AGENDA

UAF STAFF COUNCIL #265

Monday, October 12, 2015

8:45 - 11:00 AM

Wood Center, Carol Brown Ballroom

I.  8:45 - 8:50  CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

   A.  Call to Order
   B.  Roll Call
   C.  Approval of Staff Council Meeting #265 Agenda
   D.  Approval of Minutes from Meetings #263 (Aug 2015) and #264 (Sept 2015)

II.  8:50 - 9:00  STATUS OF PENDING ACTIONS

   A.  Leave Share Resolution
   B.  Staff Alliance Task Force to Review “Review Process” vs. “Grievance Process” and Make Recommendations
   C.  Resolution Requesting Staff Council Involvement in the Selection of the New UAF Chancellor and the Interim UAF Chancellor
   D.  Staff Volunteer Day Proposal and Resolution

III. 9:00 - 9:05  PUBLIC COMMENT

IV.  9:05 – 9:20  GUEST SPEAKER

   A.  Brad Lobland, Director, UAF Human Resources & Margo Griffith, Senior HR Consultant

V.  9:20 - 9:30  OFFICERS REPORTS

   A.  Faye Gallant, President
   B.  Nate Bauer, Vice President

VI. 9:30 - 9:40  GOVERNANCE REPORTS

   A.  Colby Freel, Vice President - ASUAF
   B.  Orion Lawlor, President Elect – Faculty Senate
VII.  9:40 - 9:45  BREAK

VIII.  9:45 - 10:00  UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. University Advocacy Committee - ‘Staff Mentoring Interest Survey’
B. Unit Representative Discussion
C. Staff Council Calendar Update
D. ‘Types of Employment’ Policy Changes - Temporary Employees Impacted
   i. Attachment 265-7: Q&A with Erik Seastedt, CHRO from The Statewide Voice, Sept. 30, 2015
E. Committee Representatives
   i. Staff Alliance – Staff Health Care Committee (SHCC)

IX.  10:00 - 10:10  INTERNAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Elections – Brandi Marrero, Chair
   i. Attachment 265-1: October Committee Report
B. Membership and Rules - Trish Winners, Chair
C. Rural Affairs - Chris Brooks, Chair
   i. Attachment 265-8: Oct. Committee Report
D. Staff Affairs – Jane Groseclose, Chair
E. University Advocacy – Jami Warrick, Chair
   i. Did not meet
   ii. Next meeting: Tues. Oct. 13, 10-11AM

X.  10:10 – 10:15  STAFF ACHIEVEMENTS AND HIGHLIGHTS

XI.  10:15 - 10:35  CHANCELLOR’S REMARKS

XII. 10:35 – 10:55  NEW BUSINESS

A. Staff Council Meeting Time
B. UA Statewide Transformation
   i. Attachment 265-9: Preliminary Recommendations from the Statewide Transformation Team (9/29/2015)
   ii. Feedback can be submitted at: www.alaska.edu/swbir/transformation-team/feedback-form

XIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. Staff Council Meeting with Chancellor Search Consultant, Wed., Oct. 14
      - Time, location, and remote access information will be distributed by email when available

XIV. INTERNAL AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS
   A. Performance Evaluation Joint Campaign Ad Hoc Committee
   B. RISE Board Staff Sustainability Fee Ad Hoc Committee

XV. EXTERNAL STATEWIDE COMMITTEE REPORTS (written only)
   A. Staff Alliance- Staff Health Care Committee – Lesli Walls; Kim Eames; David Bantz, Alt; Stacey Howdeshell, Alt
   B. Staff Alliance Compensation Working Group – Faye Gallant, Chair; Brad Krick, Janine Smith, Mike Cox
   C. Staff Alliance Task Force to Review “Review Process” vs. “Grievance Process” and Make Recommendations

XVI. EXTERNAL UAF COMMITTEE REPORTS (written only)
   A. Accreditation Steering Committee - On Hiatus
   B. Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for the Naming of Campus Facilities - Jesse Atencio
   C. Chancellor’s Diversity Action Committee (CDAC) – On Hiatus
   D. Chancellor’s Planning and Budget Committee - Chris Bekis, Rep; Juella Sparks, Alt
   E. Fresh Air Campus Challenge Committee – Brad Krick, Rep; Sue Miller, Alt
   F. Master Planning Committee (MPC) – Brad Krick, Rep
   G. Meritorious Service Award Committee – Connie Huizenga, Rep
H. Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) - Representative Needed
I. People’s Endowment Committee – Jessica MacCallum, Rep
J. RISE Board – Ian Olson, Rep
K. Staff Appreciation Day Planning Group – Ashley Munro & Maria Russell
L. Sustainability & Dining Committee - Mathew Mund, Rep

XVII. AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS (written only)
   A. Training & Employee Development Working Group Update - Jessica MacCallum

XVIII. 10:55 - 11:00    ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

XIX. 11:00    ADJOURN
Elections Committee Report – Oct. 2015

Submitted by Brandi Marrero, Chair

I took over as chair for the elections committee at our meeting on Friday 9/18. We anticipate opening the nominations on Monday October 5th – Friday October 16th. Once nominations are in I will assist Nicole (if needed) with vetting out candidate accuracy and collecting forms. Phil is working on the software, mapping, and TKL by unit for rolling out the electronic nominations based on the program written for past elections. After nominations are collected there will be a short window where our committee will debrief and prepare for the voting period.
9/22/2015  | Membership & Rules Committee Report  | Action Item Date/Owner
| Roll Call - Jessica MacCallum, Brad Krick, Mathew Mund, Trish Winners; quorum met. |  
| Trish will create a rough draft of survey in Google Sheets with options for retaining SC Members with Unit Changes, and notify M&R Committee to review/suggest edits. Once approved by group, Trish will create Google Form for SC Members to vote on at Oct 12 meeting. Include "Impacts" statements for each option (Simple - 1 bylaw change; Complex - Multiple Bylaws Changes required, etc.) | T. Winners / Rough to M&R, Final emailed to SC reps.
| Unit Changes Requested - Discussed Collaboration Idea with Group; Trish will write up summary of discussion and post in Unit Review Folder, email link to M&R Committee to review/suggest edits. | T. Winners
| Specific Unit Change Request - Mathew will continue work with on the affected units, will talk with requester for details on goal. | M. Mund
| SC Meeting Summary - Samara's template was saved in the Meeting Notes folder of M&R's Google Drive. Brad shared his SC Meeting Summary from 9/14. Aly put into Samara's format and sent to Nicole to distribute. | A. Englert
| Mathew discussed the goals for having a Roles, Responsibilities & Expectations (RR&E) document for Staff Council Reps. He is developing a rough draft and will share it with the M&R Committee for review / input. | M. Mund
| The end of year M&R Annual Report - 2015-2016 for our team's successes is ready for input. The goal is to populate with our successes all year instead of trying to remember them at the end. | T. Winners
| Next ParliaMinute - Waiting till late October | J. McCallum

**Action Items:**

- Update Motion Log - Section V changes motion passed SC Council 9/14 | T. Winners
- Update Motion Log - Section III changes motion passed SC Council: DONE | B. Krick
- Prep for Bylaws Review - Section VI, VII, VIII | S. Taber

**Important Dates:**

- Next SC Executive Board Meeting: 9/30
- Committee Reports due: Oct 2
- Next Staff Council Meeting: #265 - 10/12
- Next M&R Committee Meeting: 10/20
- Future Staff Council Meeting: #266 - 11/9

**Members:**

- Trish Winners (C), Jessica MacCallum, Brad Krick, Samara Taber, Aly Englert, Mathew Mund

*Where M&R Spells Fun!*
UAF Staff Council  
Staff Affairs Committee  
09/21/2015

Call to Order: 3:00 pm Rasmusen Kayak Room

Current/Ongoing Business:
Leave Share Resolution - Removed from future itineraries because it is signed and resolved.

Staff Performance Evaluations
Continue Discussions. Explore ways to keep this topic alive, possibly work into morale discussion. Compile an understanding of related HR processes. Consider compiling communications for supervisors and staff, “what works, what doesn’t,” awareness, etc.

Staff Alliance Task Force to review “Review Process” Vs. “Grievance Process”
Vacant seat - Jane will follow up, perhaps serve at UAF representative.

Staff Matching of Sustainability Fee - Removed from future itineraries because we believe the initiative was rejected by the ad-hoc committee.

New Business:
Overburdened Staff
There seems to be a university-wide issue of overburdening of staff due to the funding situation. Staff members are leaving the institution because they are being asked to do more work than they can reasonably accomplish. Some employees are compensated for their additional workloads and some are not. We want to continue this discussion. Possibly survey staff regarding their perceptions of workloads.

Related Morale issue
We’ve discussed that morale is also a rising issue related to both performance evaluation and overburdening of staff. We would like to continue discussions regarding the morale issues, and consider how they can be addressed.
Sustainability in Dining Committee Report – Oct. 2015

Staff Council Rep: Mathew Mund

Committee Report:

Overall the committee is starting anew with the new dinning contractor.

This is the main projects the committee is coring on are:

- Composting – Shredder was sold and need new shredder to make it possible to use current compost on UAF flower beds. Currently UAF Grounds has to purchase compost and a shedder would allow UAF to produce larger volume of compost and in turn purchase less. The shedder would be around $17,000 and be a cheaper option then purchasing a full compost system (around $300,000). Composting would be limited to what can be composted outdoors in Alaska, no bio plastics. UAF currently comports only pre-production (waist before food is cooked) no post food, will look into composting coffee grounds. The committee is seeking partnership with Chartwells, Dining Services and Student Sustainability grants to purchase a shedder or pursuit of a different composting system.

- Ensure students and employees are aware of 25% Discount for using reusable mug when purchasing beverages. Hope to do this with signage where this option is available.

The committee is looking to build a conversation between staff council and issues the committee is looking at. They are eager to see how our two groups can help support each other missions.
Master Planning Committee
Report for Staff Council Meeting #265
October 2015

Brad Krick, Representative; Alternate Not Filled

MPC met on September 24. The group discussed:

Taku Parking Lot Trail:

The trail from the Taku Parking Lot that heads up toward Tanana Loop and Harwood Hall. This used to be a non-motorized trail but it was widened in 2014 for use by the Taku Shuttle while Tanana Loop was closed for the Engineering building construction. The Taku Shuttle was suspended in Fall 2014 and Tanana Loop, but the path is still being used by motor vehicles. MPC moved and passed a motion to make the trail open to only non-motorized use again.

Tanana Loop Open to Traffic:

Tanana Loop re-opened on September 26. The road has been narrowed slightly around the curve as a traffic calming measure (speed bumps were considered, but discounted because of the possibility of damage to vehicle suspensions).

Engineering Building Update:

The Engineering building is done for the time being. The shell is complete but none of the interior is installed except for the student study area in the lobby. The building will be open to foot traffic coming from the Alumni Drive staircase and crossing through to the Cornerstone Plaza.

Proposed Fire/Police Station Update:

The committee received an update regarding the proposed fire station, police station, and training center. UAF’s master plan includes building a new fire, police, EMS, and training center located on the old Fairbanks St road and part of the Tanana lot just south of Tanana Loop. Soil work done at the site found poor soil at the proposed location of the apparatus bays, so the plan has been rotated 90 degrees to place the bays on better ground. This is a project that is dependent on capital funding, and could easily be 2 - 5 years from start.

MPC met again on October 8, too close to our meeting to update this report.

MPC is scheduled to meet next on October 22.
Fresh Air Campus Challenge Committee  
Report for Staff Council Meeting #265  
October 2015

Brad Krick, Representative; Sue Mitchell, Alternate

FACC met on September 17. The group discussed:

- How to best get announcements out to all users. One member of the committee reported that students were unaware of the coming tobacco-free change. The committee discussed sending out another announcement via Students-L or the Cornerstone. We're also preparing a banner for display in the Wood Center.
- Campus signs are still in-progress, but door stickers have been ordered. The plan so far - although it may change between now and Dec 31 - is for a mix of permanent signs at some locations around campus and door stickers on every door.
- The ash trays will not be removed until the campus goes tobacco-free on December 31.
- The American Lung Association provided gum and trail mix to UAF for use as gifts to give to tobacco users. Residence Life is particularly interested in having these items to give out to students and has requested more gum and trail mix.
- Great American Smokeout is November 19.
- Alaska’s Tobacco Quit Line offers free gum & patches, but is limited to Alaska residents. The committee considered whether or not that would prevent non-resident students from taking part in the program. We were not sure, but assume that if a student provides an Alaska mailing address, they will be eligible.
- The UAF Health & Counseling Center can also provide some quit services that are covered by the student health fee. Similar resources are available through the employee health plan.

FACC met again on October 1. Both Staff Council’s rep and alternate were unable to make the meeting.

FACC is scheduled to meet again on October 15.
University revises types of employment, temporary employees impacted

Q&A with Chief Human Resources Officer Erik Seastedt

The Board of Regents approved a total of three word changes to policy describing types of employment during their September meeting, including broadening the scope of casual labor from an emergency basis to as-needed. These simple changes were all that were needed at the policy level to accommodate new regulation changes redefining five types of temporary employees and updating nearly 25 pages of Chapter 4 regulations. In order to provide a little more insight to the scope and impact of those regulation changes, Public Affairs sat down with Chief HR Officer Erik Seastedt to ask a few questions.

There are five types of temporary employees in the UA system. How is each affected by these regulation changes?

Student
Student employment is unaffected except some may be eligible for employee health care under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) if determined to have worked an average of 30+ hours per week for UA. No service breaks are required. (Example: a student who works the spring semester in a student job, and works seasonally full-time plus overtime, could be eligible for employee health coverage when they return in the fall if their six-month average employment, even if if different job positions, exceeded 30-hours a week.)

Seasonal
Full time seasonal workers must demonstrate their seasonality by now having a six-month break between seasonal assignments.

Casual
This classification was revised to reflect “as-needed” employment instead of emergency employment. We do expect the greatest growth in this category where an employee must be employed less than 15 hours per week OR 750 hours per year. No service break is ever required unless hours exceed the 750-hour threshold. (Example: both an employee working full-time for 18 weeks a year and an employee working less than 15 hours per week year-round can be casual employees.)

Temporary
These non-benefitted employees work 15-29 hours per week and will now require a break between temporary assignments of 120 days after 18 months of employment, increased from the previous 10-day break after 12 months.

Extended Temporary
These employees will now be eligible for health insurance immediately instead of after a six-month waiting period. They will continue to accrue sick leave, but will no longer accrue annual leave or receive holiday leave. Employees in this category are, upon hire, expected to work 30 hours per week or more. Temporary employees may also become extended temporary as a result of actual hours worked over a six-month lookback period. Extended temporary employees will be required to take a 120-day break in service after 18 months.

Aren’t adjuncts temporary employees? How are they affected?
Indeed, adjuncts are temporary employees. However, different rules apply due to the nature of their retirement plan eligibility and union contract. Adjuncts who are determined during a lookback to have worked more than 30 hours per week over six months will be offered health coverage. However, because they are also covered by a collective bargaining agreement, they would not be eligible for sick leave accrual. Additionally, the 120-day break in service does not apply to adjuncts.

Can you provide some context on why the university is making these changes?
There are multiple factors driving these changes: recommendations and increased scrutiny from the State of Alaska Division of Retirement; obligations under the federal Affordable Care Act; and a need to make sure temporary employees are being hired for truly temporary positions, not being repeatedly re-hired as a temporary employee into what should really be a regular position.

Retirement Benefits and Temporary Employment
The number one motivation for re-defining temporary employees is protecting the retirement benefits of rehired retirees who return to work at the university as temporary employees. The state continues to pay retirement benefits to eligible employees working in temporary positions. Those temporary employees who are earning retirement benefits, and are just working to supplement that income or to keep engaged in the university, must meet the unique restrictions of their retirement plan in order to avoid the risk of being penalized. A retiree in a regular position cannot receive retirement benefits and must also contribute to the retirement system.

While the state does not itself define what constitutes a temporary position, a 2011 audit of the university by the Alaska Division of Retirement included a recommendation to make a greater distinction between regular and temporary employees. Extending the break in service to 120-days after 18 months’ employment clearly distinguishes “temporary” employees from regular employees many of whom work on 9-month contracts. Retirees working less then 15 hours per week, as defined in the newly revised casual employee category, are not considered retirement-benefiit-eligible by the state. They can still draw retirement benefits and are not required to take a break in service unless exceeding 750 hours a year.

Affordable Care Act
Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) any employee working more than 30 hours per week must be offered health coverage. Over the past five months, a series of six-month lookbacks at service hours over the past year identified around 230 temporary UA employees who met that criteria who now must be offered health coverage. It is unclear how many will choose to accept the coverage, but many of those who are eligible will be re-classified as extended temporary employees. The ACA was also the main driver behind eliminating the 6-month wait period for health coverage for extended temporary employees, as an employer is required to offer coverage at hire if it is reasonably projected that the employee will work 30 hours or more per week annually.

Temporary Positions For Temporary Jobs
The final reason for the change is to tighten up hiring practices and make sure that temporary positions are only being created for truly temporary jobs. Keeping an employee in a temporary position with no benefits and simply re-appointing them year after year using the loophole of a two week break instead of placing them in an actual regular, benefit-eligible, part-time position is unacceptable to us and to the retirement system. If a department cannot manage with the 120-day break between temporary assignments, it is a good sign that the position should not be classified as temporary in the first place.

It’s a big jump to go from 10-days to 120-days break between service appointments. How many currently employed temporary employees are going to be impacted by these changes?
As of Sept. 23 there were 30 extended temporary employees in the system. In addition, as many as 650 temporary employees will have to reduce
When will these regulation changes go into effect?
On Dec. 13, 2015 the Regulations are final and the 18-month clock will begin. Current Extended Temporary employees will be paid out any accrued annual leave and will receive that pay in the paycheck deposited on Christmas Eve. In the meantime, Statewide HR is creating new queries for tracking these employee types and continuing to conduct lookbacks to determine health plan eligibility under the Affordable Care Act.

What will be done to communicate with those affected?
Campus human resource offices will be reaching out to their affected employees and I will be contacting affected employees at Statewide.

What do supervisors who regularly hire temporary employees need to know about these changes?
The biggest change is that supervisors never worried about benefits for temporary hires until six months or 1,039 hours had passed, now they need to make sure that any new hire that will be working more than 30 hours a week gets down to their local Human Resources office to sign up for the health plan if they want it. This will be particularly important to the employee since all extended temporary employees are deemed as opting out of coverage unless they specifically contact their local human resources office to enroll.

Temporary employees who are also benefits eligible will eventually raise costs through changes in the benefit rate charged, so supervisors also need to keep that in mind for the long haul.

There also may be departments that need to reclassify positions to create a reduced-contract regular position instead of a temporary one. Any supervisors in this position are encouraged to talk with their regional human resources department.

How can I find out more about these changes?
In the coming months I will hold forums, create and distribute FAQs, and am always available to answer questions, speak with a group or otherwise answer the questions of the university community.
Rural Affairs Committee Notes – Oct. 2015
Submitted by Chris Brooks, Chair

Roll Call: Evelyn, Chris, Mercedes, Stacy

Agenda Items

We will experiment using Google Hangouts in our meeting on 10/14. Future meetings via Google Hangouts may change depending on rural site connectivity. We are inviting other Staff Council Members to join if they would like to test.

Sikuliaq: While the crew is at sea, communication is limited. Crew are paying out of pocket and not receiving timely reimbursement. Documentation tends to be late (for both submitter and processor); missing receipts for food, equipment, lodging, toiletries, etc. Are there ways that we can facilitate better communication to improve processes? Soliciting more information from crew / others.

Video Conference: Departments/VCS are discontinuing units around the state. We are holding conversations concerning any potential impact on Rural Campuses.
Transforming the University of Alaska’s Statewide Office

Statewide Transformation Team Report
Submitted to
President Jim Johnsen

September 2015

Team members:
Bruce Schultz, UAA Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
Rashmi Prasad, UAA Dean College of Business and Public Policy
Nettie LaBelle-Hamer, UAF Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Director Alaska Satellite Facility
Julie Queen, UAF Director Office of Management and Budget
Michael Ciri, UAS Vice Chancellor Administrative Services
Maren Haavig, UAS Assistant Professor of Accounting, Senate Faculty President
Carla Beam, UA Vice President University Relations, President UA Foundation
Michelle Rizk, UA Chief Strategy, Planning and Budget Officer
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I. The Case for Change

The University of Alaska’s Statewide (SW) office exists to provide leadership, broad policy and strategic direction, and a certain level of support to the three universities in its system. An effective SW entity will be lean, smart, and valued for its service. It will demonstrate clarity with regards to its purpose and system-level strategic direction, foster collaborative decision-making, and help to ensure resources invested in the system are strategically applied.

In March 2015, President Gamble established the SW Transformation Team (SWTT) to review the SW office programs and services and make recommendations to ensure SW work is tied to its essential purpose, efficient in use of resources, and effective in delivering results. (See Appendix.)

This report identifies SW’s essential roles, provides broad analysis of structural, cultural and management issues that will be important for UA’s new president and his leadership teams to consider, and it makes recommendations for specific changes to functional areas.

The recommendations involve a mix of reductions in functions or positions, changes in the work being done, and changes in work effectiveness. Some observations are focused on specific cultural improvements and customer service. The size and work of SW staff has evolved over time. Healthy levels of state funding and ongoing institutional growth, among other conditions, have led it to where it is today.

It is important to note that this review was not commissioned primarily as a budget exercise. The current fiscal climate; the changing education environment in Alaska and nationally; and changing expectations of students, policy makers, and the public made it imperative to transform SW to deliver a strong and sustainable set of core services and functions in support of the entire UA system. That said, certain efficiencies will generate budget impacts at SW and at the universities.

II. Purpose and Scope of Work

The team identified four essential roles for SW and distinguished areas of accountability that are the responsibility of the system’s three universities.

The four essential roles of SW are:

1. **External Relationships**: serving as Board of Regents (BOR) support and a single system voice when needed

2. **Compliance**: providing legal interpretation and system-level risk assessment

3. **Steward of Shared Strategic Resources**: overseeing assets such as non-educational lands, the UA network, and the consolidated endowment

4. **Leadership, Governance and Strategic Vision**: establishing system-level strategic direction, fostering collaboration to achieve UA mission, and leadership to address conflicting objectives
The universities are responsible for:

1. Direct services to UA components (students, faculty, staff, facilities)
2. University functional operations and transaction processing
3. Maintenance of data that supports individual universities and UA as a whole

The review process described in the next section led to four general recommendations which were applied after reviewing each functional area. These were:

1. Move the function to one (or more) of the system’s three universities
2. Restructure the function within SW
3. Modify the function, services and/or positions (may require moving remaining services to a university or another functional group at SW)
4. Maintain current function at SW

**Review Process:**
The Statewide Transformation Team was formed intentionally, taking into account representation, individual attributes, and collective knowledge and experience. It includes two members each from SW and the three universities. Each team member has the following attributes:

- ability to balance analytical skill with action-orientation
- strategic and creative thinker
- collaborative
- big picture perspective - sees needs of entire system and UA’s impact or potential impact on Alaska

Collectively, the team has experience in business and organizational planning, institutional reorganization, process change and improvement, and delivery of services needed to support higher education. Team members are listed on the cover page of this report.

The team’s work started with research, reviewing past reports including the Fisher Report (2011) and MacTaggart/Rogers Report (2008). It involved an analysis of the functioning and structure of UA SW as compared with appropriate peer university systems and included interviews with key SW leaders, leadership at the three universities, and leaders at the peer comparator institutions. SW functional leaders were asked to review their areas, providing information on primary functions, changes in staffing and budget between FY11 and FY15, the basis for their function’s existence (e.g. policy, Federal or State regulations and laws, accreditation requirements), impacts of not doing the function, and recommendations on improvement or change to the function. SW governance solicited input from staff on efficiencies and improvements. Finally, the information gathered from functional leads was assembled into a functional organization chart and further feedback solicited. (See Appendix).

In addition to reviewing key functions, roles, and staffing levels, the team identified other important areas through which to understand and assess the structure and functioning of SW. These included:

1. **Organizational culture and management mindsets:** Do the shared values, norms and management mindsets of SW staff reinforce a service culture in meeting the needs and
priorities of the universities and working collaboratively with them to establish rational system-level policies?

2. **Decision-making processes and levels**: Does SW function in a way that supports clear and effective decision-making and execution at the universities?

3. **Informational model**: Does SW enable an informational model which optimizes decision-making, delegated to appropriate levels in the context of shared governance at the three universities?

**Observations on Organizational Culture, Management Mindset and Decision-making:**
A prevailing observation that emerged from discussion with SW leadership, university leaders, governance, and team members’ anecdotal experiences was the lack of clarity on the part of a majority of SW functional leaders regarding SW’s essential purpose. In fact, the absence of a SW mission statement was noted by the team.

When functional leaders were asked to speak to their function’s purpose, the dominant response was “compliance.” Few made mention of serving the system’s three universities and nobody connected to the broader mission of the UA system. *(The University of Alaska inspires learning, and advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research, and public service, emphasizing the North and its diverse peoples.)*

This lack of clarity has resulted in:

- absence of a shared purpose within SW
- silos, both within the SW office and between SW and the three universities
- lack of clarity with regard to decision-making – who has responsibility and authority, who should be consulted and informed (RACI) – this will require a review of formal and informal governance groups and how they interact, or do not interact, with one another
- a lack of trust leading to a command and control style and an absence of collaboration between departments at SW and between SW and the universities
- in some departments/units within SW the absence of a service mindset
- arbitrarily-determined decision-making and veto power at multiple levels
- trouble agreeing on appropriate levels of risk
- frustration related to the tension between data integrity and data security/system access
- the inability to gain support for initiatives or move projects through the SW offices on a timeline that keeps pace with the speed and/or needs of business

These issues, if not addressed, will undermine the system’s ability to be innovative, excellent, and resilient. If successfully managed, they will catalyze the system and employees at SW and the three universities to meet the ever evolving education, workforce development, and research needs of Alaska and fulfill the UA’s commitment to attaining the effects contained in Shaping Alaska’s Future.
Requirements for Success:
The team recommends consideration of the following requirements for success as transformation options are implemented:

1. **Any reorganized and remaining SW functions need to reflect a culture change in addition to any structural changes**
   a. shift from a model of control to one of facilitation and support
   b. service to and active collaboration with universities must be incorporated into SW mission and management philosophy

2. **Transfer of a function to a university cannot be a ‘throw it over the fence’ maneuver**
   a. shared SW and university leadership discussion and decision-making will be required in order to agree on a transition plan and timeline for implementation, with expected results
   b. transfer of Full Time Equivalents (FTE) or staff involves buy-in and clarity -- universities must have the option to rehire and organize as they see fit to meet the needs and manage the function in the declining budget climate -- universities should have the authority to determine appropriate salary levels based upon restructured function
   c. resources to cover operating and labor costs should be transferred with functions at a rate or level that is mutually agreed between SW and the university that assumes the function
   d. functions transferred to a university must be managed on behalf of the UA system to provide system-wide support -- a plan to ensure this happens should be developed and agreed upon by the three universities prior to shifting functions
   e. a “lift and shift” model may not be most effective as functions are transferred, some functions may require full restructure in order to gain efficiencies and/or be sustainable in the current fiscal climate

3. **Functions reduced or moved to a university need to be discontinued at SW**
   a. if a university takes on a function, it will own operational and governance responsibilities for that function, include appropriate infrastructure or access to systems
   b. the eliminated function should not be recreated elsewhere in SW
III. Initial Observations by Functional Area

In some functions, certain recommendations have already been implemented or are in process. These involve situations where functional leads took advantage of opportunities, as they occurred, to implement streamlining opportunities. In December, President Johnsen, will make decisions on the recommendations and an implementation plan will be developed. Implementation will begin January 1 and will be completed by July 1, 2016.

The essential roles listed below are those the team believes should be the purview of each functional area, not necessarily the role(s) currently held.

1. Offices of the President and Board of Regents

   Essential Roles: External Relationships, Compliance, Steward of Shared Strategic Resources, Leadership, Governance and Strategic Vision

   Summary: Reorganize this function within SW to improve efficiency and collaboration between the two offices, and consider moving some Board of Regents (BOR) local support functions to the universities.

   Recommendations for Consideration:
   a. Reorganize administrative functions to improve efficiency and sharing of resources and knowledge, and to provide better integration with other departments.
   b. Eliminate less than 1/2 time temporary coordinator position and distribute administrative work to other departments within SW with existing capacity, or utilize a shared service model for administrative support.
   c. Use co-located administrative assistants (e.g. VP Academic Affairs and Research (AAR) admin.) as backup to President's assistant, providing professional growth opportunities and succession planning.
   d. Consider processing travel and procurement requests through existing administrative hubs or staff in other departments (e.g. Office of Information Technology (OIT) business office, General Counsel's office, a shared model among co-located VP level administrative assistants).
   e. Use local (university-based) videoconferencing and administrative support for BOR meetings.
   f. Consider eliminating the temporary housing manager and using an on-call employee as needed for events.
   g. Evaluate the need to hire a special events coordinator who might also serve as a backup in providing travel and procurement services. Assess if position would be full or part time.
   h. Reassign Shaping Alaska’s Future Office work to President’s Office (see further information in Strategy, Planning and Budget section).

2. Finance and Administration (FA)

   Essential Roles: Compliance, Steward of Shared Resources

   Summary: Move certain operational functions to the universities with an agreed upon transfer of resources to provide the functions on behalf of the UA system. Some unique finance and investment functions can only be performed at the UA system level. However, several of these areas should be moved to other SW units/departments for improved efficiency and to reduce the level of duplicate staffing and effort associated with similar work. Additionally, this group recommends that a few functions, currently housed in other areas of SW, be transitioned to FA for better internal alignment of similar duties.
Overarching Recommendations for FA:

a. Examine current level of risk for some specific reporting functions and related staffing including effort/time dedicated to some tasks -- determine if SW is over-resourcing some functions (or under-resourcing).

b. Refine FA work to align with governance/policy role of SW, moving operational functions to the universities or other SW offices where operational functions overlap.

c. Eliminate duplication of technology system management and functions by centralizing and coordinating these functions within SW OIT. Expand access and responsibility for management of operational finance technology systems, permissions, and enhancements/projects to the universities.

d. Move policy functions of Risk Services (e.g. insurance, claims) into FA. Move operational risk functions to the universities. (See further information in General Counsel and Risk Services section.)

e. Consider moving Human Resources policy functions under FA after streamlining to focus on policy level issues. (See additional recommendations in Human Resources section.)

f. Evaluate the number of senior leadership positions.

Recommendations for Consideration by FA Division/Department:

Audit and Consulting Services

a. Maintain policy functions.

b. Regularly review audit staffing levels and adjust staffing to match level of acceptable risk, potentially no less than a three-year review cycle.

c. Ensure adherence to annual audit plans by minimizing ad hoc internal audits.

d. Use audits as a tool to evaluate management practices and decisions, not to police universities. This will require a continued focus on building and maintaining trust.

Controller (Financial Systems, Fund Accounting, Cost Analysis)

a. Transition enterprise management operations to OIT and project management and system enhancements access/controls to the universities with SW Financial Systems serving as a collaborative partner rather than a system or data owner.

b. Move Banner/other Finance system security and access management to the universities and OIT. Coordination and collaboration among the three universities and SW should be used to manage this.

c. Maintain role as custodian of system institutional data and definitions, but clarify who holds responsibility for making decisions about data integrity and definitions. Involve SW and the universities in a discussion to determine if responsibility belongs at SW, with the universities, or is shared equally.

d. Maintain Financial Systems, Fund Accounting, and Cost Analysis roles at a policy and oversight level, ensuring that information is transparent, accessible/available, and reporting is a shared responsibility with the universities.
Records and Information Management

a. Remove from FA, limit to policy level role and move to OIT where Security Oversight functions already exist.

b. Examine senior management positions and consider transitioning technical management functions to a senior level lead position.

c. Move management of the OnBase system to the universities, aligning with the role they already play in operational support and use. Maintain higher level system and maintenance in SW OIT.

Finance and Investment Management (Foundation Accounting, Treasury Services, Education Trust of Alaska, Fund Management)

a. Analyze level of management needed for development and oversight of prudent SW and Foundation investment strategy.

Procurement

a. Eliminate Chief Procurement Officer position at SW and move function to a university.

b. Note: while this position is stipulated by law, there is no requirement that it be located at SW. AS 36.30.005 identifies the purpose as "meeting its responsibility to maintain fair and reasonable procurement practices throughout the university system."

UA College Savings Plan and UA Scholars Program (including system-based scholarships)

a. Maintain only the finance and investment functions for the UA College Savings Plan in FA.

b. Move oversight of student-centered programs, including associated external relationships, to SW AAR.

c. Have SW AAR coordinate with the universities and SW Office of Public Affairs on outreach activities in order to keep student-centered programs more closely coordinated with university-delivered student services.

3. Academic Affairs and Research (AAR)

Essential Roles: External Relationships, Compliance, Leadership, Governance and Strategic Vision

Summary: Maintain those areas that fulfill essential roles, but eliminate or move programmatic and student-centered operational functions to the universities.
Recommendations for Consideration:

a. Maintain leadership of educational policy issues at SW. Assess where it is best located.
b. Transition K-12 Outreach to the universities. Streamline where appropriate.
c. Move workforce development programs to the universities.
d. Maintain system-level workforce development relationships (e.g. Alaska Workforce Investment Board) at SW to ensure alignment with Shaping Alaska's Future. Clarify, remit and assess proper placement of function.
e. Maintain leadership role for system-level industry-related policy decisions at SW.
f. Change focus of Student and Enrollment Services to align with essential roles of SW and consider changing the name to Student and Enrollment Strategy (SES), as the term/name “services” implies operational responsibility.
g. Move student-related services, campaigns and communications to the universities.
h. Utilize newly-named SES to facilitate system-level student scholarship, and tuition policy development.
i. Move Alaska Scholars outreach and external relationships to AAR/SES.
j. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) policy development should be held at SW and be housed in AAR/SES. FERPA compliance should be managed at the universities.
k. Maintain system governance as it is currently structured and located.
l. Transition enterprise management operations to OIT and project management and system enhancements access/controls to the universities, with SW SES serving as a collaborative partner rather than a system or data owner.
m. Move Banner/other student system security and access management to the universities and OIT. Coordination and collaboration among the three universities and SW should be used to manage this.

4. General Counsel (GC) and Risk Services

Essential Roles: Compliance, Leadership, Governance

Summary: Maintain General Counsel work focused on legal advice and guidance, contract review, and elevation of issues that require SW leadership or intervention. Move policy-level Risk Services to FA with operational Risk Services responsibilities transitioning to the universities.

Recommendations for Consideration:

a. Move Risk services to FA, this function is administrative in nature and creates conflicts of interest as currently housed in GC.
b. Focus SW Risk Services work on policy-related operations (e.g. insurance, claims).
c. Move operational Risk Services functions to universities (e.g. emergency management, environmental health, safety and loss prevention) to avoid duplication with services already provided at universities.
d. Evaluate opportunities to streamline SW policy-level Risk Services staff. Evaluate staffing regularly (potentially no less than a three-year review cycle, similar to SW Audit) relative to degree of risk present (e.g. if claims are decreasing, consider needed staffing levels).
5. **Human Resources (HR)**

**Essential Roles:** Compliance, Steward of Shared Resources, Leadership, Governance and Strategic Vision

**Summary:** Consider moving under FA or, if maintained as a standalone function, streamline. Maintain policy level functions at SW. Move operational functions to universities.

**Overarching Recommendations for HR:**

a. Consider moving under FA as this is an administrative function.
b. If moved, consider appropriate level for current Chief Human Resource Officer (CHRO) position. If not moved, streamline with a policy-level focus.
c. Maintain those functions that are policy-related or require consistency across the system (e.g. labor negotiations, job family structure/market analysis, compensation, health benefits).
d. Universities can provide operational HR services for SW staff located in their operating areas.

**Recommendations for Consideration by HR Division/Department:**

**HR Systems**

a. Maintain a role as custodian of UA HR institutional data definitions; however, discussion is needed regarding who holds responsibility for data integrity and data definitions – is it at SW, the universities, or shared in an equal partnership?
b. Transition enterprise management operations to OIT and project management and system enhancements access/controls to the universities with SW HR serving as a collaborative partner rather than a system or data owner.
c. Move Banner/other HR system security and access management to the universities and OIT. Coordination and collaboration among the three universities and SW should be used to manage this.

**Employee and Student Payroll**

a. Move to universities or consider outsourcing.
b. Move UA tax accounting for out-of-state and international students and employees to FA.

**Compensation/Classification and Recruitment**

a. Maintain oversight role for classification and compensation at SW, but work to improve transparency to foster equity and consistency across the system.
b. Regularly review compensation across job families and between universities including criteria for determining placing executive and senior administrative staff, and conduct market analyses on a scheduled interval, providing this information to the President and the universities.
c. Consider collaborative hiring – involve university staff on hiring committees for SW positions, this may increase awareness of services/needs across university boundaries and build relationships.
d. Move recruitment functions to universities with each university providing recruitment support to SW departments in their geographic area.
**Benefits Management, Plan Design and Communication**

a. Maintain health insurance, wellness program, benefit accounting, supplemental benefits design/procurement, and retirement compliance at SW, but consider moving to FA.
b. If maintained in a standalone HR department, look for opportunities to streamline.

**Labor Relations**

a. Retain at SW, but look for opportunities to secure input from universities in labor relations and agreement implementation.
b. Consider moving under GC if HR is moved to FA.

**Training and Development**

a. Eliminate function from SW and partner with universities for needed training.
b. If system standardization is required for particular curriculum, use staff at a lead university to develop. Agreement will be needed among universities to adhere to this standard and track employee training in a consistent (preferably automated) manner.

6. **Strategy, Planning and Budget (SPB)**

**Essential Roles:** External Relationships, Compliance, Steward of Shared Resources, Leadership, Governance and Strategic Vision

**Summary:** Evaluate operational and external reporting functions that could be moved to universities and continue to explore ways to provide service/share staff with University Relations office for advocacy efforts and other communications related to long term plans and budgetary information.

**Recommendations for Consideration:**

a. Eliminate Shaping Alaska’s Future Office and reassign work to Strategy, Planning and Budget Office, University Relations and President’s Office.
b. Support University Relations on Federal relations efforts and ensure Federal and State relations are aligned and taking advantage of leveraging opportunities.
c. Consider reducing State Relations position to a six to nine month contract.
d. Consider refilling vacant Chief Facilities Officer position, as this position is critical to coordinating and advising on system-wide facilities services needs/projects and is supported by the universities.

7. **University Relations (UR) and UA Foundation**

**Essential Roles:** External Relationships, Steward of Shared Resources, Leadership, Governance and Strategic Vision

**Summary:** Realignment of certain functions under UR and expectations of the Foundation to assist in coordinating a system-level fundraising effort support a recommendation to decouple the two and eliminate a SW executive position. This will result in cost savings to the university, while enabling greater focus on its role in support of system fundraising.
Recommendations for Consideration:

a. Move AVP State Relations under the Office of Strategy, Planning and Budget (SPB)
b. Eliminate the Squire Patton Boggs Federal relations contract.
c. Create and fill a new AVP Public Affairs and/or Federal Relations position. *Note: Upon retirement of VP UR, this position to report to the UA President.*
d. Eliminate VP UR position (will occur year-end with retirement of incumbent).
e. Eliminate UR administrative support position.
f. Align efforts and explore ways to work together with SPB and AAR in supporting State and Federal relations efforts.
g. Reassign Shaping Alaska's Future Office work to Public Affairs (see further information in Strategy, Planning and Budget section).

8. Office of Information Technology (OIT) and Enterprise System Management

**Essential Roles:** Compliance, Steward of Shared Resources

**Summary:** IT functions should be evaluated with the overall objective of being policy-centered and focused on creating economies of scale (e.g. maintaining the WAN, core administrative enterprise systems such as Banner, along with the underlying databases). Further discussion and work is needed to implement a consistent strategy for enterprise system management which will help to resolve issues that arose in nearly every functional area.

**Recommendations for Consideration:**

a. Maintenance and upgrade functions for Banner should be centralized under OIT and moved out of other SW functional areas. Evaluate if significant portions of the workload can be outsourced or moved to the universities.
b. Coordination of data definitions and data quality standards should be managed by their respective functional areas in collaboration with the universities.
c. Enterprise system access control and security provision/management should be handled at the university level.
d. Projects and system enhancements should be encouraged. While data standards must be maintained system-wide, individual universities should be empowered to innovate and share solutions which means that projects will be developed and implemented either by university staff, or through outsourced contracts for specialized services.
e. The operational information technology functions for UAF and SW should be managed by UAF. UA should move to a model where host-universities provide core IT services for Statewide staff.
f. Evaluate the OIT Business Office to see if SW can achieve more value if these areas have the potential to serve all of SW as part of a shared service model for administration.
g. Continue to look at outsourcing opportunities for IT functions or contracted/hosted services.

IV. Conclusions and Next Steps

The SWTT believes SW has the potential to lead and serve the entire University of Alaska system in a way that will enable rather than hinder excellence. The SWTT believes there is a clear and purposeful
role for SW administration, and through this process, this role has been refined with agreement from the three universities and SW leadership team (i.e. Summit Team). All actions listed here are intended to clarify and strengthen the focused role of SW, and the SWTT would like to see both functional and cultural change take shape over the specified timeline.

A number of people have asked what is different now that will compel implementation of the recommendations. It is clear that the BOR, state policy makers, students, faculty and staff, and the people of Alaska expect change. The current fiscal climate and changing landscape of education require it. Recent transitions in SW and within university leadership provide an opportunity to establish new ways of doing things that will build upon the Summit Team’s growing collaborative work. Finally, a well-thought out implementation process with clear accountabilities and timelines will ensure it happens. (See Appendix.)
Memorandum

To: Staff

From: Patrick K. Gamble

Subject: SW Transformation Team Formed

Date: March 23, 2015

The University of Alaska system regularly reviews its programs, services and processes to ensure they are tied to mission, efficient in use of resources, and effective in delivering results. Prioritization efforts, program reviews, the annual budget process and Shaping Alaska’s Future are all key drivers of the continuous improvement needed to meet the higher education needs of Alaska. With the fast pace of change in higher education and the state’s deepening fiscal crisis, UA’s three universities have accelerated the pace of program reviews to ensure the budget reduction decisions they make are aligned with the system goal to maintain as strong a core as possible.

Statewide also took its share of cuts in FY15, but it is now time to conduct an even more thorough review of services and programs. Towards that end, Michelle Rizk has been assigned to assemble a small, agile team to conduct this review.

The committee will review SW functions, services, and programs. Questions they will address: What are we doing now? What is essential for a SW staff to do going forward? What’s the best way to accomplish what’s absolutely needed? Consideration will also be given to relocating certain SW functions, services, or programs within any of the three universities.

The estimated eight- to ten-member team will include members from SW and the three universities. While small, one of its first tasks will be to develop a framework for ensuring meaningful communication with and input, feedback and review by the full range of stakeholders throughout the review process. That will include mobilizing ad hoc sub-groups in specialized areas to provide more detailed and technical analysis of specific recommendations before they are sent to the Summit Team for decision.

The team will review MacTaggart/Rogers and Fisher reports to determine what recommendations from those reports have already been implemented and to assess relevance and impact of the remaining recommendations. They will also gather and analyze other ideas. Finally, they will recommend priorities for
action and develop an implementation plan.

It’s important to note this is not primarily a budget exercise. The goal is to define what they are and how we deliver a strong and sustainable set of core services and functions in support of the entire UA system. It is a long-term focused evaluation and planning process that will position UA for the coming years. The plan will be developed for FY17 implementation with certain recommendations put in place earlier where it makes sense and implementation is possible with shorter lead times. This will help to meet state budget reductions we expect in FY16.

I am grateful to everyone at SW for their ideas and energy during a challenging time and recognize that while this transformation process will be good for the University of Alaska system, it won’t be without impact to the people who work here. Michelle is committed to open communication and dialogue throughout this review to ensure you have the information you need to inform your own personal planning and decisions.

With sincere appreciation for the great job you do.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Many Traditions ... One Alaska
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

www.alaska.edu
www.facebook.com/uasystem
Appendix

Academic Affairs & Research
45 Total FTEs; Approx. 13% of SW Unrestricted Budget

System Governance
Coalition of Student Leaders
- Faculty/Staff Alliance
- System Governance Council
- SW Admin. Assembly

State Relations
-Legislative Liaison

Strategy, Planning & Budget
-Budget Prep & Advocacy
- Process/Procedures
- Support Info
- Facilities/Capital Coordination
30 Total FTEs; Approx. 11% of SW Unrestricted Budget

K-12 Outreach
- EED Liaison
- UGO 13

FACILITIES & LAND MANAGEMENT
- Shared Resource Oversight

Future Educators of AK/AK Teacher Placement

K-12 Outreach
- EED Liaison
- UGO 13

Student & Enrollment Services

FERPA Policy Compliance

School Governance
 Coalition of Student Leaders
- Faculty/Staff Alliance
- System Governance Council
- SW Admin. Assembly

Facilities & Land Management
- Shared Resource Oversight

K-12 Outreach
- EED Liaison
- UGO 13

Student System Security & Access Mgmt.
- Access Controls

Shaping AK's Future
- Outreach

FERPA Policy Compliance

External Partnerships
- Resource Mgmt.

Teacher Ed Consortium

Future Educators of AK/AK Teacher Placement

Student System Project Mgmt.
- Projects & System Enhancements
- Third Party Software
- Online Student Services Mgmt.

Asset Mgmt.
- Land Sales
- Revenue Strategy

Stay on Track
- Outreach & Retention Initiative

Student System Project Mgmt.
- Projects & System Enhancements
- Third Party Software
- Online Student Services Mgmt.

Summit Team Support
- Administration

Tuition Proposal Development

Student System Security & Access Mgmt.
- Access Controls

Leadership Development

External Reporting
- Fed/State
- UA System Survey Assessments
- UA in Review

Student Services
- Transfers
- Financial Aid
- Student Services Council

Statistical Analysis
- White Papers
- Institutional/Operational/Policy
- Budget Increment Impact Analysis

TVEP Administration

AK Post Secondary Education Initiatives

Institutional Research, Planning & Analysis

Data Warehousing
- Computational Analysis/Dashboards
- Info Standards/Reporting Defs.
- Data Collection/Scrubbing Procedures
- Data Architecture

External Reporting
- Fed/State
- UA System Survey Assessments
- UA in Review

Student Services
- Transfers
- Financial Aid
- Student Services Council

Statistical Analysis
- White Papers
- Institutional/Operational/Policy
- Budget Increment Impact Analysis

TVEP Administration
### SW Transformation Process Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1-25, 2015</td>
<td>Statewide Transformation Team finalize preliminary report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT/OPA set up website for employee input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 2015</td>
<td>President Johnsen reviews process with Chair Heckman and with President of Statewide Administration Assembly (SAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2015</td>
<td>President Johnsen and Michelle meet with consultant (call) to discuss scope, schedule and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2015</td>
<td>Discussion with Summit Team on SW Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2015</td>
<td>President Johnsen update Board of Regents on SW Transformation process next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25, 2015</td>
<td>Transformation Team preliminary report delivered to President Johnsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29, 2015</td>
<td>President Johnsen distribute report to all Statewide employees with cover memo outlining context, purpose, process and next steps; key topic in President’s staff meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29-October 20, 2015</td>
<td>Input on report received through employee website. Engage consultant for implementation plan development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Individual meetings with President’s Statewide direct reports and their key staff, SAA President and Transformation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29- October 29, 2015</td>
<td>Transformation Team analyze input from Direct Reports and SW employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30, 2015</td>
<td>Transformation Team deliver revised recommendations to President Johnsen, Summit Team and Vice-Chancellors of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2015</td>
<td>Summit Team meeting to advise President on Transformation Team recommendations (include Summit Team members, Transformation Team Members and Vice-Chancellors of Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2015</td>
<td>President Johnsen update Board of Regents on Transformation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>President Johnsen makes decisions on recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1-31, 2015</td>
<td>Implementation plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2016</td>
<td>Implementation begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
<td>Implementation complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 9/29/15