams) to facilitate process improvement efforts and changes to software tools, etc. Procurement is developing strategic sourcing to allow departments to know their procurement decisions are cost effective.
- **Training Improvement**  
EHSRM has provided and will continue to improve training opportunities in several areas.
- **Other**  
OGCA-OSP is improving the day-to-day operations of pre and post-award operations, and developing clearer accountability as well as clear and consistent communication. The Police Department has taken responsibility for parking enforcement.

### Comparison with Other Units or Organizations

**Financial Services - Office of the Bursar** - The Office of the Bursar assists more students and departments with fewer staff members than most other similar departments at comparable universities.

**Procurement & Contract Services** - UAF's total procurement spending is approximately \$170 million annually, whereas UAA's is around \$60 million. UAF has 14 procurement, receiving, and property staff, compared to UAA's 13.

**Fire Department** - One of the few programs known in the United States that utilizes student firefighters and the only one known to provide a combination of full-time student employment, experiential opportunities, and academic requirements. Along with the cities of Fairbanks and Anchorage, these departments are the only departments in Alaska with a PPC rating of 2.

**Police Department** - Has ten sworn police officers, compared to UAA's 17.

### Processes That Work Particularly Well

**HR** - Web Time Entry, paperless job forms, employee relations, and supervisor training.

**Financial Services -Office of the Bursar** - Processes for PolarExpress production, payments processing, set-up of payment plans, as well as overall effort on receivables.

**Procurement & Contract Services** - Electronic, rather than manual, formal solicitation processes have saved countless resources and the use of standardized forms, terms, conditions, and provisions that reduce the time and effort to make processes efficient and cost effective.

**EHSRM** - Issuance of Certificates of Insurance, risk assessment for new programs, ice cleat program, occupational health service, etc.

### Potential Process Improvements

- **Streamlining processes**  
Financial Services could improve processes by using more electronically enterable forms, employing electronic signature tools, and implementing TEM. OFA sees opportunities for improvement in terms of cash reconciliation, travel, journal vouchers, and accounts payable by utilizing more technology.
- **Reorganizing**  
HR suggests shifting recruitment process and approval to respective Vice Chancellors and Provost. HR can add value to the recruitment process through search committee education and in the onboarding process.

- **Cooperation and standardization of processes**

OMB would benefit from broader access to data for report production, electronic workflows, and greater partnership with other units across campus. The Office of the Bursar shares receiving of payments with CTC, CRCD and the outlying campuses and this could be improved through standardization of policies.

The Police Department could provide the Fire Department with online ProQA and AQUA use to facilitate better call and response review as well as work with Residence Life and the Dean of Students to improve the trespassing process on campus (the Police Department wants to develop a process for sharing information with Residence Life and the Dean of Students without breaching any security clearance regulations).

- **Other**

EHSRM sees opportunities for improvements in accident reporting, coordination with DDC on projects for renovation and new construction, training departments on the risk assessment process, loss prevention, training access and data collection.

The Office of the Bursar could improve the distribution of knowledge on certain tax forms, like the 1098T.

### Opportunities for Shared Service Models

- **Training**

The training function could greatly benefit from a shared-services function where subject matter expertise could be combined with training skills.

- **Financial management and transactional services**

There may be opportunities to share some transactional services between departments within the UAF campus and also with other UA institutions to reduce duplication of services across the UA system. Departmental deposits done at the Office of the Bursar are time consuming for customer service representatives; they could be done more efficiently at the department level or central fiscal office.

- **Shared knowledge**

OMB is building a relationship with UAA Finance leadership to improve reporting and business processes across both campuses. Building relationships with other departments across campus to pool resources could help reduce overlap and increase efficiency.

- **Procurement and travel**

Business functions from the schools and institutes could be shared by a central research business office. GI's Receiving and Property Office could be merged with UAF Central Receiving & Procurement.

- **HR**

HR suggests there are opportunities for shared services in several HR-related areas such as PPA positions and in recruitment.

- **Other**  
EHSRM suggests placing department safety coordinators at rural sites to help create a safety culture at those sites.

### Impacts of Reduction in Funding

Units were asked to assess the impact of a 10% personnel cut in addition to the reductions enacted in FY14. The FY15 budget reduction imposed for Administrative Services units was 6%. Because some units must be preserved in whole, other units will be addressing a 10% reduction or more. These answers informed the FY15 budget cuts within the division.

- **Customer service**  
For the Office of the Bursar, a reduction of this magnitude would result in less timely processing in areas such as fee payment and refunds. Many positions are already filled with student employees rather than full-time staff to reduce costs, but a decrease in customer service as well as inconsistencies due to lack of familiarity with processes have been experienced as a result.
- **Responsiveness**  
OFA would lose one position, with reduced responsiveness as a result. EHSRM's efforts to improve the safety culture at UAF would be slowed, and the ability to support staff, faculty, and researchers would be reduced or limited. Risk for OSHA and EPA fines would increase. HR's ability to serve the other departments would be reduced.
- **Opportunities for training**  
Several departments would lose the ability to deliver in-person training.
- **Administration**  
Administrative duties would be severely limited in several departments.
- **Further reductions not possible**  
OMB is already underfunded. Procurement is already at a level where further reductions would make it impossible to legally perform the duties.
- **Other**  
The Fire Department's ability to participate in off-shift activities such as the Summer Fire Academy would be impacted. A reduction in the number of student employees would shift the burden of emergency response to remaining students, potentially impacting academic performance, challenge the ability to meet obligations, and cause Alaska employers to hire from elsewhere. The Police Department would need to reduce staff by one sworn police officer and one emergency dispatcher. In addition, service hours within the Community Service Officer program would have to be cut. As a result, campus investigations would be hindered greatly and ability to support events on campus would be reduced (private security may have to be contracted to meet Risk Management's requirements for such events, but the department is not aware of any private security firm that provides that type of service in the Fairbanks area). The loss of one position at the dispatch center would impact the coverage of shift hours. Building security would also be reduced.

## Impacts of Reduction in Non-Personnel Funding

- **Travel**  
Most departments would have to further reduce travel. This would make it more difficult for staff to maintain professional certifications and to attend professional development conferences to stay informed of federal regulatory changes. It could also result in less effective connections and/or understanding, especially at rural sites.
- **Equipment and maintenance**  
The Office of the Bursar is already in need of equipment updates, and critical equipment purchases would be further deferred. Essential apparatus maintenance and repairs would be heavily impacted at the Fire Department.
- **Other**  
Several departments would be forced to extensively reduce printed media and other materials like hardcopy key reports and/or budgetary advocacy information.

## Administrative Performance Metrics

**Financial Services** - Is currently gathering metrics on travel transactions processed (TERs, Advances, etc.) but also wants to look at similar metrics for JVs, NSF Overrides, A/P payment, etc.).

**Office of the Bursar** - Beyond receivable and payment statistics, there are no other metrics in use, but metrics like refunds processed per semester, online payment volume, number of students dropped for non-payment of tuition/fees, number of late fees assessed, parking citations issued per month/annually, number and amount of refunds processed each semester, and the data for direct deposits, checks, or other payment methods could be used.

**Office of Finance & Accounting** - Measures travel document receipts and processing time.

**OGCA-OSP** - Research expenditures, research revenue, new awards, active grants, proposals submitted.

Metric	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Research expend.	\$106.5 M	\$118 M	\$124 M	\$117 M	\$114.5 M
Research revenue	\$127.7 M	\$125.5 M	\$134.1 M	\$128.2 M	\$126.9 M
New awards	476	332	472	455	436
Active grants	1,528	1,022	1,595	1,584	1,578
Proposals submitted	1,113	1,009	1,028	950	862

**Procurement & Contract Services** - Currently participating in a rigorous process improvement program that includes several measures of procurement process time.

**EHSRM** - Wide variety ranging from number of OSHA recordable injuries, accidents resulting in hospitalization, number of hazardous waste pick-ups, number of labs audited, number of contracts reviewed.

**Fire Department** - Number of student firefighters that complete initial probation and acquire a degree or certificate, number of student firefighters that complete initial probation and achieve employment in emergency services, and the ISO Public Protection Class Rating.

**Police Department** - Crime trends, police officer response and activity levels, review of dispatch response times.

### Facilities Services

One review of facilities was conducted in the spring of 2014 by Sightlines, a consulting firm that specializes in capturing financial, customer service and facilities data.

They compared UAF to other universities having similar programs, a similar mix of research and academic activities, and to the extent possible, a similar climate. There were 13 universities in the peer group, chosen by UAF and Sightlines. The peer group includes Montana State University, University of Maine, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont and UAA.

Sightlines conducted a customer service survey which will be repeated annually. Facilities Service mirrors the survey and conducts it annually six months after the Sightlines survey. Results from both surveys are analyzed and compared to results in the peer group. Results are used to monitor and adjust areas of opportunity that are identified. The survey results were very detailed, but have been summarized at a high level to focus on initiatives that address broad themes.

Respondents were asked about their satisfaction with aspects of services provided by different areas of Facilities Services.

Customer Satisfaction Index	Mechanical	Structural	Custodial	Grounds	Score	Benchmark
Feedback Mechanism	2.9	2.8	2.3	2.9	2.6	2.9
Understand Service Levels	3.3	3.2	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.6
Work Meets Expectations	4.2	4.1	3.2	4.1	4.1	4.1

Respondents were asked to rate the knowledge of process by Facilities Services.

Knowledge of Process	All Facilities	Benchmark
----------------------	----------------	-----------

	Services	
I understand the procedure for submitting work requests.	4.4	4.2
I utilize the proper procedure for submitting work requests.	4.4	4.2
The work request process meets my needs.	3.9	4.2

One issue highlighted by the review was that the work request process did not meet respondents' needs. Customers were commenting on work orders that had been closed without any charges or notes on the work order. They were unsure if the work had been completed, if work wasn't necessary or if a different work order had been created for the issue. To address this concern, a weekly report was created to identify such work orders. The shops have been taking steps to train workers to add notes to all work orders. This focus has almost eliminated the issue entirely. Between July 2013 and July 2014, there was a 97 percent reduction in work orders closed without labor charges or notes.

Another issue highlighted by the review was that Facilities Services was not understanding the level of service required or expected. Across all different shops within Facilities Services scores for this item were below the benchmark. In response, Facilities Services created guidelines for service levels including priority levels and criteria for each level including general response time guidelines for each priority level. The information is posted on the Facilities Services website.

While all but one shop had scores at or above the benchmark for 'work meets expectations,' Facilities Services nevertheless made changes to try to improve services. Stickers with QR codes were added to restrooms on campus to provide an easy way to send in feedback about restroom conditions. Beginning in mid-July, nine buildings were part of a pilot project to have cleaning done during the day allowing for building users to provide feedback more easily.

Respondents were asked to rate their general satisfaction with facilities. Overall Facilities Services received a 3.1 and the benchmark was 3.2. Facilities Services will conduct the same survey Sightlines did every six months to allow for continued feedback from customers. Survey results will be posted on the website for transparency. Facilities Services also revived weekly one on one meetings between customer service and customers.

Like many other departments on campus, Facilities Services also looked to shared services to allow for cost savings. Facilities Services was part of a re-organization within Admin Services that created a Business Services unit providing services to Facilities Services. The re-organization included Facilities' finance, IT, HR, Warehouse, Admin and Procurement. Most cost savings were realized within Warehouse—both within personnel and through process improvements.

Facilities Services is also leading a space utilization study for the UAF Fairbanks campus. Results will be available in December 2014.

### **Improvements to the Process for Next Year**

In order to make the Admin Services review more useful and enable departments to have useful measures of how they are performing, our next steps will be to work on the metrics. The primary lesson learned in this review was the need to be more specific when requesting information so the appropriate level of detail is received.

OMB staff will work with those departments that currently do not use any metrics to develop measures and find the appropriate comparison institutions.

This review will be conducted next year as well so that baseline data for the metrics may be collected. Subsequent reviews will occur at least every three years with the option of more frequent reviews if the budget or performance merits it.

### **Next Steps**

After reviewing all the data submitted by the departments as well as other data available, it is clear which departments have been areas of investment and which are not.

Coupling the knowledge of past investments with performance provides information for VCAS to make decisions about where to invest in the future and how the 2015 VCAS reduction of \$1.6M will be accomplished.



Areas of Investment		Areas of Reduced Investment	
Change in FTE (FY2013 to FY2014)			
Office of Management & Budget	1.0	PolarExpress Office	-2.1
		Procurement & Central Receiving	-2.8
		Human Resources	-1.5
		VCAS Office	-1.0
		Finance & Accounting	-1.1
		Grants & Contracts Administration	-1.3
		Printing Services	-1.0

## Appendix 1

### Complete Questionnaire

## Administrative & Support - Program Review

### Service Unit Template

*Updated: January 7, 2014*

#### Unit Analysis Questionnaire

Please complete the following questions as part of the UAF Administrative & Support (A/S) Program Review process. Submit data and responses no later than Friday, January, 31, 2014 to Brianna Walters, Office of Management and Budget (bdwalters@alaska.edu)

Questions are intended for unit leadership to answer with respect to structure/organization, function, associated budgets, efficiency and resourcing decisions.

1. Briefly describe your unit and its core functions.
2. What is the FTE count within your unit? Include total of each FTE on restricted v. unrestricted funds, using the table below.

Unit Name:	# FTE (0.0)	Salary & Benefits (Labor) Budget (\$0,000.0)	Operating Budget (\$0,000.0)	Total Labor + Operating + Other Budgets
Restricted		\$	\$	\$
Fund 1		\$	\$	\$
Other		\$	\$	\$
Totals:		\$	\$	\$

- a. Please attach an updated organizational chart, including FTE, job family classification and working title for each position.
- b. Has your organizational structure changed over time? If so, explain changes in budget or FTE trends for the past 3-5 years.
3. How are your business operations and administrative staff organized? For example, do you have a business office/centralized processing center or are administrative staff distributed throughout your operations?
4. What are the primary and secondary services your unit provides? Please list with short descriptions, if necessary.
  1. Primary -
  2. Primary -
  3. Primary -
  4. Primary -
  5. Secondary –
  6. Secondary –
  - a. Describe any revenue generated as a result of these services, if applicable.

5. How do your business and administrative practices reflect UAF's mission and core values? Consider the practices within your unit and those that your unit is involved in.
  - a. How do your services support and enhance UAF's core themes: to educate, discover, prepare, connect and engage?
  - b. How does your unit support a commitment to high-quality service?
  - c. Are there opportunities to make business processes more effective and efficient? If so, how?
  - d. How does your unit ensure compliance and accountability without imposing unnecessary burdens?
  - e. How does your unit address risk?

6. Please describe your largest customer group(s). If these customers were to rate business services in your unit, what do you think they would say? Please choose your perceived customer service experience on the scale below (circle one).

**Not Acceptable - Slightly Acceptable - Moderately Acceptable - Very Acceptable - Completely Acceptable**

- a. If you have conducted a recent customer satisfaction survey, please share the results as an attachment.
  - b. If you have conducted a survey or would like to see improvement with your level of perceived service selected above, please describe actions you are taking to create positive change.
7. How do you compare with other units (internal) or organizations (external) of relative size or scope (universities or other service providers)?
8. Process Improvement:
  - a. What processes or administrative workflows work particularly well in your unit?
  - b. What processes would you want to improve, change or eliminate within your unit?
9. "Shared services" is the consolidation of business operations that are used by multiple parts of the same organization. The goal of a shared service model is to allow each business unit/department to focus its limited resources on activities that support the UAF mission and core values.
  - a. Do you see opportunities to implement shared service models? If so, where and how?
  - b. Are there processes in your unit that could be shared with other units, or pooled? What impacts would you expect, in terms of service and efficiencies?
10. Impact of decreased funding:
  - a. What services would be most impacted by a 10% reduction in personnel funding, and how would they be impacted?
  - b. What services would be most impacted by a 10% reduction in non-personnel funding, and how would they be impacted?
  - c. Would you consider shared service models to ensure the same level of services continue in the event of a personnel reduction?

**11. Metric Performance:**

Identify any administrative metrics you are using that reflect your key service areas. Include actual or quantifiable performance data in addition to targets or performance goals for the last 3-5 years, if available. Note changes in trends based on performance/metric change. Examples: volume or number of items processed within a defined period of time, length of time it takes to complete each average transaction (days), accuracy rates, customer satisfaction, etc.

## Appendix 2: Changes in Labor FY08-14

VCAS	Department	2008		2014		Change FY08-14		% Change FY08-14	
		FTE	Labor (in 1,000s)	FTE	Labor (in 1,000s)	FTE	Labor (in 1,000s)	FTE	Labor
<b>Administrative Offices</b>									
Financial Services	Finance & Accounting	22.4	\$ 1,757	20.2	\$ 1,890	-2.2	\$133	-9.7%	7.6%
	Office of Management & Budget	0.0	\$ -	4.0	\$ 510	4.0	\$510	--	--
	Office of the Bursar	33.1	\$ 1,921	23.2	\$ 1,728	-10.0	-\$193	-30.1%	-10.1%
	Printing Services	7.0	\$ 615	6.0	\$ 573	-1.0	-\$42	-14.3%	-6.8%
	Aux, Bookstore, Dining Services	20.1	\$ 1,376	2.5	\$ 263	-17.6	-\$1,114	-87.6%	-80.9%
	Grants & Contracts Administration	11.8	\$ 940	12.8	\$ 1,068	1.0	\$127	8.5%	13.5%
	Human Resources	18.0	\$ 1,340	14.0	\$ 1,328	-4.0	-\$12	-22.2%	-0.9%
	Procurement & Central Receiving	17.8	\$ 1,383	14.0	\$ 1,582	-3.8	\$198	-21.1%	14.4%
	Environ Health, Safety & Risk Management	7.0	\$ 596	10.5	\$ 1,096	3.5	\$500	50.0%	83.9%
	Fire Department	13.3	\$ 2,435	11.0	\$ 2,726	-2.3	\$291	-17.0%	11.9%
	Police Department	16.5	\$ 1,727	16.0	\$ 1,757	-0.5	\$30	-3.0%	1.7%
	VCAS Office	3.8	\$ 531	2.8	\$ 470	-1.0	-\$62	-26.7%	-11.6%
<b>Administrative Offices Subtotal</b>		<b>170.6</b>	<b>\$ 14,623</b>	<b>136.8</b>	<b>\$ 14,991</b>	<b>-33.8</b>	<b>\$368</b>	<b>-19.8%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>
<b>Facilities Services</b>									
Facilities Services	Maintenance	74.0	\$ 6,356	68.0	\$ 6,403	-6.0	\$47	-8.1%	0.7%
	Operations	33.8	\$ 2,383	28.0	\$ 3,086	-5.8	\$703	-17.2%	29.5%
	Admin, Contract Services, Safety	47.8	\$ 3,132	26.1	\$ 2,450	-21.7	-\$682	-45.4%	-21.8%
<b>Operations, Maintenance, &amp; Services Subtotal</b>		<b>155.6</b>	<b>\$ 11,872</b>	<b>122.1</b>	<b>\$ 11,939</b>	<b>-33.5</b>	<b>\$68</b>	<b>-21.5%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
Facilities Services	Design & Construction	30.8	\$ 2,268	41.8	\$ 4,690	11.0	\$2,423	35.6%	106.8%
	Utilities	33.8	\$ 2,993	40.3	\$ 4,312	6.6	\$1,319	19.4%	44.1%
<b>FS Capital Projects &amp; Utilities Subtotal</b>		<b>64.5</b>	<b>\$ 5,261</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>\$ 9,003</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>\$3,742</b>	<b>27.1%</b>	<b>71.1%</b>
<b>Facilities Subtotal</b>		<b>220.2</b>	<b>\$ 17,133</b>	<b>204.2</b>	<b>\$ 20,942</b>	<b>-16.0</b>	<b>\$3,809</b>	<b>-7.3%</b>	<b>22.2%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>390.8</b>	<b>\$ 31,756</b>	<b>341.0</b>	<b>\$ 35,933</b>	<b>-49.7</b>	<b>\$4,177</b>	<b>-12.7%</b>	<b>13.2%</b>

## Appendix 3: Changes in Labor FY13-14

		2013	2014	Change FY13-14	% Change FY13-14
--	--	------	------	----------------	------------------

VCAS	Department	FTE	Labor (in 1,000s)	FTE	Labor (in 1,000s)	FTE	Labor (in 1,000s)	FTE	Labor
<b>Administrative Offices</b>									
Financial Services	Finance & Accounting	21.2	\$ 1,978	20.2	\$ 1,890	-1.1	-\$87	-4.9%	-4.4%
	Office of Management & Budget	3.0	\$ 288	4.0	\$ 510	1.0	\$222	33.3%	76.9%
	Office of the Bursar	23.3	\$ 1,924	23.2	\$ 1,728	-0.2	-\$196	-0.6%	-10.2%
	Printing Services	7.0	\$ 644	6.0	\$ 573	-1.0	-\$71	-14.3%	-11.0%
	Aux, Bookstore, Dining Services	2.2	\$ 197	2.5	\$ 263	0.4	\$66	16.3	33.7%
	Grants & Contracts Administration	14.0	\$ 1,162	12.8	\$ 1,068	-1.3	-\$95	-8.9%	-8.2%
	Human Resources	15.5	\$ 1,614	14.0	\$ 1,328	-1.5	-\$285	-9.7%	-17.7%
	Procurement & Central Receiving	16.8	\$ 1,647	14.0	\$ 1,582	-2.8	-\$66	-16.4%	-4.0%
	Environ Health, Safety & Risk Management	11.0	\$ 1,077	10.5	\$ 1,096	-0.5	\$19	-4.5%	1.7%
	Fire Department	12.0	\$ 2,735	11.0	\$ 2,726	-1.0	-\$10	-8.3%	-0.4%
	Police Department	16.0	\$ 1,865	16.0	\$ 1,757	0.0	-\$108	0.0%	-5.8%
	VCAS Office	3.8	\$ 593	2.8	\$ 470	-1.0	-\$123	-26.7%	-20.8%
<b>Administrative Offices Subtotal</b>		<b>145.7</b>	<b>\$ 15,725</b>	<b>136.8</b>	<b>\$ 14,991</b>	<b>-8.9</b>	<b>-\$734</b>	<b>-6.1%</b>	<b>-4.7%</b>
<b>Facilities Services</b>									
Facilities Services	Maintenance	64.3	\$ 6,223	68.0	\$ 6,403	3.8	\$180	5.8%	2.9%
	Operations	32.0	\$ 3,050	28.0	\$ 3,086	-4.0	\$36	-12.5%	1.2%
	Admin, Contract Services, Safety	26.0	\$ 2,460	26.1	\$ 2,450	0.1	-\$10	0.4%	-0.4%
<b>Operations, Maintenance, &amp; Services Subtotal</b>		<b>122.3</b>	<b>\$ 11,734</b>	<b>122.1</b>	<b>\$ 11,939</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>\$205</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
Facilities Services	FS Design & Construction	36.8	\$ 4,145	41.8	\$ 4,690	5.0	\$545	13.6%	13.2%
	FS Utilities	38.8	\$ 4,203	40.3	\$ 4,312	1.5	\$109	3.9%	2.6%
<b>FS Capital Projects &amp; Utilities Subtotal</b>		<b>75.6</b>	<b>\$ 8,348</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>\$ 9,003</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>\$654</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
<b>Facilities Subtotal</b>		<b>197.8</b>	<b>\$ 20,082</b>	<b>204.2</b>	<b>\$ 20,942</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>\$860</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>343.5</b>	<b>\$ 35,808</b>	<b>341.0</b>	<b>\$ 35,933</b>	<b>-2.5</b>	<b>\$125</b>	<b>-0.7%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>