



## Central Support Unit (CSU) Allocation Committee Meeting

### Minutes

<b>Date:</b>	1/20/2021
<b>Time:</b>	2 p.m. – 3 p.m.
<b>Location:</b>	Virtual Meeting
<b>Co-Chairs:</b>	Interim Provost Michael Johnson and Senior VP for Administration and Finance Gerald Hector
<b>Voting Members:</b>	Mike Kilbride, Theodorea Berry, Paul Jarley, Sissi Carroll, Fernando Rivera, Chris Ingersoll, Misty Shepherd, David Pavlonnis
<b>Absent</b>	Michael Georgiopoulos, Kathy Mitchell
<b>Huron Consultants</b>	Kevin Lintner, Michael Lee, Michael Razis, Jaime Ontiveros, Greg Bedell
<b>Staff (non-voting members)</b>	Kristie Harris, Rebeca Richards
<b>Minutes:</b>	Tracy Slavik

## Meeting Agenda

1. Approval of the minutes from December 16, 2020
2. Review KPI identification process
3. Discuss Central Support Unit KPIs and determine KPIs for CSUAC evaluation
4. Preview agenda and content for meeting #5 (January 26, 2021 at 1 p.m.)
5. Meeting adjourned

Interim Provost Michael Johnson opened the meeting by introducing Gerald Hector, the new Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Johnson shared his comments on the committee's work from this point forward:

1. This is version 1.0. The committee should focus on how it views support units and how support units should present their actions to the committee. It also is less important to get this process exactly right than it is to get it up and running.
2. The goal is not to have lists of all the items that the support unit managers should be monitoring to ensure operational efficacy, but rather a handful of important strategic items the committee wants to track.
3. The Huron team met with the support unit heads and discussed lengthier lists based on Huron's experiences at other institutions. What is being presented today is a mutual proposal from Huron and the support units.

## Approval of minutes

The minutes from the December 16, 2020 meeting were approved as submitted.

## Review KPI identification process

Kristie Harris reminded the group:

1. The KPIs will be used to evaluate a CSU's core function for budgetary decisions.
2. While three KPIs have been identified for each CSU, it is important to select the KPIs that support the CSUAC's understanding of how those CSU functions will align with the performance expectations.
3. The KPIs will not fix problems or address frustrations. Rather, KPIs are intended to establish a consistent parameter of evaluation to identify the areas where a CSU is meeting the department's expectations.

## *Approach to KPI identification*

Kevin Lintner explained that Huron followed the below approach to ensure both UCF specific knowledge and expertise as well as common industry performance metrics of CSUs are incorporated and shared with the CSUAC.

1. Analysis of UCF Reports: Huron conducted preliminary research on historical central support unit specific performance evaluation strategies using institutional and support unit published reports, dashboards, and other evaluation materials.
2. Central Support Unit Engagement: Huron facilitated individual meetings with each central support unit leadership team to document additional performance evaluation metrics and incorporate CSU perspective in metrics most relevant for CSUAC purposes.
3. Industry Research and Subject Matter Expertise: Huron subject matter expertise for specific support units provided input on performance metrics commonly monitored by similar support units across the industry and at other clients to further narrow and prioritize KPIs for CSUAC purposes.
4. CSUAC Recommendation: Share outcomes of key performance indicator identification process and facilitate KPI selection process with the CSUAC.

Paul Jarley pointed out KPIs are not the only items CSUs will bring to the committee with their budget proposals or requests. Other metrics should be shared, as well. Lintner confirmed and said the hope is the CSU can align their future funding requests to the KPIs.

Theodorea Berry recommended the committee first determine desired outcomes using the strategic plan and then work backwards.

Hector said these KPIs are the initial effort at working within the new budget model and the push for transparency and accountability. Johnson added the logic of the model acknowledges our starting point and seeks to have this iterative opportunity for improvement over time.

Jaime Ontiveros reminded the committee these conversations are a new process and a positive move in the right direction. The process will take a while, but it is laying a foundation for improvements.

#### *Summary of KPIs by Central Support Unit*

Lintner shared the list of the three KPIs for each CSU that represent recommended metric-driven evaluation criteria of central support unit performance and support for utilization by the CSUAC.

The committee is being asked if the three KPIs suggested for each unit are rational.

For Human Resources, the three are:

- Recruiting channel acquisition success rates (by position type)
- Time to fill position (by position type)
- Success of diversity and inclusion initiatives in hiring/retention

Chris Ingersoll asked if the KPIs being evaluated by the committee should be measuring financial performance rather than operational performance. Ontiveros said the committee should focus on the indicators that will help it understand if the support unit is completing the appropriate tasks.

This led into a discussion on whether other KPIs should be chosen instead and what should be the best course of action for determining KPIs.

#### Preview agenda and content for meeting #5

Committee members were asked to review the list of recommended KPIs (page 4) and the additional KPIs (pages 6-14), then rank the three most critical to evaluate for each central support unit.

Huron will aggregate the results, and these will be discussed at the next meeting, scheduled for January 26 at 1 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 2:06 p.m.