OE RESOURCE REQUEST APPLICATION

University of California, Berkeley

I. SPONSORSHIP

A. Initiative

Initiative	High Performance Culture - METRICS Subgroup		
Initiative Manager	Mary Keegan		
Phone		E-Mail	

B. Sponsorship

Sponsor Name	Rich Lyons		
Sponsor Signature		Date	
Sponsor Name	Jeannine Raymond		
Sponsor Signature		Date	
OE Program Office Signature		Date	

C. Give the title of the resource

Metrics

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT/CASE FOR CHANGE

A. Identify and describe what needs the proposed solution is seeking to address.

1. Guidelines and Best Practices: Need to aid units in the design of assessment processes. These include both *horizontal* assessments where cross-unit interdependencies arise (e.g., shared services) and *vertical* assessments where a specified future state ("vision") is translated into supporting strategy and goal-setting at all levels.
2. Effective Tools: Need for effective tools for measurement and reporting. These tools would provide information useful for the process of continuous assessment.
3. Culture of Assessment: Need for stronger norms of continuous assessment in order to take a proactive stance in identifying and responding to new challenges and to continuously improve.

B. Describe the solution that is being proposed to meet the identified need(s).

The proposed solution is a set of recommendations for implementing a system for on-going assessment and continuous improvement across the Berkeley campus. These include: • Reporting tools: units can modify/adapt to create meaningful measures of unit performance; templates and

examples of best practices from Berkeley campus and elsewhere that units could access as they develop their metrics and assessment protocols
- Training: carried out by COrWE, to aid deans, department chairs and managers in developing their assessment plans and metrics
- Building commitment: to development and use of metrics at the unit-level for decision-making and evaluation
- Direction-Setting: Clear direction from the Chancellor's Cabinet and Council of Deans for the systematic use of metrics at all levels

C. Describe the alternate approaches you evaluated in the process of developing this proposal and why those alternatives were not selected.

Preliminary research into practices at the Universities of Illinois, Michigan (ProClarity), Minnesota, and Pennsylvania (balanced scorecard) determined that these campuses have adopted various approaches and tools but did not provide sufficient information to accurately judge their systems (see appendix).

The article, "Academic Analytics: The Uses of Management Information and Technology in Higher Education" by *Philip J. Goldstein,* EDUCAUSE, http://www.educause.edu/ers0508 describes several alternative types of systems for tracking performance. In increasing order of sophistication, these are:

- Transaction system only
- Operational data store without any extract, transform and load tools (ETL)
- Operational data store used in conjunction with ETL and reporting tools
- Data warehouse with ETL and no dashboards
- An enterprise-wide data warehouse used in conjunction with ETL tools, reporting tools, executive dashboards, or alerts.

The metrics package proposed here would require the most sophisticated alternative, an enterprise-wide data warehouse with dashboards and ETL tools. The others were thought to be insufficient because they tracked transactional data only, did not integrate data from multiple sources, or were not flexible enough to enable units to develop metrics that were most relevant to their mission.

According to "University of California, San Diego: Increasing Operational Efficiencies Through Business Process Redesign and Analytics", J. Pirani and B. Albrecht, ECAR Case Study 10, 2005, UCSD has developed academic analytic tools to help managers and staff members administer their business operations more effectively. They have used a balance scorecard to support managerial efforts since 1993. *To create the scorecard, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, Relyea, developed a 9-point strategic plan that links the university's mission and the scorecard*. Key systems that they improved or put in place as a result:

1. Central data warehouse, that lets users access data across the institution for decision making, contains all types of information (financial, student, personnel), and offers two levels of queries – pre-packaged standard reports and user-guided queries with flexible parameters.

2. Dashboard that allows local data to be incorporated into reports with central data, has regular updates (daily, weekly or monthly), and is sharable and customizable. The tool they use is called MyDashboard. The users are typically business officers, fund managers, and other fiscal employees. *The Physics Department has developed customized dashboards, and when they held a daylong workshop for interested people in other departments over 90 people attended.* It was noted in the case study that people need the time and training to learn these new systems.

More details about the use of academic analytics on the UC San Diego campus can be found in the appendix. This case study confirmed our selection of the most sophisticated alternative. (See

appendix).

On the Berkeley Campus, we studied ERSO, UC Berkeley's shared service center for Engineering Research, which has established metrics system to track the performance of its organization. We carried out a series of in-depth interviews to learn about the assessment tools and practices they have used to create and maintain a high performance organization. Those interviewed included the current Director, the Director of Human Resources, Team Leads, staff, Faculty and Staff (customers). Our focus in these interviews was on the evaluation and assessment tools and practices used by ERSO as a shared service organization. We found the following factors to be important to the unit: prominence of the mission in day-to-day decision making; regular formal assessment from the customer; continuous opportunities for informal input coupled with monitoring of this input; strong communication within the organization; staff and customer training on the use of the tools. A more detailed summary of our findings can be found in the appendix.

IMPACT AND STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

A. Describe how the proposed solution aligns with the OE goals:

- Reduce administrative costs and enable the campus to direct more resources to teaching and research
- Advance an effective and efficient operating environment
- Instill a culture of continuous improvement that leads to high quality performance and outcomes

The proposed solution will put in place mechanisms (tools and protocols) for feedback and evaluation of units and shared service centers that support the creation and evolution of an effective, efficient, and responsive operating environment. We expect that these practices would lead to outcomes such as:

1. Training, protocols, and clear direction from campus leaders would lead to individuals at all levels being versed in our operating principles and seeing how these OPs align with the mission of their Unit/Shared Service Center, Department, College, Campus. This we think would translate into better decision making
2. Regular Assessment and reporting of unit performance would uncover areas of inefficiencies and lead to a more effective and efficient operating environment.
3. Continuous input and monitoring at the unit level would enable continuous improvement
4. Incorporating metrics into routine operations would enable staff to anticipate new directions, think beyond the current state of affairs, and take a pro-active stance toward meeting upcoming challenges.

B. Identify any other anticipated benefits in implementing the proposed solution.

1) We anticipate that requirements of regular assessment would lead to the stronger communication within the organization and between the organization and its customers.

2) Increased recognition of good work (and bad work) because the metrics would make individual's performance evident.

C. Identify the risks of not implementing the solution.

Benefits of shared services are unlikely to be realized without a successful assessment approach.

It will be difficult to create and maintain a culture for continuous improvement without clear direction from campus leadership, broad adoption of the operating principles, and adequate software and training for developing protocols for incorporating metrics into the work place.

Continual deterioration of services to faculty and students. Metrics alone are not sufficient to "pull the trigger" on risky initiatives. This will likely lead to faculty retention issues with heavy impact on academic excellence.

D. Describe the constituency that is intended to benefit from the proposed solution (e.g. students, faculty, staff, 1-many units)

Horizontal Assessment: Deans and Chairs throughout the campus will be major beneficiaries of effective practices for assessing shared-services units. This fact is important to our change management plan.

Vertical Assessment: Staff in particular, but also students and faculty, see significant benefit in the kind of "line of sight" that is created when desired future states are articulated, strategies are determined to achieve them, and goals are set at all levels that align with them.

More broadly, students, faculty and staff across campus are expected to benefit from the proposed metrics protocols and software.

E. Describe the extent to which this proposed solution is a collaborative effort either within campus or with external partners.

- The proposed solution is a collaborative effort across the campus.
- Effective metrics are most often user-defined, which necessitates collaboration.
- It must involve behavior changes at the leadership level, as well as, faculty and staff.
- Communications in both/all directions is also crucial.

F. If applicable, describe how the proposed solution may enable additional projects to be considered.

Refocusing/reprioritizing of work may occur as a result of measuring performance. In areas where performance falls short, new initiatives may be launched to find a better way to accomplish goals/refocus priorities.

G. What is the impact of the proposed solution on the existing systems and processes? Does it eliminate the need for existing systems and processes?

Currently no metrics tools or existing system. We do have data that would feed into the system, e.g., HCM, BFS and new replacements of system-wide level of payroll system and HR information system.

H. What is the impact on the proposed solution on the workload?

The impact is yet to be determined.

Profile/Impact in hours	Current Workload	1-time workload requirement	Ongoing workload requirement

Student	None	None	None
Staff	Low	Medium	Low
Faculty	None	Low: Some faculty will help to establish user-defined metrics for shared services.	Low: Faculty will have opportunity to provide input and feedback.

III. WORK PLAN AND PROPOSED SOLUTION DESIGN

A. Provide a statement of:
- Deliverables — results the solution must deliver to achieve the stated objectives.
- Constraints — factors that may limit the options for providing the solution (*e.g., an inflexible deadline*).

DELIVERABLES

The deliverables for this proposed solution is a set of new processes for on-going assessment and continuous improvement across the Berkeley campus. We expect these to include: new administrative structure(s), processes and protocols, and technological systems to efficiently provide optimal service to Faculty and Students, while supporting a healthy working environment for Staff. More specifically, these include:

Reporting Tools & Templates: IS&T will develop or purchase reporting tools and templates that units can modify/adapt to create meaningful measures of unit performance, as part of new processes for assessment and continuous improvement across the Berkeley campus. We expect the new assessments to be applied to structures, processes, protocols and systems. These tools must access reliable data and provide:

- Methods for ensuring that goals are aligned across different levels on the campus.
- Templates and examples of best practices from Berkeley campus and elsewhere that units could access as they develop their metrics and assessment processes.
- Protocols for ensuring that unit goals are aligned with Berkeley's operating principles across different levels on the campus.

Training & Consulting Support:

- Pilot and conduct training series to assist leaders of units to develop unit-appropriate protocols and reports and design their assessment practices. We anticipate COrWE will oversee this training and additional staff will be needed for these efforts. In the 2011-12 academic year, 8 workshops for 25 people each will be carried out for initial training of unit managers, department chairs, and deans, and appropriate dean's staff.
- Specialized staff will consult with deans, chairs, and relevant staff as they develop their assessment plans and customize reporting tools.

Building Commitment: Foster an environment of proactive engagement with the Campus, regular assessment, communication within the organization, and recognition of good work. We expect that

- Operating principles, e.g. knowledge-based continuous improvement, would directly align with the use of the metrics package and a communication campaign would be mounted to promote the use of the metrics package to achieve these operating principles.
- Commitment from the highest levels of leadership to have a 360-review where they are measured against these operating principles.

Direction

- Chancellor's Cabinet and Council of Deans will set clear expectations in the use of metrics at all levels.

CONSTRAINTS

The proposed solution is a collaborative effort across the campus and must involve behavior changes at the leadership level, as well as, faculty and staff.

New technological systems must be tied to reliable data sources and be broadly accessible.

Administrative structures need inherent flexibility to allow administrative support allocation to meet changing demands and allow for continuous improvement (e.g. workloads are such that managers have time to meet and plan; staff are able to deliver quality service vs. quantity)

B. Provide a work plan for the proposed solution with high-level steps to complete the solution, including timeline. (Try to limit your plan to no more than seven steps.) ****This timeline is dependent other OE initiative outcomes******

	MILESTONE	FUNCTIONAL OWNERSHIP	TIMELINE
1.	Select Team to oversee implementation of Metrics Package and hire 1 FTE (for 4 months) support staff. Team member recommendations: the appropriate team may be the existing Institutional Data Council or a sub-team it creates with representatives from ABOG Management Council, CAO, CUAs, Academic Senate, COrWE, IS&T; faculty with experience as academic department head.	OE Program Office or Institutional Data Council[1]	June 1, 2011
2.	Team studies existing tools & structures (on/off campus) Coordinates with OE Groups: IT; Org. Simp.; Shared Services Pilots training session for developing assessment program with units on campus	HPC Metrics Implementation Team	June 1 – September 30, 2011
3.	Team formulates recommendation; publish suite of best practices and templates for evaluation process, including outcomes from the pilot training sessions.	HPC Metrics Implementation Team	October 1-November 30, 2011
4.	Submit draft recommendations to Institutional Data Council	HPC Metrics Implementation Team	December 1 – January 30, 2012
5.	Recommendations to Chancellor's cabinet and Council of Deans	HPC Metrics Implementation Team	February 1-28, 2012
6.	Discussion among senior leaders and endorsement of recommendations	HPC Metrics Implementation Team	March 1-31, 2012
7.	COrWE begins training series, mount Web site. Location recommendation: COrWE and UC Learning Center.	COrWE	April 1 – July 31, 2012
8.	Implementation of technical systems – a clearing house of best tools	IS&T	Dependent on IT
9.	Communication campaign	AVC Communications	March 1- June 1, 2012
10.	Assessment of initial steps	HPC Metrics Implementation Team	2012

C. What are the data requirements for the proposed solution?

New technological systems must be tied to reliable data sources that are broadly accessible (i.e., the enterprise-wide data warehouse note above, the components of which are largely in place).

D. What are the technical requirements for the proposed solution?

The metrics package proposed here would require academic analytics software that accesses an enterprise-wide data warehouse that integrates data from multiple sources and allows the inclusion of local data and that includes flexible reporting tools that are flexible enough to enable units to develop metrics that are most relevant to their mission.

E. What are the greatest risks for the proposed solution and the plan to reduce or eliminate the risks?

[1] Institutional Data Council co-chaired by Erin Gore and Shel Waggner.

	RISK	MITIGATION PLAN
1.	Metrics that are more trouble to produce than they are worth.	For horizontal assessment, ongoing communication between users and shared-service units will continually review cost/benefit tradeoffs of various measures. For vertical assessment, units leaders will receive training and periodic reminders to review their key metrics and cease using those that are less useful.
2.	Metrics that are not sufficiently tethered to desired outcomes.	This is more relevant for vertical assessment. Guidelines, best practices, and training will all focus on mitigating this risk – tethering tightly to desired outcomes is the central objective.
3.	Metrics that support efficiency but stifle innovation.	Training on use of assessment approaches will provide insights into how they can inadvertently stifle innovation and how to avoid this.
4.	Metrics that are not backed by commitment across campus.	Heavy emphasis on communication by Chancellor, Deans, and other senior leaders on the benefits from establishing and sharing metrics.

F. How does the proposed work plan allow for evaluation and course correction to ensure the outcomes meet the campus needs?

The HPC Metrics Implementation Team will perform an assessment of the use of metrics after initial implementation and make adjustments as needed.

V. CHANGE MANAGEMENT

A. What is the change management plan to successfully implement the outcomes of the proposed solution?

Impacted Groups

- Staff, faculty and students whose work is reflected in the metrics collected and reported.
- All those who help prepare the metrics.
- Managers who take information from the metrics to inform business process changes.

New Roles

Staff working in units that supply metrics to decision-makers will have a different orientation to their work; they will review metrics and see opportunities for improvements.

Governance

Development and support for organizational metrics at unit and higher levels of aggregation is consistent with the work of the Institutional Data Council. This Council includes members from all major computer data sources and should be considered as a possible home for coordinating metrics.

New Competencies

Behavior changes emphasizing the importance of commitment to metrics are needed at all leadership levels.

- Chancellor's Cabinet and CoD must support a systematic use of metrics at all levels, e.g. all units of a certain size must participate. COrWE needs to take responsibility for promotion and implementation *after* cabinet and CoD endorsement.
- The annual review of a unit's performance and manager's performance will be aligned with the established mission of the unit and use evidence-based feedback.

How New Competencies will be Attained

Training workshops must be required for unit managers, department chairs and appropriate dean's staff in order to assist them with development of evaluation plans that are tied to the mission and purpose of the unit and create a clear line of sight from the unit to the institutional goals.

Communication Plan

Communication plans begin at the unit level in those units that actively adopt metrics. As higher levels of aggregation of metrics occur, more comprehensive communication plans will need to be developed.

Communications will provide tangible examples of benefits derived in campus units from great commitment to metrics.

Engagement Plan
Managers will receive training in how to develop staff engagement in the collection and use of metrics for process improvement and include client satisfaction.

Resistance & Mitigation Plan
One area where substantial high-level commitment already exists is around accountability of the emerging shared-services units ("no interdependence without accountability"). This high-level commitment is anchored at the decanal level. We propose that the implementation team harness this commitment and build upon the solid foundation it provides. This will mitigate any resistance both above at the Chancellor's Cabinet level and below throughout the campus.

B. What incentives and/or disincentives are proposed to influence behavioral changes necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed solution?

Incentives
A well-designed and easy-to-use system that documents clear goals, performance measures and results can in itself be motivating and encourage continuous improvement. Benefits from horizontal metrics to assess shared-services units will be evident and clear. Benefits from vertical metrics that align goal-setting at all levels with strategies and desired future states are particularly motivating for our people.

Disincentives
Unit managers who do not use metrics will be apparent in the system. This will be reflected in the performance evaluations. Shared services units can be disbanded.

C. Who has been identified as the change leaders and implementers to carry out the changes necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed solution?

Change Leaders
Chancellors' Cabinet and CoD
Deans and Chairs
Institutional Data Council

Implementation Team
Team member recommendations: representatives from Institutional Data Council (which may have a sub-team), ABOG Management Council, CAO, CUAs, Academic Senate, COrWE, IS&T; faculty with experience as academic department head.

IV. FUNDING MODEL AND BUDGET

A. Could the proposed solution move forward with partial funding? If yes, describe the revised scope, including the associated savings impact.

Initial (Development) costs: to be developed by Institutional Data Council. Suggestions include:

- 4 months of 1FTE produce examples of best practices and templates for use in the evaluation process. ($40k)
- Develop (or purchase) software tools that offer systems to measure, report, and reference performance at the unit level. ($100K – This is an estimate that assumes these tools would be developed/purchased in conjunction with related tools and data warehouse. At UCSD, costs were 0.5 FTE for one year to develop and acquire free software for their system.)
- Develop a Website that makes guidelines and templates available to campus. The Website would be

located on COrWE Webpage with link to materials located on the Learning Center site. Cost Neutral

- 0.5 FTE to Design and develop (make or buy) a training program on the concepts of measuring unit performance and alignment with unit's mission. ($60K)
- 8 workshops for 25 people each (200 total) carried out over a one-two year time period. ($80k)

B. What is the plan for sustainable funding to support ongoing operations of the proposed solution?

On-going costs:

- Maintain Website with up-to-date links to resources available on campus (Cost neutral)
- 0.5 FTE staff (in COrWE) to offer on-going workshops, and to assist and coach individual units with design and implementation of their evaluation plans. ($60K)
- Culture of continuous improvement will require staff practices to change to become more evidence-based, improvement-oriented, and in alignment with the unit mission. (Cost neutral)
- Possible on-going software updates ($20k – see above assumptions about the software)

C. Please download and fill out the OE Resource Request Budget Template located at [location] and follow the instructions on the first worksheet in the workbook to complete the budget ant line descriptions. Include both completed sheets with the Resource Request.

VI. ASSESSMENT PLAN

Please use the table below to detail your metrics.

METRIC CATEGORY	SPECIFIC MEASURE	MEASURE BASIS	DATA COLLECTION METHOD	DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY	FUNCTIONAL OWNER OF DATA COLLECTION	LARGER GOAL TO WHICH METRIC RELATES
EXAMPLES:						
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE						
1 Reduction in average price of office supplies	*Avg price*	*Per item*	*Look at vendor catalogs*	*Quarterly, first day of each quarter*	*Procurement Director*	*Overall reduction of 15% in average price of office supplies*
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE						
1 Reduction in average processing time per transaction	*Avg person-hours required*	*Per transaction*	*Survey of transaction processors*	*Semi-annually*	*Director of Billing*	*Reduction of 20% in average transaction processing time*
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE						
1) Reduction in unit-level spend for activities now supplied via shared services	Total spend on a given shared service	Per unit	Units provide prior spend for comparable service	Annual	Unit financial manager, aggregated by HPC Metrics Implementation Team (HPC MIT)	Efficiency gain from moving to a shared-services environment
2) Efficiency in making budget tradeoffs due to guidance from vertical assessment	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey of unit financial managers, including VC Budget and Admin	Annual	HPC MIT	Efficiency gain from better decision support
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE						
1) Tools & templates – pervasiveness of use	# in use		Survey unit managers	Annual	HPC MIT	TBD by Institutional Data Council

		Per unit				
2) Data warehouse – ease of use and effectiveness	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey unit managers	Annual	HPC MIT or Institutional Data Council	Efficiency gain from better decision support
PRODUCT / SERVICE QUALITY						
1) Evaluation of training relating to metrics	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey unit managers	Annual	COrWE	Efficiency gain from better decision support
2) Evaluation of templates and tools for metrics	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey unit managers	Annual	COrWe	Efficiency gain from better decision support
EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION						
1) Staff satisfaction with metrics use	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey staff	Frequency of climate survey	Climate survey team	Efficiency gain from better decision support
2) Faculty satisfaction with metrics use	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey faculty	Frequency of climate survey	Climate survey team	Efficiency gain from better decision support
3) Student satisfaction with metrics use	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey selected students (e.g., student leadership)	Bi-annual	HPC MIT	Efficiency gain from better decision support
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION						
1) Shared-services user satisfaction	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey users	Annual or semi-annual	HPC MIT or Org Simplification Implementation Team	Quality maintenance following move to a shared-services environment
2) Deans and Chairs user satisfaction	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey all Deans and Chairs	Annual	HPC MIT	Efficiency gain from shared services and better decision support
3) Senior staff user satisfaction	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey all senior staff	Annual	HPC MIT	Efficiency gain from shared services and better decision support
4) VC Admin and Budget satisfaction	Survey question	Scale 1-5	Survey the VC Admin and Budget	Annual	HPC MIT	Efficiency gain from shared services and better decision support
PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY						
1)						
2)						
SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE						
1)						
2)						

APPENDEX - ERSO Case Study

The metrics subgroup of the High Performance Culture Initiative of Operational Excellence examined Engineering Research Support Organization (ERSO). ERSO is a shared service that provides research administration support to all faculty, research centers, and affiliated ORUs in the College of Engineering. It's stated mission is:

The Engineering Research Support Organization was designed and created with the following goals:

- Provide optimal Research Support to College of Engineering faculty through experienced, well-trained teams of Research Support staff.
- Knowledgeable in sound business and research administration practices, financial management and quality service delivery.
- Cross-trained to allow maximum use of resources.
- Structured with inherent flexibility to allow proper research support allocation to meet changing demands.
- Current with regard to all pertinent policies and procedures.
- Responsible for adherence with University Principles of Accountability.
- Consistent in policy interpretation and application.

Our aim was to learn about the ways in which ERSO tracks the performance of its organization; responds to needs of its clients and staff; and maintains alignment with the mission of the unit and of the university. The particular focus of our case study was on the metrics and processes that ERSO has in place to create and maintain a high performing workplace. We also thought it would be informative to learn why ERSO was established, and how and why its approach to evaluation of its services has evolved. Our study included interviewing staff working in ERSO at all levels, staff who interface with ERSO, and faculty who use ERSO.

With the exception of an initial joint interview with Cathy Jen and Cynthia Weekley, we held individual interviews with the following people:

Professor Costas Spanos (Associate Dean of Research, COE – at time of ERSO inception); Cathy Jen, Director; Cynthia Weekley, HR Director; Jane Doyle, Research Support Team Lead; Yulia Golubovskaya, Research Support Officer; Kathy Schermerhorn-Cousens, Faculty Research Assistant; MaryAnne Peters, Faculty Research Assistant; Professor Panos Papadopoulos, Mechanical Engineering; Professor Andrew Lim, IEOR

The following is a brief summary of our findings. We have limited them to topics related to our subgroup goals- modes of assessment/metrics implemented by ERSO.

1. Prominence of the Mission of shared service
    a. All employees have the mission of the unit on the tip of their tongue
    b. Customers are aware of the mission
    c. Clear statement of services provided

2. Regular Assessment from the Customer
    a. Strong faculty advisory board
    b. Originally in set up did a design study + baseline survey
    c. Then regular annual surveys

3. Continuous input and monitoring
    a. Instant feedback – reviewed biweekly; IT person reviews the instant feedback;
    b. Workloads are such that the managers have time to meet and plan
    c. Leadership (Jen & Weekly) open-door policy for staff and customers

4. Communication within the organization
    a. Regular Meetings (e.g. bi-weekly breakfast)
        i. Meet as teams
        ii. Meet with peers (without supervisors) to trouble shoot
        iii. Team leads meet with supervisors
    b. Communication via the Intranet
    c. Tracking a whole project to see where it is in the process – everyone can see all of the pieces.
    d. Accountability is to all from beginning to end

5. Recognition of good work (and bad work)
    a. Rewards for employee – Scoop Salute celebrate bimonthly; nominate monthly by anyone but self (e.g. co-workers, supervisors, faculty)
    b. Annual performance evaluations; 100% participation, input from customers

6. Anticipate new directions (rather than be in response mode)
    a. Volunteer work on related projects all the time
    b. Creates a pro-active positive community

7. Staff Training
    a. Experts in field, access to them
    b. Send to external meetings/workshops
    c. Staff become specialists, not generalists, not clerical
    d. Both on-boarding and continuous

8. Customer Training
    a. In-person training on systems
    b. Visit customers

9. Make small investments with high leverage (client and staff)
    a. Support for workshop in new research area

ERSO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

We form a subgroup of the High Performance Culture Initiative of Operational Excellence, and our subgroup's charge is to investigate metrics and processes that create and maintain a high performing workplace. As part of our investigation, we are studying ERSO as a case study for how a shared service might operate. Our study includes interviewing staff who work in ERSO, staff who interface with ERSO, and faculty who use ERSO. We aim to learn about the ways in which ERSO tracks the performance of its organization; responds to needs of its clients and staff; and maintains alignment with the mission of the unit and of the university.

As a customer of ERSO, we are interested in getting input on/hearing your perspective on the following:

1. What do you see as the goals of ERSO? Do these goals connect to your interactions with ERSO? If so, how?

2. What mechanisms are available to you to convey your ideas for improvement or concerns and problems? Have you taken advantage of these avenues for providing input? Have you seen others do so? If so, how did the organization respond and what was the outcome?

3. Do you see ERSO adapting and/or continuously improving? If so, how does it accomplish this?

4. What tools and guides are provided to assist you in interfacing with ERSO? How important are these for the effectiveness of the service?

5. Do you think ERSO would be a good model for others to adopt? What features are particularly important to remain intact if it were to be adopted? How scalable do you think it is?

6. Do you have experience working with other shared services organizations? If so, please compare and contrast these experiences, particularly with respect to the above questions?

7. As an administrative staff member what is your vision or expectation of a rewarding work environment that at the same time aligns with the campus mission of academic excellence?

8. If you were working on a set of metrics to assess and monitor your unit's effectiveness and flexibility for continuous improvement, what might they look like? (Name 1-3 examples)

APPENDEX - UCSD Case Study

The following is a summary of: "University of California, San Diego: Increasing Operational Efficiencies Through Business Process Redesign and Analytics", J. Pirani and B. Albrecht, ECAR Case Study 10, 2005.

UCSD developed academic analytic tools to help managers and staff members administer their business operations more effectively. They have used a balance scorecard to support managerial efforts since 1993. *To create the scorecard, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, Relyea, developed the following 9-point strategic plan that links the university's mission and the scorecard*.

- Within limited resources, maintain the most critical support services that will sustain the excellence of the university's academic and clinical programs.
- Simplify procedures and reduce workload for academic and clinical departments.
- Provide our customers with intuitive and flexible tools so they can be successful.
- Reduce cycle time and improve the performance of our essential support services to students, faculty, and staff.
- Provide appropriate development opportunities for university staff.
- Enhance the university's system of financial controls so we maintain the public trust of our stewardship of campus resources.
- Disseminate, promote, and put into action UC San Diego's Principles of Community.
- Enhance methods of communicating with our key customers.
- In the area of technology, migrate the campus to a set of standard protocols and tools that will allow for improved customer support in the future.

According to VC Relyea, "*The balanced scorecard is so ingrained in our culture, we can't imagine not doing it, because it represents our strategic thinking… The basic vision remains the same, though we constantly tweak the strategy and objectives to keep it relevant*."

Systems that they improved or put in place:

1. Central data warehouse, that lets users access data across the institution for decision making, contains all types of information (financial, student, personnel), and offers two levels of queries – pre-packaged standard reports and user-guided queries with flexible parameters.
2. Dashboard that allows local data to be incorporated into reports with central data, has regular updates (daily, weekly or monthly), and is sharable and customizable. The tool they use is called MyDashboard. The users are typically business officers, fund managers, and other fiscal employees. *The Physics Department has developed customized dashboards, and when they held a daylong workshop for interested people in other departments over 90 people attended.* It was noted in the case study that people need the time and training to learn these new systems.

One of the tools developed to help managers and staff members effectively manage their operational areas was a transaction sampling system. *It was discovered that 60% of transactions were under $100 and a large amount of staff time was being spent reconciling these small transactions. With this new tool, transactions were selectively reconciled.* The sampling process was such that 5% of transactions under $100, 5% of transactions between $100 and $500, 16% of those between $500 and $2,500, and all transactions above $2500 were selected to be reconciled. Two important adoption factors: Department could also establish profiles to reconcile specific risk areas; and *the Vice Chancellor indemnified the department on project closeouts* – if an item not examined under the sampling process was questioned, the VC would cover it. All in all, this led to better use of staff time working with PIs on projections, advise on how they are spending dollars, advice in proposal preparation on areas that need more funding.

The case study lists several lessons learned. Three that are relevant to Berkeley:

1. Balance central and local needs – build a similar structure that accommodates university's needs and create opportunities for customization
2. Think integration – use common data, communicate and share projects
3. Turn beta testing into training – involve users in the testing process, quickly respond to user input.

APPENDEX - Other universities

1) University of Pennsylvania: Scorecard Method

- Scorecard created in-house (within department or unit) consisting of a series of topics to be studied and measured. Final scores are examined for areas of improvement.
- Collect Data from a variety of sources
- Collect and use feedback to improve score card effectiveness

Examples of Study Areas

- Salary Management
- Performance Management
- Learning and Education
- Recruitment and Retention

Scorecard Ups and Downs

- Ups:
  - Can build a constructive dialogue between administration and academic/research units about what is going well and what needs improvement.
  - Well-organized and contextualized data can provide useful information and statistics to both ask and answer the right questions across a range of categories.
- Downs:
  - Can create more of the current problems: fractured metrics and reporting systems, miscommunication, confusion, and inefficiency
  - An overflow of poorly-presented and contextualized data can cause the wrong questions to be asked, and can overload the users

2) University of Minnesota: Institution-Level Recommendations

Goal**:** Establish a system-wide standard for excellence in measurement, analysis, and reporting.

4 Institution-Wide Recommendations:

- Engage Leadership Support, recognizing need for upper-admin support for any changes.

- Foster Agreement on Use of Metrics and Analytic Tool, standardization of data collecting and reporting practices across units with "an emphasis on dashboards."

- Develop Quality Assurance and Accountability, either by leveraging existing structures to foster data custodianship, or create a new unit to oversee data quality

- Enhance Analytical Skills and Resources, provide testing for new hires, training for existing employees, and infuse an analytical mindset into daily decisions.

Takeaways for Institution-Level Recommendation Method

If Done Well
- Could help align the hundreds of units with regards to measurement, analysis, and reporting practices.
- Could provide badly needed analytical training to staff and administration, thereby improving efficiency and human capital.
- Could improve quality and use of data through oversight and database custodianship.

If Done Poorly

- Could stifle innovation on the unit level because of a lack of flexibility.
- Could cause frustration with a new system for analysis and reporting, especially on a technological level.
- Could create another layer of bureaucracy that would reduce efficiency and frustrate users.

3) University of Michigan: Advanced Academic Analytics

IT Tool – ProClarity:

- Enables quick, easy, one-stop-shop metrics of the whole University that can be used to make important administrative decisions.

- Information is granular, and can be broken down into a large variety of categories and sub-categories by department, race, gender, etc.

DEMO: http://bi.umich.edu/projects/download/hr_metrics/HR_HM_HRMetricsDemo_FS.htm

NOTE: A system analogous to this would be essential for the effective implementation, maintenance, and use of any new metrics practices at UC Berkeley.

HPC Initiative Conclusions from Comparative Analysis

Metrics Should Be

• Connected to a Strategic Plan or guiding principles of the University (Excellence, Access, Innovation, etc.)
• Designed to bridge the gap between analysis and action.
• Granular, as comprehensive as possible, and easily accessible (both physically and intellectually)
• Clear about what information they do and don't provide.
• Broad in scope, but narrow in focus. General practices should be capable of being divided and sub-divided to fit each unit's specific needs.

Metrics Don'ts

•Be careful not to over-credit metrics, they are information, not truth.
•Misuse of metrics (intentionally and unintentionally) can lead to distrust, abuse of information, and incompetence.

Our Proposed Guidelines for Effective Metrics

• Show your work: What process did you use to reach your conclusion?
• State your purpose: What questions are you asking? What problem are you trying to solve?
• Establish a Lifecycle or Workflow: When do you start and stop collecting data? How long is that data good for? When will you need to collect more data?
• Follow Through: How did the metric work? Did it answer the question? DID YOU TAKE ACTION BASED ON THE METRIC? Did you reach your goals? What did you learn? What could you do better next time?