



Central Support Unit (CSU) Allocation Committee Meeting

Minutes

Date:	12/2/2020
Time:	9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Location:	Virtual Meeting
Interim Co-Chairs:	Interim Provost Michael Johnson and Associate VP for Financial Affairs Kristie Harris
Voting Members:	Mike Kilbride, Theodorea Berry, Paul Jarley, Sissi Carroll, Fernando Rivera, Chris Ingersoll, Michael Georgiopoulos, David Pavlonnis, Misty Shepherd
Absent	None
Huron Consultants	Kevin Lintell, Michael Lee, Michael Razis, Jaime Ontiveros
Staff (non-voting members)	Derek Horton, Rebeca Richards, Kathy Mitchell, Joe Trubacz
Minutes:	Tracy Slavik

Meeting Agenda

1. Gather feedback on components of central units' annual budget review
 - a. Components
 - b. Process and unit participation
 - c. Expected outcomes
2. Review framework for best practice components of an SLA and desired UCF customizations
3. Discuss application of SLA framework in context of central support unit for initial committee focus
4. Preview agenda and content for meeting #3
5. Meeting adjourned

Refresher: CSUs in the Annual Budgeting Process

Kristie Harris explained the Financial Proposal, Key Performance Indicator (KPI), and Service Level Agreement (SLA) requirements for the Central Support Units (CSUs). Required annual expectations for CSUs will differ based on the need for greater understanding of operations, for review of service level agreements, and/or to develop or review key performance indicators.

This committee will determine the rotation and framework for a comprehensive review of select units and work with CSUs to identify which require KPIs and SLAs.

One option for the committee to consider is to have KPIs be part of the Financial Proposals. The units will still determine the KPIs conducive to measuring their performance, but this committee and the department heads also will provide input.

It also needs to be decided if all units or only select units will develop SLAs.

The end goal is to work as a committee to determine the best process to review proposals, play a major role in identifying KPIs, and help prepare SLAs for a select group of units.

Financial Proposal Component

Harris stated each central support unit will develop a financial proposal every fiscal year for new funding requests to be reviewed by the CSUAC.

She asked the committee if every central support unit should be required to present financial proposals, or if proposal submissions – without a presentation – are acceptable.

Theodora Berry said for efficiency, it is unnecessary for all units to make presentations. However, the committee needs to limit guardrails on what is included in presentations so members can have as much information as possible. Also, if some areas present but not others, a protocol needs to be in place to decide who can present.

Sissi Carroll recommended having representatives from each unit be on standby while the committee discusses that unit's proposal, in lieu of a formal presentation by the unit.

Paul Jarley concurred and said while the committee needs to review all requests, not every unit needs to present. Future committee meetings can be reserved for requested units to attend and answer questions.

Chris Ingersoll suggested the committee review the proposals and make one of three decisions: 1) Enough information was provided and the committee has no further questions, 2) The committee has minor questions and will submit those to the unit in writing, or 3) Request that the unit present to the committee on items that require dialogue.

Berry said criteria would need to be set for why one group would be asked to present and not others. She likes the idea of having a unit member available for questions, but she thinks it is critical to have all the information the committee needs be included in the actual proposal.

Michael Johnson said the committee consensus then is to not have formal presentations but have a version of making sure people are available to answer questions. The committee needs to show equity among the units and be disciplined as a group.

Harris also asked the committee for feedback on what information to include in the financial proposals. Financial proposals will differ by support unit based on the operating model and services provided, but all will contain: 1) Overview of Central Unit, 2) SLA Development, 3) KPI Evaluation, and 4) Funding.

Jarley asked to see one-year and multi-year forecasts and that units provide their sources of funds (E&G and outside of E&G). Johnson said the forecasts are likely covered under the “Demand or Consumption Data” bullet in the SLA Development section. Providing the sources of funding would likely be covered under the Funding section.

Carroll asked for an explanation of the “Sensitivity Analysis” listed in the KPI Evaluation section. Harris said these are areas where the risk is highly sensitive to the operations of that unit. Jaime Ontiveros added units are operating at a set point today, but if considerable changes occur, this is what will impact how the unit delivers their services. The sensitivity analysis is calling out those items and relating them back to changes in the KPI and how much money would be needed.

Berry asked for the “Reserve Balances” bullet in the Funding section if historic reserve balances should be considered. Harris suggested a three-to-five-year reporting period. David Pavlonnis agreed and said this will allow the committee to have a better understanding of how each fiscal year impacted the unit.

Michael Georgiopoulos asked for the KPI Evaluation section if units will provide survey data or other information that provides the current status quo and performance of the unit. Johnson said yes, but he suspects the ability to do so will vary by unit, and the framing of good KPIs is iterative.

Jarley said KPIs stress operational metrics and efficiency but do not indicate how the unit is performing on an outcome-oriented basis. Johnson said that is the conversation that needs to happen between this committee and the CSUs.

Jarley added this is the distinction between management and leadership. KPIs are about management and making sure the unit is working correctly from an efficiency standpoint. However, KPIs do not ask the leadership question—Is the unit is doing the right things. Johnson said the committee needs to evaluate KPIs and SLAs and not just accept them, and metrics must be measurable.

Fernando Rivera commented that providing this information will be time consuming for the units, and the committee should be sensitive given the aggressive timeline. Harris said it is important for the committee to provide direction and guidance.

Misty Shepherd added the committee membership is not representative of the people in the units who will be completing the reports and other measures. Units are feeling pressure from numerous information requests but not receiving additional resources to assist.

Johnson said the committee cannot be adding and adding information requests, nor would it want to read lengthy documents. Materials need to be at a level the committee can grasp. It also cannot wait until the new ERP system is in place to request information. This first year will be learning as we go and not a night-and-day change.

Kevin Lintner said initial KPIs will be based in what the current system can provide, but as the university moves to the new ERP system, units will have the opportunity to develop outcome-focused KPIs.

Key Performance Indicator Component

Harris said KPIs will vary based on classification, but KPIs drive behavior and the type of service provided by the CSU. It is about simplicity and the types of metrics identified to measure performance. Benchmarking also is important to compare ourselves to other institutions.

Expectations for Current/Future Year Budget Cycles

Harris said the Parallel Year directives are almost complete. The new budget model will be fully operational in Year 1, which includes the full adoption of the CSU budget review process and rotating components (Financial Proposals, KPI Review, SLA Development/Refinement).

In Year 2, funding requests from CSUs are framed around service performance as defined by the KPIs within the SLA. Funding requests will transition from anecdotal to data/metric-driven that align with service expectations of customers. Visibility into the resource need on a per-service-unit basis also will increase to enhance the ability to prioritize investment opportunities and realize the largest return on investment.

SLA Best Practices

SLA: Best Practices

Lintner said SLAs are typically structured around four areas: 1) roles and responsibilities, 2) service catalog, 3) funding and cost structure, and 4) escalation, evaluation, and enhancement.

He asked the committee for feedback on additional components or customizations.

Georgiopoulos asked who decides the contents of these areas (for example, roles and responsibilities). Lintner said this committee will review and decide. The process has been to start with the support unit and evaluate its needs, then take those under review.

This will be discussed further at the next committee meeting on December 16.

SLA: Roles and Responsibilities

Lintner said role clarification and defined responsibilities ensure all parties understand where their attention is required and what dependencies exist to avoid service interruptions or delays.

Purpose:

- Defines responsibilities and requirements of each party involved in the delivery of services
- Establishes accountability structures, dependencies, and provides expectations to refer to during service disputes to prevent ability for either party to plead ignorance
- Ensures clarity on roles to avoid duplication of activities between support unit and receiving unit/customer

Framework for SLA:

- ‘Parties’ involved in delivery/provision of services include the CSU
- ‘Parties’ receiving services include schools/colleges, departments, self-supporting units, other support units, and employees

Ontiveros said they will need input from the committee on not only the SLA components but also who to talk to within each unit to validate those.

SLA: Service Catalog/Cycle Time

Linter said service catalogs provide an overview of services offered through a given support unit, as well as expected cycle times for service delivery.

Purpose:

- Documents services provided by a central support unit which are available to be utilized by campus constituents
- Establishes guidelines for services central support units do not have in-house expertise to perform or ability to deliver
- Sets expectations for service cycle time (average time for service delivery/completion)

Framework for SLA:

- Advertises ‘publicly’ available services
- Services are defined at the “request” level in SLAs
E.g. “I want to hire someone”
- Activity, step, and task level detail is excluded in SLA, but is an important consideration for continuous service improvement
E.g. “Request background check/immunization forms”

Ingersoll asked if consideration can be given for services that are in a catalog but not needed by the customer. Lintner said stakeholders will evaluate the catalog and decide if certain services are not needed. This will align the support unit services to the demand or expectations of the service recipient. On the flip side, the service catalog also advertises available services.

Preview agenda and content for meeting #3

Linter said the next committee meeting (December 16) will discuss:

1. SLA: Funding/Cost Structure
2. SLA: Evaluation, Escalation, and Enhancement Process
3. Application of SLA Framework
4. Revisit service level agreement framework customizations
5. Confirm stakeholders to engage for each SLA development central support unit

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.