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A wide scope:
- All 8 faculties (700 FTE in scope)
- Major impacts for 3 service divisions
- Includes administrative and teaching support functions

With an extended timeline:
- Business case approved 2012
- Pilot faculty implemented 2013
- Shared Transaction Centre and Staff Service Centre: September 2014
- New faculty positions, structures, processes and services “go-live” October 2014
- Benefit realisation...............ongoing

Our Case Study: The Faculty Administration Review (FAR)
Our goals

1. A consistent, transparent, effective, low-cost faculty administration model
2. Clear career pathways for professional staff
3. Streamlined and largely standardised roles and processes across faculties to increase efficiency of service delivery
4. Strengthened leadership capability of professional staff
5. Consistent and strengthened support for academic heads
6. A consistent, transparent, effective, low-cost faculty administration model
Our state pre-FAR

• Eclectic development of faculty administrations
• About 100 processes requiring faculty activity
• Processes largely undocumented, undertaken differently in each faculty, by different positions with different titles and variable resourcing – hence difficult to bring about improvements
• Poor ability to collaborate with equivalent central functions
• Cost of services is high (e.g. 110,000 financial transactions p.a. @ $11.10 each; best benchmarks @ $6.51; saving $500kpa)
• Barriers to professional staff career advancement because of lack of role clarity (cf clarity for academic careers)
• Unable to benchmark remuneration against external roles
1. Consistent faculty model
2. Provide clear career pathways for professional staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>From 1 October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>410 different job titles for ca 700 staff in scope</td>
<td>36 generic job titles plus some faculty-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to advance very unclear (no common structure)</td>
<td>Clearer progression paths evident for most functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater mobility already apparent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current complexity: Admissions

- 67 FTE
- 217 individuals (average 0.31 FTE each)
- 118 position titles, including:
  - Postgraduate & Research Coord Team Leader - PGrad & Rsch Adm
  - Administrator - Undergrad Admissions
  - Admissions Advisor
  - Coordinator Undergraduate
  - Part One Administrator
  - Student Admin - Undergraduate
  - School Administrator
  - Student Advisor
  - Customer Service Consultant
Current complexity: Administrative support – Departments/Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average FTE</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position titles</td>
<td>142 including:</td>
<td>Only 4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>• Group Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department Administrator</td>
<td>• Group Services Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department Coordinator</td>
<td>• Group Services Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department Secretary</td>
<td>• Group Services Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Departmental Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilities Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty Receptionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secretary Office Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Standardise roles and processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>From 1 October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 34% of faculty staff professional staff in generic roles (≥10 staff with role)</td>
<td>ca 90% in generic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 100 processes requiring faculty activity</td>
<td>- 96 processes documented and accessible to all staff on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many are undocumented</td>
<td>- Procedural and training documentation for 35 priority processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delivered differently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Variety of positions involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Processes and procedures

The way we get things done

The focus of this site at the moment is to provide process and procedural information in support of the FAR programme. It will be regularly updated with information relating to changes to processes and with procedural documentation as it becomes available.

Browse our processes

- Academic Programme Management
- Information System Management
- Communications and Marketing
- Financial Management
- Operational Management
- Strategic Development & Planning
- Student Services
- Human Resources
- Property &Facilities Management
- Student Administration

Procedures on their way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Date Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage Access Cards: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Course and Class Set Up: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Exam Papers: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Examiners &amp; Assessors: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage External Transfer Credit: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Final Results: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Student Completion: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Postgraduate Applications: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Undergraduate Applications: All faculty procedures</td>
<td>5/9/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About these processes and procedures...

These processes were published: 22nd August 2014
Find out what’s changed in this version
Updates to processes will now be published as soon as they are ready. To help you keep up-to-date, a list of changed processes will be available.

Procedural documentation will be added as soon as it becomes available. In order to get the information to you as early as possible, some documents might not be quite finalised. These will show as ‘draft’.

About this site...

This is the beginning of what will be a very valuable resource for staff. It is a little rough around the edges in places but they will be smoothed out as the site evolves.

Something to note:

Search

The site search functionality available at the top right works so please use it. At the moment however, clicking on a search result will take you away from this site. This is being worked on now. In the meantime...

Tips: Opening the link in a new window (by pressing ‘shift’ when you click on the link) will keep this site open in the background.

Your feedback is welcome. Email us at far@auckland.ac.nz
Maturing process management capability.

- **Level 1: Ad Hoc** - No uniform process. Success happens when it happens due to heroic individual action.
- **Level 2: Repeatable** - Processes defined. Basic disciplined approach emerges.
- **Level 3: Defined** - Processes documented & integrated. Planning and forecasting takes place.
- **Level 4: Managed** - Metrics collected. Processes understood and managed using quantitative methods.
- **Level 5: Optimising** - Continuous improvement methods used.

Ability to guarantee reliability, availability and service ranges from Low to High.
4. Strengthen leadership capability of professional staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Benefits phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard leadership positions in each faculty</td>
<td>Leadership development programme – 360, team building, coaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Communities of Practice established across functions | - Common objectives  
- Continuous improvement  
- Problem solving |
5. Strengthened support for Academic Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Variable models of provision of generalist support across departments and faculties | Standard models to access support:  
  • Face to face in Faculty  
  • Staff Service Centre  
  • Online                  |
| No definition of services or service levels for Academic Heads       | Service standards being co-created progressively. |
| No ability to measure support or service quality                     | Reporting being delivered progressively |
| No standard induction or support resources                           | Academic Heads website                  |
Overview of satisfaction drivers

Leadership is its own reward

- 'Make my mark'/make a difference
  - influence & involvement at University level

- Personal growth, extension, learning; rising to the challenge

- 'People listen to me'
  - Prestige (to some extent)

- Guide, support & 'develop my people'

- Advance my school/standing & reputation – autonomy.
  - Passion for 'my school' a key driver

- Involvement, contacts at senior level, feeling included in the loop

- Service – opportunity to contribute

Underpinned by personality-type
Foundation for satisfaction in the role

Relationship with Dean
- Supportive
- Engaged
- Connecting to University strategy with strong context for understanding department

Adequate Resourcing
- Infrastructure aligned with strategy
- Knowledge of budget process and relationship with finance team
- Easy to use tracking reporting systems (e.g. financial, HR).

The Research Office
- Ideally provide strategic input, to spot opportunities for funding
- To take on some of the workload for applications
- To provide strategic guidance – how to win a grant

HR & IT
- Consistent support & training
- Knowing what’s available is important – some gaps here

Departmental Managers, technical & admin. staff
- Skilled professionals
- Integral to team
- Engaged/ dedicated
- Recognised

Cohesive team and Deputy Heads
- To share load
- Collegial approach
- Allowing research time
- Succession planning

Research Assistants
- To make the role manageable
- To some extent doing the donkey work

Admin support
- To manage overwhelm, ‘minutiae’, e-mail overload, but keeping department priorities in mind
- To create ‘thinking time’, research time

Other HODs
- Connecting for support and advice

PhD Students
- To help with their research
- Sense of nurturing their progress
- Love of teaching
How we will measure our success in strengthening support for Academic Heads

- Reporting against service standards
- Regular service satisfaction i.e. “pulse’ checks
- Staff Engagement survey
6. Reduce costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average 3.65 direct reports per manager</td>
<td>Average reports per manager 5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline 700 FTE in scope</td>
<td>139 FTE reduction across 8 faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost transactions</td>
<td>Reduced cost of finance and student administration transactions. Shared Transaction Centre operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process informed by four key elements

- UniForum
- Comparison with Others
- Faculty specific discussions
- Comparison with ourselves
- External Benchmarks (Finance & IT)
UoA Internal Benchmarking

- Started with the Uniforum analysis of the UoA
- Adjusted for known anomalies
- Split categories of service between “standard” and “differentiated” to reflect faculty uniqueness
- Adjusted for size & scale by scaling for student and academic staff numbers
Costs per function varied widely across our Faculties e.g. Student Support Services

- Highest cost Faculty: Cost per EFTS ($000) = $3.8m
- Average 4 Lowest cost Faculties: Cost per EFTS ($000) = $3.5m
- Average 3 lowest cost Faculties: Cost per EFTS ($000) = $2.6m
- Lowest cost Faculty: Cost per EFTS ($000) = $2.6m
Realising Benefits

1. Starts with each change conversation from planning to post implementation
2. Reflects a Rock Solid business case
3. Requires managing the “heat”
4. Relies on assembling and supporting the right team
5. Happens when committed Sponsors stay the distance
6. Requires anti “evaporation’ interventions
Achieving the change
Effective communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>Change Impact Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Raising Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Raising Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Building commitment and stimulating behaviour change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The consultation process

- Consultation commenced 14 April and closed 16 May
- 883 submissions were received
- University-wide issues were considered by a University Review Committee
- The process added value and strengthened the proposals
The consultation process
Keeping the conversations going

- Communities of Practice
- Academic Heads Website
- Academic Heads Forum
2. Have a rock solid business case
Planning at the start

- Better Business Case Framework
- Investment Logic Maps
- Benefit Maps
- Benefit Realisation
3. Managing the heat
The Heatmap View | Pre ‘Go-Live’

### Organisational Change Heat Map Plot

#### Change Impact Scale
- 0 = No Impact
- 1 = Low Impact
- 5 = Medium Impact
- 9 = High Impact

#### Total Change Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Strategic Impact Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Administration Review Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Academic Qualifications Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic English Language Requirements (AELR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Intelligence and Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Managing Capital Program Transitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Building Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Campus Strategy (including Newmarket/Eng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Building City Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Growing International Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;E Postgrad Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Processes and Delegations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d) Major Research Funding Bids (CoREs, National Science Challenges etc)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Heatmap View | Post ‘Go-Live’

#### Organisational Change Heat Map

- **KEY**
  - High Impact
  - Medium Impact
  - Low Impact

- **CHANGE IMPACT SCALE**
  - 0 = No Impact
  - 1 = Low Impact
  - 5 = Medium Impact
  - 9 = High Impact

#### TOTAL CHANGE IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Strategic Impact Initiatives</td>
<td>Faculty Administration Review Programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Administration Review Benefits Realisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic English Language Requirements (AELR)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Reading Lists implementation project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Policy and Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBRF QE 2018 Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Intelligence and Reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Assemble and support the right team
5. Committed sponsors that stay the distance
6. Avoiding benefit evaporation!
Bedding in process change
Delivering well

Staff Service Centre
Satisfaction Levels

- Quarter 1
- Quarter 3
Introducing new controls

- Job descriptions
- Position Maintenance
- Budgeting FTEs
- Processes
- Policies
Questions?
Thank You