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**Vision Statement (working draft)**

Human Resources at the University of Maine System is known for providing best practice in the following areas:

- Excellence in service delivery
- Leadership in creating systems and cultures that engage our faculty and staff in order to serve our students and state
- Thoughtful, effective, and timely response to all members of our university community
- Appropriate balancing of responsiveness to the campuses with necessary consistency and cost-effectiveness to the overall System

**Mission Statement (working draft)**

The role of Human Resources is to advance the core mission of the University of Maine System in strategic partnership with other staff and academic units of the University by recruiting, motivating, and retaining diverse faculty and staff in an open, fair, simple, responsive, and efficient manner by using the integrated System-wide talents and technologies of the HR organization.

* The Vision and Mission statements will be revised by a broader representative group of Human Resources and Equal Opportunity staff and stakeholders in FY 14.
Executive Summary

In January, 2012, the University of Maine System Board of Trustees adopted a statement of Goals and Actions, comprising a plan to make UMS financially sustainable, accessible, and affordable to students, and poised to meet the needs of Maine citizens for higher education, research, economic development, and community service. Among the actions was a series of administrative reviews intended to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of administrative functions by removing barriers and creating functions that are interoperable. This report covers the Human Resources Analysis and Design steps of the process culminating in nine recommendations, one of which is an umbrella or overarching recommendation: transition the Human Resources organization to a new paradigm that incorporates three major components:

1. A collaborative HR governance structure that improves the investigation, problem-solving, and resourcing of the unique needs of large and small campuses and the system office
2. HR leadership delivering strategic and grand tactical consultation and partnership that maximize the effectiveness of our faculty and staff (a move to strategic HR). As an operating paradigm we recommend HR leading, modeling, and suggesting systems that enhance the engagement of the workforce, and drive decision-making authority to the lowest competent level.
3. HR modeling “optimum service delivery” of strategic, tactical, and transactional HR services

Strategic human resource (SHR) management is the term most often used to denote the shift of the human resource function from a reactive and transactional entity to one that assists leadership in the proactive engagement of employees. Strategic human resource management defines employees as a resource, an asset, that provides competitive advantage to an organization, and on whom organizational success is leveraged. This view of employees, as the prime drivers or one of the prime movers of organizational success denotes that people are in the special position of best helping the organization attain its objectives.

The SHR approach requires proactive planning for an organization to better meet the needs of its employees, and for the employees to better meet the needs of the organization. This approach affects the way things are accomplished, improving everything from hiring practices and employee training programs to assessment techniques and strategic planning.

Organizations dependent on human capital for a large portion of their innovation, productivity, or service delivery must cultivate a work environment conducive to engagement and
productivity. In an environment of engagement and productivity, all faculty and staff can flourish and excel whether their work be teaching, scholarly activity, and service; providing essential supports to students and faculty; or maintaining the physical campus. The beneficiaries of this environment are our students and the citizens of Maine.

An engaged employee is defined as one who is fully involved in, and enthusiastic about their work, and thus will act in a way that furthers their organization's interests. According to Scarlett Surveys, "Employee engagement is a measurable degree of an employee's positive or negative emotional attachment to their job, colleagues and organization that profoundly influences their willingness to learn and perform at work." Thus engagement has components influenced by employee satisfaction, motivation, effectiveness, and organizational culture.¹

The Gallup organization, a leading international expert on the topic of engagement (or lack thereof) wrote: "Engaged employees are clearly more valuable to your organization than disenchanted ones. Great managers and leaders know this instinctively, and the Gallup Organization's latest research into employee engagement levels among the U.S. workforce confirms it. In fact, according to Gallup's calculations, actively disengaged employees - the least productive - cost the American economy over $300 billion per year in lost productivity."²

Optimum service delivery:

The Review Team reviewed all HR services and divided them into three groups:

- Services to be delivered locally (high-touch, high immediate value)
- Services to be consolidated, but not centralized (named shared expertise teams in the report)
- Services that were System-wide, transactional and could be automated and centralized (named shared services)

The report recommendations are aimed at finding the optimum balance of centralization, consolidation, and/or local delivery based on weighing the type of service expectation with available delivery mechanisms. Models and recommendations are discussed for each in the body of the report.

Another portion of optimum delivery is process improvement. Many organizational consultants are comfortable claiming 20% inefficiency in unexamined systems, of which 50-80% can be cost-effectively recovered. Obviously, not all of this is direct cost, but includes opportunity costs, avoided costs, and better service delivery as well.

¹ For a good summary of employee engagement see this white paper by DecisionWise at: http://www.decisionwise.com/three-components-of-employee-engagement-whitepaper-access-page.html
Lastly, any truly customer-focused service organization has to get feedback from the customers. The review team recommends the adoption of regular feedback surveys, complete with prioritization and action planning for improvement.

Scope

It is the above considerations that convinced the HR Review Team to expand the scope of the HR charter and recommend a set of strategies that would position HR to assist UMS leadership in capturing the larger value represented by the overall cost of human resources and not just the administrative cost of HR administration. The following graph depicts the potential for leverage of the full human resource at UMS compared to concentrating solely on direct HR administrative costs.

Summary Recommendations

Overarching Principle

To better engage and utilize the human resources (faculty and staff) that carry out the education, research and public service missions of UMS, the Human Resources Administrative Review Team recommends a transition of UMS HR to a new paradigm of human resource engagement, including:
a. Adoption of a collaborative HR governance structure that improves the investigation, problem-solving, and resourcing of the unique needs of larger and smaller campuses and the system office

b. HR leadership delivers strategic and grand tactical consultation and partnership that maximizes the effectiveness of our faculty and staff (a move to strategic HR). As an operating paradigm we recommend HR leading, modeling, and designing systems that enhance the engagement of the workforce, and drive decision-making authority to the lowest competent level.

c. HR models “optimum service delivery” of strategic, tactical, and transactional HR services

**Recommendations (that form the plan)** To accomplish this very large and significant culture change, the team is making the following additional tangible supporting recommendations (grouped in the three above categories although there is overlap):

1. Form, train, and team-build a high-performing human resources leadership team (HR LT) consisting of four leaders representing the HR function of all universities and the system office. Fill leadership positions in a manner to ensure that team members possess appropriate competencies. This team would become the policy, program and budget team for UMS HR and EO, subject to appropriate approval.

2. Transition our current HR to strategic HR management, utilizing the engagement operating model:
   a. For optimal organizational performance, HR leaders will be fully integrated business partners with direct lines of communication to the President/Chancellor and other members of the President’s/Chancellor’s cabinet/executive staff. While recognizing that it is an executive decision, we strongly encourage the use of strategic HR consulting when making strategic decisions and making the lead HR officers a member of the cabinet and a direct report to the Chancellor/President.
   
   b. Educate HR staff and UMS administration and leadership on strategic HR (SHR), engagement, service delivery, and transactional efficiencies so that they understand the vision for HR as an efficient, effective, service-oriented strategic partner and they are aligned with these goals.

3. Optimize the service delivery model:
   a. Create a “shared service” unit for all transactional HR business – such as benefits, payroll, e-recruiting, document management, and data entry.
   
   b. Pilot and learn from creating a Shared Expertise Team (SET) to share specialized knowledge and expertise across the System. Expand as the model proves to be more efficient and effective.
c. Reinforce and support the need for appropriate HR services to remain locally at the campus level.
d. Ensure requisite investment in technology and IT support services to better support current and expanded shared services and self-service.
e. Employ LEAN Higher Education (process improvement) techniques to streamline HR processes facilitating higher value in service delivery as well as cost-savings. Build capacity to expand LEAN HE to other functional units across the organization.
f. Utilize feedback tools to receive formative “service delivery” feedback at both the work group and leadership levels. This includes formulating action plans to address any areas for improvement.

Seeking approval of:

UMS HR needs to become more efficient and effective if it is going to be able to become more strategic without adding cost burden.

Savings for implementing the full conceptual plan were quantified both in terms of overall FTE headcount and administrative costs, with a headcount reduction from 83 to 74 over the period\(^3\), while adding capacity to deliver SHR services.

It is the express recommendation of the HR review team that savings in HR be reinvested in technology, automation, and strategic HR services to allow for the building of capabilities that will allow resourcing of similar improvements in all human dependent functional areas. It is the intent of this reinvestment over time to build and embed the SHR and process improvement training capacity into the HR function to be able to resource all campuses and the system office in their change efforts.\(^4\) Recognizing that capital for investment is tight, the team is requesting approval for the following:

1. Approval of the full conceptual plan
2. Authorization to form and populate the new HR leadership team
3. Several pilots as proof of concept. The pilots are as follows:
   a) Continue the “LEAN” pilot within HR, and focus first on benefits (readiness for technology investments)
   b) Develop out phase II of the Employee Benefits Center (EBC), including the addition of case management software

\(^3\) The period will be defined by the rate of investment in technology, automation, and training. This will be recommended in the implementation plan.

\(^4\) Also the recommendation of Sibson Consulting (see their report – Appendix H – Executive Summary – page 1)
c) Begin awareness training on the concepts of SHR for key leaders, managers and HR staff

This plan requires an upfront investment of $590k over two years ($388 in FY 14 and $202k in FY 15). During this period the HR LT will find efficiencies to defray the future on-going costs of these investments, $404,457 per year.

A Look Ahead

The HR review team thanks you in advance for your interest in reading the full report that follows.

Upon approval, the first step will be to form and team-build the HR Leadership Team. They will be tasked with the following:

- Coming together as a team to lead System-wide HR, including development over the next twelve months of a full implementation plan
- Formulating a business case for each specific software/technology investment,
- Stewardship of the pilots to ensure successful implementation
- A financial model for shared services (working with Finance)
- Metrics to measure the progress/success of the effort
- A review and assessment process with Presidents’ Council and SSAC
Background

This group was chartered in July, 2012 as part of the administrative reviews tied to the Board of Trustees’ Goals and Actions of January, 2012.

The team was made up of a cross-campus mix of HR representatives, led by Tracy Bigney from the system office.

A consultant (Sibson) was hired for a three-month period to review the work of the team and help them work through some organizational design options.

The process of analysis and redesign was used by the team to evaluate current state and design a more optimum future state.

The details of the background, charter, team process, and campus input can be seen in Appendix A.
Overarching Recommendation: Create a Strategic HR Function that Optimizes the Effectiveness of the University’s Full Human Resource Asset

Expanding the Scope of HR to Strategic HR

Numerous studies spanning decades have demonstrated the long-term return on investment of developing and engaging the human asset of an organization; especially in service organizations.\(^5\) The University of Maine System is one such service organization.

Arguably everything that is (or is not) accomplished at the University of Maine System is done through, and because of, people. Effective teaching, research, economic development, and community service are the extension of individual and group competencies, training, alignment, deployment and performance. Moreover, salaries and benefits constitute 73% of the current UMS educational and general budget and 64% of the total annual expenditures; by far the largest single budget component. By contrast, the HR/EO function itself is a minor piece of the

\(^5\) Service organizations tend to have a larger component of their cost and impact reliant on individuals when compared to production or manufacturing organizations that are able to capture greater benefit from technology like automation, robotics, programmable logic controllers, and information technology.
UMS budget, totaling about 1.5% of the UMS E&G budget and $6.8 million dollars of total annual budget (Figure 1).

These realities - the return on investment of leveraging human resources and the people-centric nature of our organization - broaden the original anticipated outcomes of this review. The Review Team recognized that, while it is important to keep costs of the Human Resources function at an efficient level, it would be shortsighted to focus on these costs without looking at the context of the total cost of human resources within the organization. Our conclusion is that the UMS Human Resources function can best assist the organization’s competitive advantage by creating systems, processes, and a work environment where individuals and groups can optimize their contribution to the organization. This is the essence of strategic HR.  

The Human Asset

Higher education fulfills its promise of accessible, quality education, basic and applied research, economic development, and public service through the efforts of its faculty and staff. It is a labor intensive enterprise. Approximately 5,700 regular employees and 800 part-time faculty (in any semester) make up the human resources at UMS. In addition, undergraduate and graduate students constitute another sizeable part of the workforce. Human resources services and programs support the efforts of all these people, the university’s full human resource. The totality of knowledge, skills, talent and other characteristics of the UMS human resource is the “human asset;“ arguably, the most critical asset to UMS’ success.

Principles

During the Human Resources Review process, four key concepts emerged.

1. **Strategic human resource (SHR) management**
2. **Engage the workforce** and push decision-making down to the lowest competent level as a more effective way to operate
3. **“Optimum service delivery”** where the customer becomes the judge of value (what is received, compared to what it costs)
4. **Differentiation of service delivery** by type, method of delivery, and scale

---

6 Sibson Consulting recognized these shifts as “Industry” Trends (see their report – Appendix H – Executive Summary – page 5), and further noted that UMS HR was “thin” in important areas supporting this type of move (bullet point 1).
The Human Resources Administrative Review team strongly endorses all four concepts and recommends that they be adopted as principles guiding plan design and implementation. We provide a summary of each below.

**Strategic human resource management** is the proactive management of employees tied to the directions articulated in the strategic plan of the organization. It is an intentional shift from human resource management as a reactive, compliance-focused unit charged with administering programs and reactively responding to issues and is a move towards human resources becoming an essential business partner. Such a shift can only be accomplished by first recognizing and acknowledging that strategically developing and engaging our employees is not just a value-added option, it is an imperative to stay competitive in the marketplace. This is particularly salient in such a people-centric industry as higher education. Developing competencies in SHR is one primary method by which we will create and sustain a competitive advantage for UMS going forward.

Key practices in SHR include:

- institutional planning
talent management (finding, attracting, nurturing, and developing employee talent, proper positioning of individuals within the organization, and off-boarding)
- alignment (aligning individual, group, and organizational goals)
- culture/work environment management (encouraging employee engagement and decision-making, increasing morale and retention)
- organizational development (structures, human capacity planning, efficiency and effectiveness)

Effective implementation of SHR fosters a proactive approach to human resource management that moves the organization towards performance excellence.\(^7\)

The concepts of **engagement and “service delivery”** represent another two concepts that coupled with SHR can provide UMS and campuses with the competitive advantage that will place UMS at the cutting edge of organizational change and effectiveness. As envisioned by organizational development consultant Peter Block in his book, *Stewardship*, these paradigm shifts mean much more than providing excellent customer service. They mean placing service above all else and engaging the workforce so as to drive responsibility and decision-making as far down in an organization as employee competence and accountability will allow.\(^8\) These

---


concepts address the very way in which our organization practices alignment, leadership, and performance management.

The recommended HR service delivery model can be depicted by the schematic that came out of the March Presidents Council. It visually depicts the paradigm shift that needs to occur for staff groups as they redirect their efforts in support of those that serve the customer (students or internal/external constituents).

Leadership has historically been integrally tied to hierarchy, initiative, responsibility, and control. The act of leading in this historical paradigm has meant leading largely by determining the desired future, defining the path to get there and knowing what was best for others. This model of leadership was well suited to the industrial revolution where knowledge, power and financing were consolidated in the minority. Block’s model of stewardship, however, requires the movement of choice and resources closer and closer to those that serve the paying customers, urges us to serve employees as customers, and distributes the power and decision making thus increasing responsibility and ownership by employees. This stewardship paradigm enhances employee engagement and organizational success.

---

9 It is important to note that the same type of triangle could be drawn for the research, economic development, or community service portions of the mission.

10 Block clearly tackles accountability in his model – making it the third cornerstone. Joint accountability means there is no one else to blame. He quotes: “if people want the freedom that partnership offers, the price of that freedom is to take personal accountability for the success and failure of our unit and our community”.

---
**Engagement:** Employee engagement, also called worker engagement, is a business management concept where an "engaged employee" is defined as one who is fully involved in, and enthusiastic about their work, and thus will act in a way that furthers their organization's interests. According to Scarlett Surveys, "employee engagement is a measurable degree of an employee's positive or negative emotional attachment to their job, colleagues and organization that profoundly influences their willingness to learn and perform at work". Thus engagement has components influenced by employee satisfaction, motivation, effectiveness and organizational culture.  

The Gallup organization claims to have studied over 17 million employees since 1997. Their published findings show that engaged employees produce more, they make more money for the [organization], they create emotional engagement with the customers they serve, and they create environments where people are productive and accountable. They also demonstrate that engaged employees stay with the organization longer and are much more committed to quality and growth than the other two groups. Gallup has statistically correlated that [for profit] companies with world-class engagement have 3.9 times the Earnings Per Share (EPS) growth rate compared with organizations with lower engagement in their same industry.

Peter Block asserts “[o]ur belief that consistency and control are the cornerstones for running productive organizations [has been] visibly reflected in our human resources policies and in the way we expect this staff to operate.”

By contrast, the engagement model of customer-oriented human resources services asks HR leaders to create “teams serving client groups..., teams responsible for a whole work process...” This engaged team approach sees HR staff organized in consulting roles to the organization’s leadership assisting them in engaging employees rather than in specialized silos formulating and monitoring policy.

**Differentiated service delivery models:** the group wrestled with and came to preliminary conclusions that different services require different delivery mechanisms depending on a number of attributes. The Chancellor is fond of quoting a Maine organization that divided their service delivery into three major buckets:

- Integrated services => common platform and policies
- Consolidated services => strategically utilizes different locations but not centralized
- Centralized services => all together in one place

---


14 Ibid. at 151
Utilizing this framework the HR Review Team came up with the following categories of HR work:

- (Integrated) Locally delivered services: those services where high touch, situational factors, lower automation and/or scale make it optimum to have them locally delivered.
- (Consolidated) Shared Expertise Teams (SETs): those services where level of expertise, lack of scale, and/or ability to best deploy talent across multiple locations lend themselves to a team of employees working collaboratively from multiple sites to deliver the services enterprise-wide
- (Centralized) Transactional shared service: those services that are more uniform and repetitive, that can be automated and where a team of employees working together give the service economy of scale

In summary, the combination of SHR, engagement model of leadership and service delivery means that UMS Human Resources shifts from a primary role of enforcing policies and procedures to one of being partners to leaders and employees in creating systems and procedures that advance the mission and vision of the institution.

Recommendations (that form the plan):

1. Form, train and team-build a high-performing human resources leadership team (HRLT) consisting of four leaders representing HR for all seven universities and system-wide services. This team will become the priority setting, policy and budget team for UMS HR, subject to appropriate review and approval.

There are fundamental differences between the HR needs and resources for large campuses, smaller campuses and the system office. In the current state, there are far too many times where HR representatives feel like they are not being heard, which creates tension and lack of efficiency. This is not an indictment of good people; it is a realization that our “federation” system often has folks at cross purposes. These differences create the need for a forum where issues can be worked collaboratively to optimum resolution. This recommendation sets up a leadership team to find the “win-win” solutions to System-wide HR issues.

To be successful, the HR leadership team, with the support and engagement of the Chancellor and Presidents, will need to confront and overcome the historic tensions arising from the differing perspectives represented by the system office, small campuses and large campuses.
This challenge will not be easy and it will take time to build and nurture the necessary trust and relationships to support this effort but the challenge must be met to successfully move UMS towards a sustainable future.

Individual team members and their roles include:

**UMS Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO):** The UMS CHRO coordinates and engages the HR leadership team and as such ensures that the voice of HR at all the campuses is fully represented in key UMS policy and program changes and initiatives. In addition, this position provides leadership for shared services and common UMS functions (labor relations, compensation and benefits, etc.). This position has ultimate supervision and budget authority for centralized or SWS HR services. One of this position’s direct reports is a senior leader (see below) for the five smaller campuses and SWS HR staff. The UMS CHRO represents the leadership team as the HR business partner with the Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and other UMS senior staff.

**Small campus/SWS Chief Human Resources Officer:** This “multi-campus” CHRO replaces the current ERL function and provides SHR leadership for the five smaller campuses and SWS HR programs, services and staff. He/she serves as the liaison between smaller campuses and UMS business strategies. This counterpart to the UM and USM positions (below) ensures a strong equal voice for the smaller campus’ issues, provides a level of dedicated strategic HR expertise not always available or cost effective for individual campuses to achieve, and helps to ensure appropriate consistency in delivery of service. While seemingly a “new” position, appropriate deployment of this as a multi-campus resource will eliminate the need for smaller campuses to have to find and fund this resource on their own. Smaller campuses are otherwise caught between the hard choice of attempting to individually fund redundant, and sometimes difficult to recruit and retain, senior-level HR expertise or operating without this “higher-level” HR resource.

**UM Associate Vice President for Human Resources (AVPHR) and the USM Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO):** The UM AVPHR and USM CHRO will retain leadership, supervision, and budget authority for their campus HR programs and services. In addition, they will acquire the System-wide responsibilities inherent in being a member of the HR leadership team. In the new role, each continues to serve as their campus HR business partner, while acting as a liaison between their campus and UMS HR strategies and having a part of their role being devoted to System-wide responsibilities (LT).
In addition to the team’s broad leadership role, each of the four members of the UMS HR/EO leadership team may also have future responsibilities for cross-campus/SWS creation and oversight of teams for sharing expertise.

Three of the above positions have a dual role: serving as HR leaders at a campus(es), and being a member of the System-wide HR leadership team that designs and implements the details of this plan. For this to be effective, all parties will need to have clear agreements as to the percentage of time devoted to System leadership versus to campuses. The initial estimate is to plan approximately 10% HRLT and 90% campus(es). These percentages will be confirmed by the HRLT and agreed to by the Presidents with a 6-month review in the first year, and an annual review thereafter. Other significant on-going system responsibilities by campus-based employees (e.g. leadership for a shared services center (SSC) or a shared expertise team (SET), described below) will be treated similarly.  

The intent of the design of the HRLT is that they will utilize shared expertise, collaborative inquiry, and team skills to arrive at optimum designs that leverage the whole as well as the parts of UMS. That stated, the review team understands that there are times when hard choices have to be made and in those rare cases one individual needs to be charged to do that. For this reason, the team recommends a rather unique reporting arrangement. The CHRO will report to the Chancellor, who will collect and utilize feedback from Presidents and the three other HRLT members in the review of the CHRO.

15 Also see Sibson Consulting report – Appendix H – pg12 – bullet 3
The “multi-campus” position will report to the CHRO, and his/her review will be based largely on feedback gathered from the Presidents and HR staff of the five campuses and SWS. The two large-campus HR leaders will report to their Presidents for their campus role and to the CHRO for their System role. CHRO reviews of these two HR leaders for their System role will be provided to the respective Presidents to be used in their reviews at the negotiated percentages.

This service model orientation calls for competencies in Human Resources leaders different from those of the traditional HR leader serving as guardian and enforcer of centralized practices. For the University of Maine System this means that its Human Resources/Equal Opportunity leaders at the campus and System-wide Services level must first themselves be organized as a collaborative team able to be proactively responsive to the new reality. This leadership team will establish UMS HR strategy, priorities, and resource deployment subject to the Presidents’ Council, Chancellor, and Board of Trustees approval. The function of the HR leadership team includes implementation and assessment of HR programs, services and, overall HR spend. This team models, practices, and promotes both an engagement approach and strategic human resources management.

The individuals on the HR leadership team must possess executive-level competencies needed for the stewardship and service model of HR and for the leadership of any functional areas for which each is given responsibility. The fundamental competence is an orientation of adding
value to employees’ efforts rather than one of centralized control. It is the express recommendation of the HR Review Team that these positions be established and filled to appropriate competencies through a process that acknowledges and respects the competencies, performance and service of current employees in similar positions and minimizes unnecessary disruption to the workforce. Competency-based staffing and HR staffing principles are included in Appendix D.

The nature of the times in higher education call for a significant transformation in the way we engage and empower those that serve the ultimate customers (students and Maine residents). It is the Review Team’s belief that UMS and campus HR can form a leadership team that best manages resources to effectively face challenges and empowers employees to meet them. With this team leadership approach and these shared competencies, HR will model the behavior needed for the University of Maine System—it’s seven campuses and University Services—to become an organization of engagement and service.

**Recommendation 2: Transition the HR organization to Strategic Human Resources Management and a culture of appropriate engagement**

2a. For optimal SHR and organizational performance HR/EO leaders must be fully integrated business partners with direct lines of communication to the President/Chancellor and other members of the President’s/Chancellor’s cabinet/executive staff.

The Human Resources profession has evolved dramatically from its roots in payroll and benefits to its current broad portfolio of responsibilities including the management, support, and development of people as one of an organization’s most critical success factors.

The increasing need for strategic human resource management here in the University of Maine System is evidenced by the nature of the strategic challenges facing UMS. These include:

- The ability of UMS to be responsive to the needs and opportunities of Maine people
- Declining numbers of high-school graduates in Maine and New England
- Declining revenue from both Maine State appropriations for higher education and frozen in-state tuition and unified fees
- Claims upon university funds to do more with less
- Competition from Maine’s community colleges, for-profit higher education institutions, and online higher education offerings
• The necessary changes to the workforce skills employers seek for success in the 21st century economy.\(^{16}\)

These challenges for UMS can’t be met without harnessing all of our employees’ abilities in service of innovation and strategies to sustain public higher education in Maine. Human Resources must be a strategic partner to accomplish this.

A strategic Human Resources partnership with UMS leaders brings three competencies to the table.

1. **Organizational Development.** HR can help cabinet-level leadership with processes to determine priorities and envision/design organizational structures and polices that engage and empower employees to successfully move the campuses and System towards a sustainable future.

2. **Development and Deployment of the Workforce.** Faculty and staff must have the right competencies and be positioned appropriately for all areas to meet or exceed the outcomes anticipated and expected by our students, the public, the legislature and the Board of Trustees. When there are gaps it is performance management and training/development that often can correct the situation.

3. **Guidance with Legal and Policy Implications.** Customer-focused HR can assist leadership, managers, and supervisors to achieve their outcomes while staying away from costly oversights.

For Human Resources to be a strategic partner, lead HR officers need to be at the table as integral managers during conversations of a strategic and grand tactical nature. For the smaller campuses, this may be the “multi-campus” CHRO or an individual campus lead as appropriate. Such integration and strategic partnership is most easily and typically accomplished through:

- Direct reporting lines from HR to the chief executive officer,
- Making lead HR officers a member of the cabinet or executive staff, as appropriate.

Effective deployment of SHR requires human resources management to be fully integrated with strategic business practices. HR leaders must serve as proactive strategic partners with senior management, fully involved in the establishment and achievement of organizational goals in

light of employee and business objectives. To accomplish this, HR must have a seat at the table and be positioned to act with responsibility and authority.

2b. Educate HR staff and UMS administration and leadership on strategic HR (SHR), engagement, service delivery and transactional efficiencies so that all HR staff understand the vision for HR as a strategic partner and are aligned with these goals.

The shift from traditional to strategic human resource management will be a significant change both for those involved in providing and delivering human resource services and for organizational leaders including members of the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, the Presidents, department chairs and directors. The shift will require a concerted development and communication effort to shift the focus within HR and shift how it is perceived by others to the new strategic role.

Recommendation 3: Redesign the HR organization for optimum service delivery

Overview
Human Resource functions may be categorized in three major types of services: transactional, customer service/tactical, and strategic. These different types of service lend themselves to differing delivery models. The review team divided HR work into the following three categories and service delivery models for UMS:

- Locally delivered services: those services where high touch, situational factors, lower automation and/or scale make it optimum to have them locally delivered.
- Shared Expertise Teams (SETs): those services where levels of expertise, lack of scale and/or ability to best deploy talent across multiple locations lend themselves to a team of employees working collaboratively from multiple sites to deliver the services enterprise-wide.
- Transactional shared service: those services that are more uniform and repetitive, that can be automated and where a team of employees working together give the service economy of scale.

3a. Reinforce and support the need for certain HR services to remain locally at the campus level.  

Tactical/customer service HR work involves context specific service, often of a face-to-face nature, with employees - from those holding entry-level positions to faculty to those in upper administration jobs. Each of these employees is an HR customer or client and they come with many opportunities, challenges, and problems that aren’t routine. One of HR’s most important responsibilities is to help these employees be as productive as possible as they serve the needs of their institutions.

Important locally based HR services include:

- **Advising Presidents, Provosts, Deans and Directors, and supervisors on personnel policies and labor relations**
  
  Local HR provides timely and effective guidance to administrators as they contemplate organizational changes such as reorganization or operational changes that may affect personnel. The HR department helps to ensure that appropriate policies and procedures are understood and followed, laws and collective bargaining provisions are understood and followed, and employees are treated fairly, while protecting the institution’s ability to manage change.

- **Assisting with innovation and group process**

  While an HR department may consult with many groups of employees as they strive to innovate, no group of people seeking innovation will bring to the fore identical issues in ways identical to another group’s process. Assisting group processes is not something HR can do well from afar—it takes a local HR presence to facilitate these efforts.

- **Designing, training and auditing effective performance management**

  When a supervisor brings the challenge of working with an under-performing employee to HR, local HR staff must work with the particular supervisor/supervisee relationship in the context of the particular work within the department on the particular campus.

18 Also see Sibson report: Appendix H – pg5 – paragraph 3.
• **Supporting employees**
  When an employee brings a problem of sudden illness, an increasing disability, a family stress, a financial concern, or the repercussions of a death to HR, he or she may need personal contact with caring HR personnel on a campus.

• **Employee, manager, leadership, and organizational development**
  Particularly as we move to new paradigms of employee engagement and service, employee, manager and leadership development will be critical to our success. While tools for these and other development efforts such as succession planning may be generated away from a campus context, their application requires an HR presence in tune with unique campus interests, capacities, and cultures.

3b. Pilot and learn from creating a Shared Expertise Team (SET) to share specialized knowledge across the System. Expand if the model proves to be more efficient and effective. ¹⁹

The UMS 2009 “Report of Human Resources Service Delivery Model Task Force” recommended a service delivery model based on Centers of Expertise (COEs) to share specialized knowledge across the System. There were two pilot project COEs established, the Employee Benefits Center, and the Wellness COE.

Through experience we have learned that benefits administration services are not an appropriate use of the COE model, but are better suited to a shared service center as are other transactional services, as indicated in supporting recommendation 3c of this report.

To avoid confusion with the earlier terminology of Center of Expertise concept and to make a distinction of this role from the Shared Services model, the Review Team is recommending establishment of Shared Expertise Teams (SETs). The role of the SET is to share specialized knowledge and expertise across the system and to focus on the design, implementation, and execution of System-wide HR programs, initiatives or services that are not routine or transactional.

SET members may be located at a campus or at the system office and are a resource for all locations. SET members may provide consultation using phone, e-mail and teleconference or travel to another campus or location to provide assistance and consultation. The SETs will give the University System the ability to become more proactive in sharing best-practices, as they

¹⁹ Also see Sibson report: Appendix H – pg5 – paragraph 2.
are made up of a small number of dedicated, specialized team members who focus on high-impact, non-routine work.

The team has identified the following functional areas as potential areas for SETs:

- Compensation (program design and maintenance, with more work needed to determine the role of the SET in position classification)
- Labor Relations
- Organizational and Workforce Development/Training and Communications
- Benefits and Wellness (excluding shared services functions)
- Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, Diversity

Coordination and alignment are needed within each SET to ensure consistent application of policies and procedures and quality assurance for the SET work. Clear communication channels will be needed to promote sharing of knowledge within the SET and opportunities for the SET to provide input to planning and policy in the SET area.

The general design parameters for SETs need to be determined by the new HR leadership team working with employees in these areas to determine the timing and best application of the concept in each functional area. Some SETs need accountability to the System Office because the programs apply System-wide and there are policy and compliance issues (i.e.: Labor Relations, Benefits and Compensation Program design). In other areas it may be possible to have an SET leader reporting to a campus with the team sharing their expertise System-wide or amongst several campuses (i.e.: Organizational and Workforce Development). More detail work is needed around this issue as the new team does pilot(s) and learns from the successes and failures.

3c. Create a “shared service” unit for all transactional HR business – including benefits, payroll, e-recruiting, document management, data entry.  

The Shared Services Center (SSC) will offer operational support to managers, employees and applicants of the University of Maine System in the areas of payroll, benefits administration, recruiting and data processing.

Shared Services will be responsible for:

- Providing exceptional service delivery directly to employees and managers
- Day-to-day processing of HR transactions

\[\text{20} \] Also see Sibson report: Appendix H – pg6 – paragraph 4, pgs8-9, and pgs 14-16.
• Resolving routine questions that cannot be handled through self-service
• Managing the HR systems and ensuring data quality
• Monitoring usage, customer satisfaction, and providing reports

The bulk of the transactional activities will be handled by support staff reporting to a working leader who will manage the SSC as well as handle complex issues and provide overall accountability. Through experience we have learned that physical co-location of employees providing services through a shared services center offers a smoother and more efficient operation. We have also learned that gaining efficiencies and meeting service delivery goals through shared services is dependent upon requisite technology.

Shared services will be under the leadership of the UMS CHRO. A funding model for shared services needs to be developed. In addition, the specific location for these services has not yet been determined.

Benefits Administration
An anticipated first step in the transition to the SSC is to redesign the processes for benefits functions not already assigned to the Employee Benefits Center (EBC), including:

• Benefits related to and management of medically-related and other types of leaves
• Employee and retiree problem resolution and advising, and other miscellaneous services
• Separation benefits advising and processing

In addition, the SSC personnel would be charged with identifying process improvements in benefits onboarding, annual open enrollment, and status changes through facilitated application of the LEAN process.

From our experience with Phase 1 of the EBC we know that case management software is needed to provide timely service, realize greater efficiencies, and decrease the amount of time EBC staff spend documenting and researching employee contacts. Case management technology will allow for:

✓ E-mail integration: ability to route incoming emails to ticket queue and track outgoing responses via e-mail
✓ Robust request/ticket management for assigning case ownership for proper follow-through and ticket escalation to next tier workflow level
✓ Reporting capabilities for case analytics (e.g., request types, resolution time, staff allocations, etc.)
✓ Ability to expand to and be shared by HR System-wide (scalability), which will allow it to be used for other HR needs without added cost
Additional necessary technology includes workflow, increased use of document management and expanded employee and manager self-service.

**Payroll Administration**

Once Phase II of the transition of benefits administration to the Employee Benefits Center is solidly on track, it is the recommendation of the HR Review Team to consolidate and centrally manage payroll administration. In the process of implementation planning, carried out with significant involvement of payroll staff, we will determine:

- Best practices for shared service payroll (including application of LEAN for optimal process redesign)
- Impact on data management function
- Necessary technology enhancements
- Appropriate staffing level
- Potential cost savings and time efficiencies

**Complete Document Management**

Currently most campuses are in the process of being trained on the ImageNow document management system. Scanning stations have been purchased at all locations and are in place. Existing staff have begun imaging current staff personnel files. The Shared Processing Center is making its scanning services available to HR when they have capacity beyond their student work. Once all campuses have adequate training on imaging, the next “phase” of the document management project will be training on workflow. This will allow not only for efficiencies within internal campus operations, but aid in ease of Shared Services operations.

**Complete Pilot and Expand E-recruiting to Smaller Campuses**

As we implement shared services we will determine the feasibility of adding other functions such as data entry, e-recruiting, applicant tracking and background screening. In each of these areas we will work with staff familiar with each function and with our IT partners to develop LEAN processes, determine what technology is needed, assess appropriate staffing levels and ascertain the potential for cost savings and efficiency gains.

3d. Employ LEAN-HE (higher education) process improvement techniques to streamline HR processes facilitating higher value in service delivery as well as cost-savings. Build capacity to extend LEAN-HE to other functional units across the organization.

LEAN is a continuous process improvement tool developed and refined in the Toyota Production System. While originally used in the world of production manufacturing, it is gaining recognition and success in higher education, hospitals, and K-12 institutions which have
increasingly seen success in application. The HR Review Team is encouraged by the high success rate of the fledgling attempts at using LEAN within UMS.

The fundamental philosophy of LEAN is to add value to the process by removing steps that do not add value that the customer would be willing to pay for. LEAN is about engaging and empowering the person/group in the position closest to the customer to determine when something works and when it does not, and to offer suggestions for improvement. LEAN-HE (higher education) is an adaptation of LEAN manufacturing. The application of LEAN management in higher education has become prevalent in administrative processes such as: admissions, add/drop, purchasing, facilities, hiring and budgeting. LEAN has also been applied to academic processes.

During the Fall semester of 2012, University of Maine Human Resources hired internal consultants from USM and worked with a group of 20 stakeholders over three days to LEAN-HE the process of approving positions and searching to hire. This search process had been identified as confusing, frustrating, overly complex, and taking too long. Based on the LEAN work, the process has been reduced from 98 to 51 steps (33 done by HR) and the group reduced actual staff hours from 116 to 67 per search. When these savings were monetized, a conservative estimate of gross savings for a full year is $88,482 with more savings expected as UM adopts an applicant tracking system (see the description of the UM HR LEAN hiring process in Appendix E). The team recommends that UMS HR adopt the LEAN-HE process and begin several initiatives like the one completed at UM as part of the implementation of SHR.

Both the Sibson consultants as well as the UMS Executive Director of Organizational Effectiveness believe that a conservative estimate of rework in any unexamined process is 20%. It is normally cost-effective to retrieve 50-80% of the opportunity that is discovered. The team believes that the effective deployment of LEAN will therefore result in finding and eliminating a significant amount of rework and redundancy in HR and across the organization, which will lead to substantial savings on the order of 10-16% for reinvestment, empowerment of employees, improved employee morale, and better customer service.

3e. Ensure requisite investment in technology to better support current and expanded shared services and self-service (integrally tied to supporting recommendation 3a: shared services).

In adopting an optimal service model for HR, the importance of technology and sufficient information technology resource can hardly be overstated. The consolidation of transactional services depends heavily on technology for communication, case management, and use of tools such as document management and workflow to achieve a high level of customer service and the desired efficiencies. KPMG International Cooperative issued a study of “HR Optimization in
the Public Sector” in October 2012. Among the seven lessons learned from case studies of public sector HR organizations were three related to data, IT and technology:

- Invest in IT applications: HR infrastructure and process improvements help ensure service delivery integrity. Focus on developing infrastructure for data and tools for managers.
- Have a sophisticated applications system of HR: This makes centralization of processes possible. IT and information systems need to be in place before you even start—at minimum, a central system for the HR applications and the data warehouse. Start with this, and then move to the organizational design, follow[ing] up with centralized transaction processing.
- Use shared services as a way to centralize all data gathering and analysis: performance management is as much about data as it is about effective processes and rules.

The HR Administrative Review Team calls for a number of investments in enhanced use of technology and increased information technology support. In this arena, the Review Team recommends the following actions and added technologies:

**Critical for full implementation of the Shared Services/automation model**

1. Clarification of the level of technology support needed within HR and from Information Technology Services to support appropriate levels of automation for HR services.
   a. Sibson consulting and internal IT advisors have suggested that HR will require additional 2-3 FTE positions to facilitate implementation and serve as functional liaisons for new technologies.
   b. HR currently receives an excellent quality of IT service, but does not have a sufficient amount of IT service to support current needs. Additional support is needed to catch up with pending priorities.

---

21 KPMG defines shared services as the collective set of resources, capabilities, and systems to deliver support services such as information technology, finance and accounting, human resources, procurement, and other business services across an organization. Implied in shared services delivery is greater consolidation and leveraging of common applications, business processes, models, and leading practices across an enterprise. Research findings reinforce the KPMG position that adopting, deploying, and expanding shared services is a never-ending journey. The initial benefits are typically cost savings resulting from economies of scale and scope, better use of technology, standardized business processes, expanded use of performance metrics, and a reduction in the number of people required to deliver services. The destination and longer-term benefits typically are a moving target dependent on changing needs and conditions. They run the gamut from further cost savings to enhanced process performance, higher quality services, and overall business improvement.
c. The technology recommendations of the Review Team will require significant IT support to implement and maintain.

2. The adoption of shared services for benefits administration, payroll, data entry and other transactional services will require case management software, enhanced document management, workflow, and additional employee self-service applications such as pledging for the annual charitable campaign.

3. Streamlined recruitment to result in time savings for hiring departments, search committee members, and HR and to serve employment applicants better requires e-recruitment/applicant tracking software.

**Mid-term opportunities**

4. Managers and employees are more likely to complete performance reviews effectively if supported by performance management software to manage performance forms, job descriptions, and notifications.

5. As HR oversees the delivery of more education, training and development programming, a learning management system (LMS) would facilitate enrollment, content delivery, and record keeping. Legal mandates to provide certain kinds of training make record keeping critical in this area. UMS needs to evaluate the needs for an LMS and determine whether they can be met with course management systems used in the delivery of academic courses.

**Long-term major investments**

6. UMS capacity for HR reporting would be greatly strengthened by having an HR data warehouse. (The current UMS data warehousing initiative is limited to Campus Solutions/student data.) Such an investment should be evaluated for 2017 and beyond.

7. Employees would be able to answer many more of their HR questions if they had access to an employee portal with an HR knowledge base through which they could obtain information about policies and benefits applicable to their own situation. This takes self-service beyond data entry, expands access and can reduce the need for HR customer service staff for basic questions.

HR is already engaged in two of these initiatives, document management, and applicant tracking. In the area of document management, all campuses are now beginning the process of scanning personnel files to create electronic personnel files. One campus has purchased, and others are considering the purchase of applicant tracking. These two projects were initiated by campuses eager to expand the use of technology and willing to share their experience with other universities. These projects will proceed regardless of the outcome of this review.
UMS Information Technology Services has reviewed the technology recommendations within this report and is in agreement with the Review Team that investments in hardware, software and expertise will be required to further the work already in progress and to undertake implementation and support of new technology systems in HR. Specific proposed changes or new systems will need to be documented, analyzed and approved through the normal business case development/return on investment process if this report and recommendations are approved. The CIO’s report and cost estimates by technology category are Appendix F.

3f. Utilize feedback tools to receive “service delivery” feedback at both the work group and leadership levels and formulate action plans to address any areas for improvement.

The HR Review recommends the development and implementation of a robust feedback model for leaders and for operational units within HR. 360-degree feedback is a method and a tool that provides each employee or service function the opportunity to receive performance feedback from all aspects of their work life (thus full coverage). This includes supervisors, peers, reporting staff members, coworkers, and especially customers. Most 360 feedback models also include the opportunity for self-assessment. This process allows each individual or functional group to understand how his or her effectiveness and responsiveness or service delivery level is viewed by others. The intent of 360-degree feedback is to provide actionable performance information to individuals and/or groups.

UMS HR has limited experience with 360-degree feedback. The Employee Benefits Center routinely asks employees to complete a basic feedback survey and compiles and reviews results. The System Office of HR, along with other System departments, also conducted a customer satisfaction survey of campus customers in 2010, and a small number of individuals have participated in 360-degree reviews. These experiences lead us to believe that more systematic use of this feedback mechanism would be useful. Possible applications include:

- Campus HR departments getting feedback from campus employees, supervisors and managers
- System office work groups, Shared Service Center or Shared Expertise Teams getting feedback from individual employees, administrators and/or campus HR staff as appropriate
- Individual employees, particularly at the leadership level, engaging in 360 reviews
While UMS HR currently has the capacity for 360-degree assessments, they are optional, utilize paper-based forms and are not systematically utilized. This recommendation would make their use an integral part of the HR change assessment and improvement.

**Implementation Timing and Financial Impact**

Significant cultural changes of this magnitude take time and must be built on a solid foundation. Building on the feedback and concerns expressed in the May-June review, it is now the recommendation of the team to seek approval for phase I (establishment of the LT and proof of concept).

**Phase I:**

**Overview**

During the upcoming fiscal year, FY14, Phase I of the recommendations will focus on the composition and development of the Human Resources Leadership Team, the expansion of the Employee Benefits Center, and the education of University System leadership and HR staff on Strategic HR.

**HR Leadership Team**

The HR Leadership Team (LT) consists of the UMS Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO), the UM Associate VP for Human Resources, the USM CHRO, and the Multi-Campus CHRO.

The LT is charged with advancing a collaborative governance structure to oversee human resource policy, program, and HR budget for the entire university system, subject to appropriate approval.

**Specific Tasks for FY14:**

- Determination of the proper competencies for each of the positions in the LT
- Populating the LT based on competencies through assignment or recruitment and hiring
- Development of the LT and the formation of a common vision for HR
- Oversight of system-wide and campus HR policy, program, and budget
- Responsibility and authority to identify headcount reduction/savings to support the following ongoing investments:
  - Additional EBC positions (2 FTE)
  - Case Management Technology
  - HR Liaison - IT (1 FTE)
  - Multi-Campus CHRO (1 FTE)
- Conduct initial training for University System leadership and HR staff on Strategic HR
- Planning, implementation, and oversight of the Employee Benefits Center expansion
• Development of a business case for the next pilot project from the Human Resources Administrative Review report recommendations to commence in FY15

**Employee Benefits Center (EBC)**
The EBC is the first logical pilot project under the HR Administrative Review given the existence of a business case dated March 12, 2012, the significant experience of current stakeholders in the prior development of the virtual EBC, and the opportunity to conduct a simultaneous pilot of LEAN to redesign EBC processes.

The HR Administrative Review Report identifies employee benefits as a transactional service – those services that are uniform and repetitive, easily assisted by automation, and for which a team of employees working together give the service economy of scale. The EBC would report up to the UMS CHRO; however, the entire LT is charged with successful planning, implementation and oversight of the EBC.

**Specific Tasks for FY14:**

• Location of suitable space for the EBC staff
• Identification of savings to cover the additional ongoing cost of the EBC
• Recruitment, hiring and positioning EBC staff and HR Liaison - IT to competencies
• Utilization of LEAN to redesign EBC processes
• Identification of the scope of work and preparation of the RFP to procure case management technology
• Implementation of the procured technology

**Report Feedback**

After approval of the conceptual plan by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor it was vetted by the Administrative Review Steering Committee, Presidents’ Council, CFOs, CAOs, and HR/EO staff. The draft report was distributed to the Administrative Review Steering Committee, Presidents’ Council, Shared Services Advisory Council, CAOs, HR/EO staff in early May and posted to the web. Input was collected in person and incorporated into this final conceptual report submitted to the Steering Committee and Board of Trustees Finance and Facilities Committee for approval and inclusion on the consent agenda for the July 15, 2013 Board of Trustees meeting.

The following items will be more clearly articulated in the implementation plan:

• Include benchmark data and metrics
• Include a schedule of audit and review
• Each new significant software/technology will require an approved business plan
• Outsourcing will be considered as an option for service delivery of specific low-touch services
• Need for education, as these are new concepts to many in the UMS community
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Appendix A - Background, Charter, and Process Utilized

In January 2012, the University of Maine System Board of Trustees adopted a statement of Goals and Actions, comprising a plan to make UMS financially sustainable, accessible and affordable to students, and poised to meet the needs of Maine citizens for higher education, research and economic development. The Board of Trustees hired and charged Chancellor James Page with carrying out these Goals and Actions. Among the actions was a series of administrative reviews intended to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of administrative functions by removing barriers and creating functions that are interoperable. Review teams were chartered in Information Technology, Strategic Procurement, Human Resources, and a fourth broad area to set priorities for future administrative reviews.

Each team received a charter and timeline to review their functional area and make recommendations for eventual review and approval by the Board of Trustees.

The Human Resources Review Team developed a work plan that was accepted by Chancellor Page in July 2012. Work began in August 2012, but was heavily encumbered and delayed due to labor negotiations and short staffing through early fall. Work resumed in earnest in October and was completed in April 2013. Periodic progress reports were submitted to the Steering Committee and posted on the project website as a means of communication with the university community.

Anticipated outcomes:

- Interoperability and integration of HR/EO [equal opportunity] services across the enterprise to meet the needs of UMS now and in the future
- Increased efficiency through reducing unnecessary redundancy, leveraging expertise, and using technology to enhance efficiency
- Administrative cost savings
- Identification of service areas to be maintained, enhanced, reorganized, reduced or eliminated
- Timely, high quality service to employees, administrators, managers, supervisors and retirees
- Clear lines of responsibility, accountability and decision making authority

Team Members / Resources

- Tracy Bigney, Chief HR & Organizational Development Officer, UMS - Team Leader
- Cindy Huggins, President of the University of Maine at Machias - Sponsor
- Martha Freeman, Chief HR Officer, USM
• Sheri Stevens, Executive Director of Administrative Services, UMA
• Jennie Savage, Human Resources Manager, UMPI
• Judith Ryan, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Administration, UM

The work was overseen by a Steering Committee comprised of:

• Chancellor James Page
• Vice Chancellor Rebecca Wyke
• Trustee Karl Turner
• President Paul Ferguson
• President Cynthia Huggins

President Huggins served as the team sponsor and liaison to the Steering Committee until February 2013, when Vice Chancellor Wyke assumed that role. Tamara Mitchell served as the Organizational Effectiveness partner and was joined by David Stevens in January 2013. Laurie Gardner (UMF) joined the team for final deliberations and report writing.

In December of 2012, an RFP was created for an external consultant with knowledge of best practices in public higher education to assist with the work of the Review Team. The consultant role was threefold:

• To assist with identification of best practices, benchmarks and metrics,
• To review the work completed on the functional matrix, proposed service delivery mechanism and leadership model, and
• To assist in the development of the recommendations

Sibson Consulting was engaged for the period January through March 2013 to review the team’s work in an “over the shoulder” manner and assist the team in identifying technology resources to improve service and considering organizational structures. Sibson facilitated three workshop sessions involving about twenty UMS staff from all campuses in HR, EO, finance, and IT to elicit information and ideas and to provide feedback regarding organizational design structures. This work assisted the Review Team in identifying opportunities for technology enhancements and related costs, in estimating HR/EO staff number needs, and in identifying areas of consensus and unresolved issues for further consideration. The Sibson report is Appendix H.

Following the Sibson workshops, the Review Team worked with structured facilitation and assistance to resolve outstanding issues. David Stevens, Executive Director of Organizational Effectiveness, coordinated the preparation of the report, with all Review Team members contributing draft material and reviewing drafts. After it is accepted by the Chancellor, this
report will be vetted by constituent groups and available for broad UMS community reactions leading up to inclusion on the agenda for the May Board of Trustees meeting.

**Process**

**Work Products**

In the early fall, the Review Team developed two work products that assisted our analysis and design efforts, referred to as the HR inventory and the HR matrix.

**Inventory**

One of the first tasks completed by the Review Team was an inventory of current resources dedicated to HR and EEO as of October 2012. The inventory provides detail about the staff and financial resources devoted to HR/EO at each university and the System Office, including resources not assigned to HR/EO. The inventory indicates a total of 87.4 staff FTEs providing HR/EO services in UMS with a total budget of $6.8 million. This provides a baseline against which to measure future resource allocation. The inventory also includes counts of employees and W-2 forms issued as measures of size related to HR/EO staffing levels. As a System, UMS employs close to 6,000 non-student employees and issued more than 16,000 W-2 forms for 2012. The inventory is included in Appendix B.

**Matrix**

The Human Resources/ Equal Opportunity (HR/EO) matrix was designed to define the scope of the Review Team’s work and as an analytical tool. The scope of HR/EO was divided into eight large categories and multiple components were defined within each category. The matrix is included in Appendix C.

The HR/EO work defined in the matrix was analyzed several ways to provide insight into the optimal service model. For each component of HR work, aspects of the work were identified as either:

- Transactional (routine, repetitive and lends itself to centralization and automation)
- Customer service/tactical (needs to be delivered to a customer to help them operate effectively)
- Strategic (moving the organization forward in a positive manner)

In addition, the work in each cell of the matrix was identified as either:

- “Mission critical/mandatory”
- “Should do” for a well-functioning HR program
“Would be nice” for those components that are optional

A very high number of the matrix cells were designated as mission critical or mandatory because of federal and state law including collective bargaining, non-discrimination laws, wage and hour laws, and tax regulations.

In considering the optimal mode of service delivery the Review Team determined that transactional work (repeatable, standardized and routine, requiring detailed knowledge but limited application of judgment) could most efficiently and effectively be provided in a centralized or consolidated manner. It was determined that much customer service/tactical work is best performed at the local university level close to the employees, supervisors, managers and executives served. The strategic work of HR has multiple aspects, some of which are best provided at the local level and some at the system level because of the System-wide impact.

Areas of focus for the review were selected because of three characteristics:

1) Those that could be performed most effectively and efficiently in a consolidated manner
2) Those with the greatest promise of efficiency and improved service through increased use of technology
3) Areas in which HR/EO could contribute more through collaborative efforts and shared expertise not necessarily involving a single location and reporting line

Taken together the matrix and inventory also serve to show what is not included in the scope of the review. For example, student payroll is included, but student employment (awards, placement) is generally outside the HR function and the scope of the review. Likewise EO/AA for students and non-employees is not within the scope of this review. The organization of these functions varies among the universities. As we move forward, we need to remain alert to the impacts of our recommendations on functions that are partly within and partly outside HR.

NOTE: For the purpose of this review and report, EO/AA for employees is included in the Human Resources function regardless of reporting at individual campuses.

Communications

Major communication milestones in the review process included:

- A PolyCom meeting in June to acquaint all HR and EO staff with the review work plan and charge
- Updates to Employee Relations Liaisons (ERLs or campus HR leaders) and EO directors in October, December, March
- Solicited feedback/input from campus leadership, ERL’s, EO & HR staff in December
- Meetings with the Chancellor in October, February, and April
Summary of Input Received

Two important groups were asked to provide input to the Review Team: university presidents with their cabinets/executive staff and HR/EO staff at each university and the system office.

Two members of the Review Team met with each university President’s cabinet/executive staff and the system office leadership team. The sessions served to update the university leadership about the HR Administrative Review and the areas selected for further review and to obtain feedback to a series of structured questions about the value of Human Resources at the university level and priorities for the review.

Input from HR/EO staff was gained through a process led at each campus by a member of the Review Team. The five team members conducted the meetings at their respective campuses/system office. Two team members also conducted meetings with staff at other universities, and one university ERL used the briefing materials to conduct the meeting.

The overriding theme of feedback from both sets of groups was that every university strongly endorsed the need for a strong local presence of Human Resources at the campus. Other common themes were raised frequently by both groups.

Common themes from both leadership teams and HR/EO staff

- Strong support for the role of campus Human Resources on all campuses
- Visibility/credibility of Human Resources functions on campus, consultation, and local quality customer service very important
- Reinforced need for local knowledge in relation to performance management, parts of hiring, and handling of complex or sensitive matters
- Strong recognition that human capital management (employee development, mandatory training, leadership development) is important but is currently a gap in HR service
- Generally broad support for improving data management/technological solutions (e-hire, workflow, e-training) and streamlining business processes

Other themes that emerged from either the leadership groups or the staff groups included:

From leadership

- Nearly all HR services are essential services – payroll, compensation and benefits, employee relations, performance management, labor relations, and HR consultation services
- Universally recognized issues with decision-making process (lack of clarity or accountability) across the organization
- Currently recognized gaps are in employee development and training and lack of formal inclusion of campus leadership in labor relations strategy and communications
Scalability is important – differences may be due to campus size, mission, or rural vs. more urban settings

From HR/EO staff

- There is a need for an intentional communication plan and shared expectations (clarity) between system office and campuses
- More HRIS [Human Resources Information System] authority (correct history, time administration, security) should be decentralized (mentioned by most campuses)
- Need better reporting, integration of databases (HRIS, GL, Campus Solutions)
- Would like to see improved training for HR staff
## Appendix B - HR Inventory

### HR and EEO FTE and Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>UMA</th>
<th>UMF</th>
<th>UMFK</th>
<th>UMM</th>
<th>UMPI</th>
<th>USM</th>
<th>SWS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff with HR responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Dept FTE</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>76.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO Dept FTE</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in HR/EEO dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student employment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty personnel actions</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness FTE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Training FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in other depts. with significant HR responsibilities</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Equivalents (FTE)</strong></td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>*15.75</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>87.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR budget</td>
<td>$1,648,374</td>
<td>$399,547</td>
<td>$292,773</td>
<td>$241,430</td>
<td>$133,620</td>
<td>$154,911</td>
<td>$1,652,565</td>
<td>$1,726,671</td>
<td>$6,249,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO budget</td>
<td>$332,800</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>$356,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HR and EEO budget</td>
<td>$1,981,174</td>
<td>$399,547</td>
<td>$292,773</td>
<td>$241,430</td>
<td>$133,620</td>
<td>$154,911</td>
<td>$1,652,565</td>
<td>$1,726,671</td>
<td>$6,606,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment budget</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$43,302</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$198,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td>included above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,039</td>
<td>$13,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,998,674</td>
<td>$442,849</td>
<td>$369,812</td>
<td>$274,280</td>
<td>$133,620</td>
<td>$180,011</td>
<td>$1,733,965</td>
<td>$1,726,671</td>
<td>$6,859,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student employees 10/12</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-2’s issued for 2012</td>
<td>7,739</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>16,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SWS HR Dept FTE * Includes 2 EBC employees loan from UM; some HR expenses related to the wellness program are budgeted in the pooled benefits account
UMS * Two of these FTEs are being held vacant with no current plan to fill
UM HR budget Contingent on Temporary Staffing Pool fee revenue (FY13 $70,000)
UMFK HR budget - (Includes EEO & Recognition)
UMFK Other (specify) Wellness/Salaried & Hourly Development Funds
F Other (specify) development

Recruitment budget pays for advertising and other expenses which are budgeted in the hiring department at other campuses

Employee count includes all regular employees plus part-time temporary faculty as of 10/31/2012

Budget and staffing as reported October 2012.
## Appendix C - HR Matrix Excerpt

**UMS Administrative Review: HR Matrix**

Areas of focus for increased efficiency are highlighted in yellow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Function Areas</th>
<th>Activities By Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talent Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment - Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment - Advertising/posting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment - Screening--assessing qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment - Interviewing (not usually HR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment - Background and Reference checks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate with selected candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding - Appointment letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding - Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management - Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management - Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management - Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Development and Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offboarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rewards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation - Program design and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation - Classification/reclassification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits - Program design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits - Vendor relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits - Enrollment and changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits - Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness &amp; Health Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions - Policy development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Management - FMLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Management - Sabbaticals and Educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Management - Disability and Annual leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Management - Leaves without pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor &amp; Employee Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining (planning, developing positions, conducting negotiations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining greater consistency policy across bargaining units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Files and Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D - Competency Based Staffing and HR Staffing Principles

Competency Based Staffing

The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) defines competencies as “individual characteristics, including knowledge, skills, abilities, self-image, traits, mindsets, feelings, and ways of thinking, which, when used with the appropriate roles, achieve a desired result.” The SHRM HR Competency Model prescribes proficiencies in:

- HR technical expertise and practice
- Relationship management
- Consultation
- Organizational leadership and navigation
- Communication
- Global and cultural effectiveness
- Ethical practice
- Critical evaluation
- Business acumen

Similarly, University of Michigan professors David Ulrich and Wayne Brockbank have developed a competency model for strategic HR based on over twenty-five years of research. Their latest research identifies the following competencies for HR leaders—an HR leader must be a:

- Credible activist
- Change champion
- Capability builder
- Strategic positioner
- HR innovator and integrator
- Technology proponent

---

22 See Elements for HR Success: SHRM’s Competency Model for HR at www.shrm.org/HRCompetencies/Documents.
Taken together, in the context of the stewardship and service paradigms and UMS HR leadership team roles described above, these competency models suggest that the team must be comprised of HR leaders who:

- Believe and manage to a model of shared governance, empowerment, and influence
- Inspire the Presidents’, Chancellor’s, and Board of Trustees’ confidence in the leadership team, especially in regards to effective decision-making and execution and business acumen
- Possess a high degree of competence in selecting, positioning, aligning, and managing performance of key HR working team leaders
- Demonstrate sound understanding of institutional planning and fiscal management;
- Understand team-building with the outcome of shared complementarity of leadership
- If pertinent to their role, has managed and understands management of shared services
- Demonstrate/model the engagement and service model in their work

**Competency Based Filling of Positions**

These statements are to indicate HR’s commitment to competency based filling of positions and to providing opportunities for current employees. It is not possible to say specifically how these guidelines will be applied and carried out until we know the future organizational design and phasing of changes.

- Where there are new or substantially changed positions, appropriate administrators will develop position descriptions and competency requirements utilizing internal or outside expertise as necessary to ensure that those placed in the positions are well suited to the needs of the position.
- Assessments of current employees’ competencies will be made by current and new supervisors with the assistance of internal or external expertise as appropriate.
- The goal is to minimize disruption. Where future positions are identical or very similar to current positions and no positions will be cut, employees will not have to compete for their current positions, so long as they have the necessary competencies (as determined by the appropriate supervisor).
- We are committed to developing and educating current employees. Those with a close match to competencies, but who may be lacking in some specific area will receive development opportunities and training or education to be able to succeed in new or revised positions.
• Incumbent HR/EO employees at all locations will have opportunities to be considered for all new positions at any location. For example, if a position at campus/location A will be eliminated and a position will be created at campus/location B, the employee whose position is eliminated as well as other HR/EO staff will have the opportunity to apply for the position at campus/location B.

• Searches for new positions will be limited to current HR/EO staff when we believe it is likely there is an adequate pool of qualified applicants. If an internal search is not successful in identifying a well-qualified candidate, external searches will be conducted. When it does not appear likely that there is an adequate pool of well qualified applicants internally, we will proceed directly with an external search for both internal and external candidates.
Appendix E - University of Maine LEAN-HE Pilot

University of Maine LEAN-HE

I LEAN

LEAN Continuous Improvement tools are gaining recognition for their ability to streamline processes in academia. The term LEAN refers to the system known as The Toyota Production System, and while originally its use was limited to the world of manufacturing, hospitals, K-12, and post-secondary institutions have shown incredible success in applying the lessons of LEAN.

The fundamental philosophy of LEAN is to add value to a process by removing steps that do not add value for the customer. LEAN is about empowering the person in a position to say when something works and when it does not, and to offer suggestions for improvement.

University of Maine’s Search and Selection Process

Ila Background

The process of approving positions and searching to hire at the University of Maine required several layers of approval resulting in delay and frustration. Consultants specializing in continuous improvement were engaged to help the group streamline processes and eliminate redundancy. Human Resources (HR) came together with partners in Academic Affairs and the EO’s office to understand the current state. From the time HR became aware of the need to fill an approved position, 98 steps were required to process the required paperwork before an employee could begin work. A group of 20 stakeholders worked over 3 days to map the process and, in doing so, met its two primary goals:

1. **Reduce the number of steps and length of time required to hire a new employee.** The group worked together to reduce the number of required steps from 98 to 51. The overall elapsed time is dramatically improved.
2. **Provide clarity for all members of the community.** The group created and published two flow charts, which provide a clear understanding of the process. The members are also designing orientation and training sessions for the departmental liaisons.

IIb Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Former Process</th>
<th>Current Process¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Steps</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>51 (33 steps are handled by HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Elapsed Time²</td>
<td>91 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Elapsed Time</td>
<td>247 days</td>
<td>62 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the six months from August 2012 to January 2013 there were 47 full completed searches, with an estimated possible savings of 49 staff hours per search. The average cost per hour for employees involved in this work is $19.21. Cost savings during this time frame was $44,241; double that number for a full year and the total savings number becomes $88,482. This is a conservative estimate based upon savings in full searches only, there are additional savings in partial and search waivers that are not included in this number. In addition, should UMHR adopt the applicant tracking system now in discussion the savings will be substantially higher.

III Summary and Next Steps
The efforts of the improvement team in this process are commendable. The staff worked within and among departments to ensure an improved and transparent process for the entire university community. During follow up meetings with the team, members’ pride and improved morale was palpable. In addition to following up with the group on their progress toward continued improvements, the staff will be asked to complete a questionnaire with regard to their impressions of the process and employee morale.

---

| Actual Staff Hours[^iii] | Up to 116 possible staff hours | Up to 67 possible staff hours |

[^iii]: Actual Staff Hours are the hours a staff member is actively handling a task.
Appendix F - UMS Chief Information Officer’s Report

The University of Maine System Information Technology Services has reviewed the technology components of this Human Resources Administrative Review. ITS is in agreement with the HR Administrative Review report that additional functional subject matter experts will be required to further the work already in progress and to undertake implementation of new technologies and support expansion of technology systems in HR. ITS cannot estimate specific number of staff until the technologies and business processes to be addressed are fully identified. It is expected that additional staff will be required to implement new initiatives and to maintain and support new technologies going forward. ITS recommends that specific proposed changes or new systems be documented and put through a normal business case development/return on investment process prior to implementation.

The Chief Information Officer suggests creating an annual allocation of $600,000 to cover the likely cost of improvements under this initiative, including cost of subject matter and IT staff services as technology is added, to cover costs of new software, hardware, vendor implementation costs, and operations.

Identified Technology Areas for Early Implementation

**Case Management**: Research indicates that licensing costs for case management software could run in the range of $36,000 to $45,000 with vendor implementation costs ranging from $20,000 to $75,000, and annual fees of approximately 20% of total costs of the system. Information Technology staff time, Human Resources staff time, hardware, software or integration costs have not been assessed as of yet. Both the software solutions and implementation and maintenance costs will vary depending on business process decisions.

**Document Management**: Human Resources and IT are engaged in a project which will position Human Resources to have an electronic personnel file. Activities are currently underway to configure the document management system and ITS has dedicated .75 FTE toward the project through December 31, 2013. After January 1, 2014, the personnel will drop to .5 FTE to support and maintain this work. Expansion of this system should be evaluated and be approved based on priorities and available funding as described above.

**Business Process Enhancement/Workflow/Self-Service**: Improvements in process and workflow are very valuable and IT is committed to supporting this effort. Improvements may require significant IT and HR subject matter effort and this should be estimated and prioritized against allocated funding as suggested above. Estimates for personnel and other costs will be estimated as part of each initiative.
**Recruitment**: Currently two institutions have engaged with Hire Touch for applicant tracking. The vendor has provided the following estimates for a System-wide implementation of the software. This estimate assumes less than ten hours of IT time. The IT needs will change if the security or interface requirements change.

**Longer Term**: The total effort of phase one, coupled with the possibilities anticipated in phase 2 are difficult to estimate and will be contingent on affordability, payback (ROI) and expectation of improved services. An annual allocation, earmarked for improvements to new HR technology systems and improvements will support any phase 2 investment decision(s). As new systems are implemented, the annual cost of operation should also be covered from the allocation to maintain and support the technology solutions.
## Appendix G – Phase I Financials

### 2013 Human Resources Administrative Review
#### Phase I - Scope of Work and Financial Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Team (LT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Investment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Additional Investments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FTE - Multi-Campus/US Lead</td>
<td>$113,550</td>
<td>$151,400</td>
<td>$151,400</td>
<td>$151,400</td>
<td>$151,400</td>
<td>$151,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Misc.</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment</strong></td>
<td>$118,425</td>
<td>$157,900</td>
<td>$157,900</td>
<td>$157,900</td>
<td>$157,900</td>
<td>$157,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Employee Benefit Center (EBC)** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **Administrative Investment** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **Current Investment** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4 FTE | $169,208 | $225,610 | $225,610 | $225,610 | $225,610 | $225,610 |
| **Future Additional Investments:** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2 Additional FTE | 80,444 | 107,258 | 107,258 | 107,258 | 107,258 | 107,258 |
| Supervisor (Upgrade) | 3,975 | 5,300 | 5,300 | 5,300 | 5,300 | 5,300 |
| Temp Employees | 5,700 | 7,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 |
| 2 phones | 1,200 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Computers (2) plus replacements | 3,800 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 1,900 |
| General Office Supplies | 2,250 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| **Total Administrative Investment** | $266,577 | $350,668 | $350,668 | $350,668 | $350,668 | $350,668 |
| **Less existing EBC staff funding:** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2 FTE - University Services | (95,755) | (127,673) | (127,673) | (127,673) | (127,673) | (127,673) |
| 2 FTE - UMaine | (73,453) | (97,938) | (97,938) | (97,938) | (97,938) | (97,938) |
| **Total Additional Admin. Investment** | $97,369 | $125,057 | $125,057 | $125,057 | $125,057 | $125,057 |

| **Technology Investment** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **Future Additional Investments:** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Case Management Software - one-time | $125,000 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Case Management Software - ongoing | $37,000 | $37,000 | $37,000 | $37,000 | $37,000 | $37,000 |
| IT Hardware/Support | 9,500 | 9,500 | 9,500 | 9,500 | 9,500 | 9,500 |
| 1 FTE - HR Liason to IT (FY14 = 1/2 yr) | 37,500 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| **Total Technology Investment** | $172,000 | $121,500 | $121,500 | $121,500 | $121,500 | $121,500 |
| **TOTAL ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT (LT & EBC)** | $387,794 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 |

| **Savings & Additional Funding** |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Human Resources ongoing savings (TBD) | $0 | $202,229 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 |
| UMS one-time investment | 387,794 | 202,228 | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING** | $387,794 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 | $404,457 |

**Note:** All compensation based on FY13 salary & benefits - no factor included for future increases

---

1 FY14 reflects 10/1/13 implementation unless otherwise noted.

---
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I. Executive Summary

The higher education environment is undergoing substantial and permanent change. The old recipe to restore fiscal health to colleges and universities, tuition hikes and short term cost reductions, are no longer viable options. Universities require lasting change in the efficiency and quality with which they operate. As a part of its initiative to promote operational excellence throughout the University, the Chancellor of the Maine System has called upon University functions to find creative and effective ways to promote the academic mission of the organization at reduced costs. Sibson Consulting, with experiences with 150 recent academic clients, was brought in to assist Human Resources with their administrative review process. Working with a group of Human Resource, finance, and IT professionals representing all campuses, the working group (Review Team) achieved consensus on several restructuring initiatives over a course of several weeks. These recommended changes were designed to improve consistency in operations, accountability for decision-making and end-results, and responsiveness to the varied constituencies of educational institutions. By conceiving of a design that introduces productivity-enhancing process and technological improvements, greater centralization of common activities, creation of single point reservoirs of knowledge and standards, and sound methods of systemic integration, the proposed approach would enhance service, while reducing HR operating costs. In turn, net savings could be reinvested in strategic human resource functions.
II. Overview of Changes in Higher Education and Presenting Issues for UM System

A. Trends in Higher Education

Higher education has been undergoing pressures for change for some time. Recently, however, the public, legislators, special interest groups, and government agencies have formed a consensus: higher education has not done enough to contain costs and increase efficiency, productivity and, arguably, quality.

The Higher Education Price Index (an inflationary standard tied to costs in higher education) has outpaced the Consumer Price Index in 37 of the 48 years in which it has been computed. These prices have been passed off to consumers in the form of escalating tuition. Consumers, however, have become increasingly resistant to the costs of a degree and have joined the chorus of those who want institutions held accountable for the value of an education: for both the expense incurred and the results produced. As a result, many institutions have slowed or frozen tuitions at a time when endowment income is down and, in the slow-growth economy, states have scaled back support for their public institutions.

Institutions have limited options for economic stability. Significant tuition increases are likely to cut enrollments and, therefore, no longer appear to be an attractive path to sustainability. Many colleges and universities are loaded with debt with little room on their balance sheets to borrow their way out of trouble. That leaves cost cutting as the most feasible alternative. While seldom a favorite, many both inside and outside of higher education would argue that it is about time that colleges and universities controlled costs. Many institutions have chosen to target high administrative costs in efforts to reign in their budgets. Progressive institutions recognize, however, that the competitive landscape in higher education has changed and mending costs in the short-term will not solve the long-term problem. Instead, the fundamentals of the business must change. The goal cannot only be to cut costs, but to cut costs by transforming the way work is organized and performed: an argument we recently made in conjunction with the University of Minnesota before State Senate of Minnesota (a copy of the report is located at: https://excellence.umn.edu/Spans_&_Layers_Final.pdf).

The Chancellor of the University of Maine System has requested this administrative review with the goal of lasting transformation in mind. Maintaining the health of the organization requires systemic process improvements and technological advances to support more efficient methods of completing work. Higher productivity and greater efficiency are crucial to restoring colleges’ and universities’ fiscal health and, consequently, the gains associated with process improvements and technological enhancements are fundamental to the solution identified in this document.
B. Presenting Issue for the University of Maine System

Like other large state university systems, the University of Maine System is faced with significant challenges that have forced the institution to reconsider all aspects of the administrative delivery model. Factors instigating this review include:

- Flat to declining revenues from tuition, State appropriations, and investment income
- Increasing scarcity of money from State and Federal grants
- Rising labor costs, especially due to increases in benefits costs (e.g., healthcare)
- More demanding public expectations regarding the accountability of the University of Maine System, e.g., persistent demand for the best faculty, ongoing capital improvements, excellent research facilities
- A focus on cost reductions/efficiency while sustaining quality of service
- Changing demographics of students, declining enrollments, greater competition from both in-State and out-of-State colleges and universities

Because of these increased demands, the University of Maine System embarked on an initiative to review and refine its service delivery model in all core administrative areas. IT and Procurement have recently completed detailed reviews and have presented timelines for implementation of their service models that include significant reductions in cost. Human Resources was given a similar charge and a committee was put in place in the summer of 2012 to begin that review.
III. Assessment of Current State and Recommendations on Future State

After commencing the review of the HR function, the Review Team completed a detailed inventory of current services, described the perceived state and quality of those services at the system level and at all campuses, and broadly defined a desired future state. Research involved comprehensive interviews with leaders on all campuses and brainstorming sessions with key HR leaders across the system. In addition, Sibson Consulting was brought in to advise the Review Team on trends in higher education (and, as appropriate, general industry) and to provide guidance in the re-design process and implementation planning. The review covered three key categories:

1. Core HR Services
   - University of Maine System Self-Assessment
     In interviews with campus leaders, nearly all current HR services were viewed as essential, therefore, opportunities to eliminate functions did not emerge as a viable option. With that said, the committee did examine and prioritize functions that it perceived as high-value added, or regarded as core to the identity of a vital HR. The review group agreed that investments in both technology and people should focus on those areas that were seen as central to the strategic purposes of Human Resources. The Review Team’s evaluation of critical Human Resource functions converged on five priority areas, in the order listed below:

     - **Talent Management:** Recruitment, Hiring, Onboarding, Employee Development
     - **Labor/Employee Relations:** Collective Bargaining, Contract Administration, Consultation
     - **Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS):** Software System, Electronic Records, Reporting
     - **Institutional Leadership and Planning:** Strategic Planning, Executive Advisory Services/Facilitation, Policy Development, Compliance Oversight, Goal Setting
     - **Organizational Development:** Employee/Leadership Development, Succession Planning, Workforce Planning/Management, Change Management, Metrics, Management Consultation, Conflict Resolution
Collectively, these areas were ones the Team believed would have significant, positive impact on the operations of the University and productivity if executed well.

**Industry Trends**

Industry trends in both Higher Education HR and, in fact, in general industry, confirm the focal areas identified by the HR Review Team. Over the past few years, Sibson has observed the increased prominence of more complex, strategic areas of HR, including:

- **Talent Management and Development**, as many institutions have increasingly looked for a competitive edge through ongoing learning and innovative thinking
- **Staffing, and Workforce and Succession Planning**, particularly in light of the aging workforce and limited pipeline of talent in key administrative areas at many institutions
- **Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS)**, for automation of record-keeping, tactical and strategic use of metrics and reporting in support of decision-making, and as a tool to increase the efficiencies of HR operations
- **Organizational Development**, particularly leadership development as effective leadership/management has been identified as the best predictor of employee satisfaction, motivation, and productivity; organizations additionally realize that strong leadership is essential to affecting change

**Sibson’s Recommendations**

Sibson recommends the following actions regarding core functions:

1. **The University should concentrate headcount on those areas identified as highly critical and that require a high degree of specialization for superior service delivery.** We noted that some areas of Human Resources were thin in important areas, such as organizational learning and development, and we suggest future plans include building these capabilities up. The list of core functions identified by the Review Team serves as a starting guide regarding where to focus efforts.

2. **Consideration should be given to grouping highly specialized talent into Centers of Excellence (COEs).** There are multiple advantages to this structure. The obvious benefit is that it prevents fragmentation of systemic expertise (i.e., avoids duplication and the potential for conflicting opinions) and, conversely, fosters uniform guidelines and consistent services across the University. Since COEs also have partially overlapping content domains that require coordination, proximal seating makes collaboration easier and reaction times to urgent requests faster. We recommend COEs in Communications/OD/Training, Labor Relations, Compensation and Benefits Design and AA/EEO Reporting, consistent with the Review Team’s conclusions.

3. **A campus presence should be maintained for core areas that require a high degree of personal interaction and expertise (e.g., Labor and Employee Relations),** and where an awareness of the local culture is imperative.
4. Non-core areas, or areas requiring lower levels of expertise and performance of routine procedures, should be examined for possible automation/outsourcing/centralization. We recommend automation/outsourcing/centralization of payroll and benefits administration: a suggestion that the Review Team unanimously supported. Indeed, Human Resources has already begun to centralize and automate benefits, but full implementation remains incomplete.

2. Technology and Automation

University of Maine System Self-Assessment

As part of the assessment, the HR Review Team evaluated current HR technology: areas in which enhancements would be of value in ensuring quality and/or increasing efficiency. Specifically, the group ranked the current level of use of technology and, subsequently, pinpointed areas where additional technology/automation would improve the operational efficiencies of the System. Results are summarized in the chart below.

RANKED RATINGS ON CURRENT TECHNOLOGY

- Organizational Development
- Institutional Leadership and Planning
- Labor/Employee Relations
- Total Rewards
- Equity and Diversity
- Talent Management
- Payroll
- HRIS

Legend:
- No technology opportunities identified
- Some technology opportunities identified
- Significant technology opportunities identified

SIBSON CONSULTING
After some discussion, the group prioritized a number of areas for increased technology usage in HR, including:

**Total Rewards**

- **The Employee Benefits Center (EBC):** There have been significant improvements in benefits administration; however, the Team recognized that with further technological upgrades, benefits administrators could accommodate higher volumes at a lower cost per transaction. In other words, it was agreed that in order to be optimally effective, increased spend would be required on benefits automation.

- **Wellness:** Human Resources is unique in that it not only is accountable for its own cost-benefit as an operating entity, but also has tremendous influence on the expenses of the University. Nowhere is this more pronounced than in healthcare. To that end, one opportune area for the greater use of automation concerned health promotion and wellness in the form of information exchange, interventions, and training, for example.

- **Leave Tracking:** The Team expressed mixed thoughts on automated leave tracking. Although there was some perceived need, the topic never generated much excitement or gained much traction as an area in want of technological overhaul.

**Talent Management**

- **E-Recruitment:** One campus has implemented recruitment technology and it has helped with the front-to-back recruiting process but the Team concluded that a ubiquitous system-wide solution is required. Recruitment, and related functions, were seen as urgent needs but it does not appear that the technology now in place will easily fulfill them.

- **Employee Orientation:** Online employee orientation and online training were flagged as opportunities, but individuals urged that in-person training be retained as a key element as well.

- **Payroll and HRIS:** Both are currently automated, but investments are needed to bring systems up to date and increase efficiency.

- **Employee Records:** Technology exists for scanning/electronic records but usage needs to be increased. In fact, records management was identified by Team members as one area that could be improved upon.

The bulk of efficiencies to be gained broadly fall into the payroll/benefits administration and recruitment processes. These areas tend to involve routine, repeatable processes and, thus, are strong candidates for increased automation. Currently, these areas account for a large proportion of FTE time, are services valued by the workforce, and hold promise for cost savings. The group’s impression was that automation/technology implementation in these areas, in all likelihood, would heighten the quality and responsiveness of services and lower costs.

The group unanimously acknowledged that any technology expense would have to be balanced with increased efficiency (likely in the form of headcount reduction) and enhanced HR-effectiveness to be approved.
Industry Trends

Although many elements of Human Resources require a personal touch, the function has become increasingly dependent on technology to operate efficiently. Nevertheless, adoption of leading technologies in Human Resources has been slow. First, enhancements and upgrades to enterprise systems are prohibitively expensive for many institutions. Second, as non-profits, limited funds have historically been used to support academic services and capital improvements in order to gain competitive advantage. Third, many large systems are highly decentralized which has made it difficult for widely dispersed functions to build a cost-benefit case for major installations.

Fortunately, circumstances are changing. Lower cost cloud and subscription services are now available. Cost containment versus expansion has moved to the strategic forefront in higher education. And, many institutions are actively searching for commonalities among their diverse operations, for ways to reduce unwanted redundancies, and for methods to harness the productive capacity of organizational overlaps. There is no reason today that Human Resources cannot be in equal parts a people- and technology-function.

In the past few years, we have observed many of our clients making significant investments in automation- and technology-driven, centralized processes in the same areas targeted by the HR Review Team for technology enhancement. The table below (from a CUPA-HR study of 212 institutions in 2011 – 2012) shows the progress to date. The shaded areas represent the Review Team’s summary self-assessment of the University of Maine System’s standing in each area. As indicated, the System’s position is commensurate with the majority of other institutions in higher education. Like others, the Maine System has partially automated a wide array of Human Resource functions but has ample room for additional technological developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following processes are partially or fully automated? (n=212)</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Self-Service</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Administration</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Administration</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Job Data Maintenance</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Labor Management</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Training Management</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Management</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Onboarding Support</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sibson's Observations and Recommendations

We recommend the following enhancements/additions to technology and automation in the University of Maine System:

1. Make significant investments in technology in the following areas as quickly as monies are available: Benefits Administration, Payroll, and E-Recruitment; we suggest adding E-Learning once these first three are in place and generating returns

2. Identify the operational benefit of enhancement/implementation of technology in the form of increased efficiency, performance improvement and FTE reduction across HR

3. Implement technology fully before headcount reduction is implemented in these areas as a successful transition will require significant learning time and people will be required to manage the workload during the systems’ migration period

4. Focus on using existing technology (e.g., scanners, online documentation of job changes) more effectively and, where feasible, introduce more self-help options

3. FTE and Organizational Template

UM System Self Diagnosis

During the course of their work, the HR Review Team recognized the need to refine how the HR organization works as a whole. However, opinion varied regarding the organizational changes that would be required, from strong to weak agreement.

Key areas of strong agreement were:

- The need for subject matter experts in critical areas (identified earlier), some of which exist currently and some that would involve a new or stronger emphasis such as communications and organization development (the latter encompassing management consultation), career development, and training.

- The need for local resources where necessary for high-value, high touch HR functions where knowledge of the organization is essential for sound execution. Key examples cited were employee relations and recruitment. Even here, however, some individuals felt that some level of centralization (or a central, expert resource) would be necessary to increase consistency across campuses and provide resources for smaller campuses that could not afford an FTE with a high level of expertise in each area.
Areas of **moderate consensus** included:

- Development of Centers of Excellence (COEs) to lead key areas, which, due to law, policy, or regulations, must be managed consistently across the system. The group agreed these areas include compensation and benefits design, compliance, labor and employee relations, and organizational development. Whereas the group recognized the value of consolidating expert resources, they never settled on a location: whether the resources should be housed on one or more of the campuses or centralized in the System Office.

Areas of **limited consensus** included:

- **FTE Requirements**: Although the group understood that headcount reduction was necessary to achieve budget reductions requested by the Chancellor, the group labored to come to consensus on where / how headcount could be reduced, even with the addition of technology. During the term that Sibson worked with the group, the Team never reached consensus in headcount by function that would net significant savings. Nevertheless, the Team acknowledged the need for savings that could, in turn, be partially reinvested as a means of transforming UMS HR into a more client-focused and strategic partner.

- **Organizational Structure** (high-level design considerations), including:
  - Reporting structure (to Presidents of Universities, to a Central HR leader, or dual reporting)
  - Location of COEs and reporting model for COE employees (to a COE Director, to the Campus HR)
  - Number and type of talent needed (leadership, managerial, exempt, non-exempt).
  - Roles and titles

The information in the following section on industry trends focuses on the areas of moderate and limited consensus.

**Industry Trends**

**FTE Requirements**

In the past few years, austerity and scrutiny of FTE counts have become realities in higher education. Few organizations operate as leanly as they could, and higher education is no exception. In fact, many would argue that higher education has been administratively expansive.

To evaluate the current FTE staffing of UMS’ HR department, it is helpful to compare industry standards in higher education to the current state at UMS (based on 5,700 staff and faculty, including 3,550 non-faculty). Table 1 presents standard (median) FTE ratios for Human Resource Departments based on a CUPA-HR survey of 214 universities and colleges in 2011 – 2012 and compares these results to UMS’ current state. The shaded column provides a recommended ratio (at a 10% premium) for UMS. The premium addition to headcount is an estimated extra to account for the geographic dispersion of the system: only 25% of institutions reporting to the CUPA-HR survey had multiple campuses. This proportion may be representative of the population but would dilute the true needs of the Maine System.
### TABLE 1: RATIOS OF FTES TO HR STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratios:</th>
<th>UMS (HR Staff to FTEs)</th>
<th>HE Industry (HR Staff to FTEs)</th>
<th>UMS Recommended (+10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N of FTE Employees (non-faculty) per</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Exempt HR staff</td>
<td>1:58</td>
<td>1:86</td>
<td>1:78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Exempt and Non-Exempt</td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>1:57</td>
<td>1:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N of FTE Employees (staff and faculty) per:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Exempt HR Staff</td>
<td>1:93</td>
<td>1:127</td>
<td>1:114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Exempt and Non-Exempt HR Staff</td>
<td>1:68</td>
<td>1:85</td>
<td>1:77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 provides an overview of UMS’ current HR staffing and two alternative recommendations: one, based on the highlighted HR ratios in Table 1 for faculty and staff and the other on the ratios based on staff only. According to these standards, UMS should have a total of between 70 – 74 employees. Industry statistics indicate that, within the exempt staff population, 50% are generalists and 50% are specialists, therefore, those estimates are provided as well.

Benchmark data always should be approached with caution since inter-institutional comparisons are imperfect. However, the results described are well within normative ranges based on Sibson’s experiences and appear achievable.

### TABLE 2: RECOMMENDED STAFFING FOR UMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Employee</th>
<th>UMS Current</th>
<th>UMS Recommended (based on Staff and Faculty)</th>
<th>UMS Recommended (based on Staff only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Specialist</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Generalist</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Exempt Total</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Non-Exempt Total</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Template

A move toward centralization and the use of COEs in institutions of higher education have become common in recent years, predominantly due to the need for increased operating efficiency and budget savings. “Shared services” is once again a fashionable topic of discussion on many campuses.

For clarity, when we reference “COEs,” we are denoting the policy-making and design elements of a function, as opposed to the tactical and operational aspects. Therefore, not all positions and people within a COE need to reside in a central location: at a minimum, only those positions that have system-wide responsibilities need to be centralized. Those individuals who are responsible for the interpretation and execution of policies and standard practices should remain in the field, close to the day-to-day work and their constituencies. In our experience, where practical, this division of labor is critical in order to balance the systemic interests of the institution with the decision-making discretion of people working on the ground. Based on our observations, we have found that centralized/COE models are most successful in geographically diverse institutions when:

- Functional roles and responsibilities within the COE are clear, with the centralized body accountable for setting common standards, policies, and practices for the organization – and is beholden to the institution as a whole versus to a segment of the institution
- The primary role of the centralized COE (in addition to establishing the guiding rules and regulations for the organization) is to facilitate sound judgments in the field by assuring that actors have the requisite knowledge and information required for execution
- There is local authority to act when issues are within the range of an individual’s abilities: otherwise, those in the field should look to the centralized COE to whom they have a dotted line relationship for expert guidance and opinion

In addition, systems with multiple institutions (and multiple Presidents) manage reporting relationships between local HR and their host campus/school and between local and central HR in different ways. We have seen all sorts of dotted and solid line combinations between local HR and their Presidents/Deans and local and central HR. In our experience, the most common reporting relationship is a solid line to the head of the campus/school and dotted line into central HR (although we suggest hardening the dotted line a bit).

Sibson’s Recommendations

1. Phase-in reductions in headcount coincident with the introduction of new technology and the required learning curve; to offset the commonly experienced decrement in performance following the implementation of new processes and technologies, reductions in FTE should lag three to six months behind and then gradually be reduced further over the ensuing six months as circumstances warrant.

2. By the end of year three, FTE for essential HR programs and services should be below 74 and, ideally, closer to 70 if system improvements have the intended effects.

3. Strengthen the role of central HR by putting a dual-reporting structure in place for heads of HR on campuses: introduce a bolded dotted line to a Chief Human Resource Officer (CHRO) and maintain the direct line to the respective Presidents. This revised structure, while appearing minimalistic, will greatly bolster cross-campus consistency and the
management of risks, improve the allocation of scarce resources across Human Resources, and retain Human Resource’s stature and leadership role on each campus.

4. COEs should report directly to a senior HR executive whose role is to ensure consistent, high quality service to all campuses. Although expertise is the defining attribute of COEs, it is by no means the sole indicator of success in this role: a word of caution, then. The COE positions will be difficult to fill in that the right employee must not only be technically informed but interpersonally effective (i.e., you do not want high-control gatekeepers but facilitators who help others perform their jobs well). For larger campuses with high-level experts on site, we propose providing a dotted line relationship into the appropriate COE.
IV. Recommended Solution

Organization Design Principles

Before Sibson joined the HR Review team, the group had developed a set of key organization design principles and vetted these principles thoroughly with leaders on all campuses. Sibson reviewed and endorsed these principles with minor edits based on discussions with the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. The principles require that the new design:

- Enhance interoperability: having systemic “depth” not “redundancy”
- Ensure competence/quality customer service and a high level of professionalism
- Ensure consistency and clarity-in data, decision making and policies
- Create cost savings and efficiencies

These criteria served as the touchstone for recommendations. Any suggestion made by the Team was tested against these principles and the draft, repurposed mission, below.

New Mission

*The following mission statement has been assembled from statements found on some of the campuses and should be regarded as a working versus final declaration:*

“The role of Human Resources is to support the academic mission of the Maine System in strategic partnership with other staff and academic units of the University by recruiting, motivating, and retaining diverse faculty and staff in an open, fair, simple, responsive, and efficient manner by using the integrated system-wide talents and technologies of the Function.”

The following sections describe actions that we view as requisites for fulfilling this mission and satisfying the criteria necessary for success: fostering higher returns on the System’s significant labor costs.

Technology Enhancements Required

Efficiency, productivity, and quality are predicated on the effective use of technology. Human Resources will be able to go only so far in reducing costs and improving service in its absence. This section, then, focuses on technologies that are critical to Human Resource performance. The group identified four key technologies to enhance/add:

1. **Benefits Administration,**
2. **Payroll,**
3. **E-Learning,** and
4. **E-Recruit.**

Details on each recommended implementation and related estimated costs are provided below.
Benefits System

The University of Maine System recently partially automated Benefits Administration, but the group pointed out that the automated system needed further significant investment to realize the full efficiency potential of the area. Required add-ons include case and document management, improved workflows, and increased self-service options. The Team estimated that an additional investment of $87,000 would be required for implementation, with recurring annual fees from year two on of approximately $37,000 for upgrades and maintenance.

Payroll

Currently, Human Resources devotes substantial resources to payroll. It services students and employees, and transactions are expected to be handled expeditiously and at a high level of quality.

Our experience suggests that a significant system upgrade to payroll costs between $60,000 and $70,000, on average. Training adds another $10,000 to upfront costs; ongoing maintenance and enhancements produce about another $15,000 in expenses annually. These estimates may vary based on the University System’s current configuration and the pricing of its current vendor. In general, trends in payroll technology in higher education include maximizing self-service tools, making the system easier to use, incorporating business intelligence and analytics for employer reporting, automating workflow processes, and conducting all transactions in electronic form.

The self-service options typically associated with payroll involve time and labor reporting, duplicate W-2s, maintaining/changing form W-4, setting up, modifying or cancelling direct deposits, providing pay statements, and verifying leave and benefits. In general, self-service is an excellent way to reduce the burden on Human Resources. Other common self-help options include:

- **HR**: maintenance of personal information, emergency contacts, dependent and beneficiary updates, job postings, employee development, training schedules

- **Institutional Administration**: organizational policies and procedures, newsletters, calendars, organizational charts

In many cases, benefits and payroll technologies are offered as a combined solution. This would be advantageous if HR’s current technology supplier could seamlessly wed these functionalities, as a general trend in HR is to co-locate payroll, benefits, and call center operations.

Learning Management Systems (LMS)

Learning and development was recognized by Review Team members as key to the success of the Human Resource organization, and the group agreed that with the geographic dispersion of the campuses, a robust LMS system would be integral in providing strong service in this area. Indeed, several members of the review group thought that one of the great tactical quivers in the HR bow was to improve the institutional IQ through continuous learning and development.
The perceived need for the technology was great and several areas were mentioned where it might play some role. These were:

- On boarding
- Development/Career Advancement
- Training
- Payroll
- Wellness
- Hiring
- Benefits Administration
- Compliance
- Diversity
- Recruitment
- Employee/Labor Relations

We would not suggest complete replacement of place-based learning as, in some cases, it is the most effective method. Yet, even here, a LMS system would be of significant value to the institution for the management of person-centered classes.

An LMS is the infrastructure that delivers and manages instructional content, identifies and assesses individual and organizational learning or training goals, tracks progress toward completion of goals, and collects and presents data for supervising the learning process of the organization as a whole. An LMS delivers content but also handles registration for courses, course administration, skills gap analyses, tracking, and reporting. It is important to note that LMS is a learning as opposed to course management system and, therefore, they are distinct from applications such as Blackboard.

The American Society for Training & Development (“A field guide to learning management systems,” 2005), recommends the following functional requirements for a corporate LMS:

- Integration with the Human Resources system;
- Administration tools which enable the management of user registrations, profiles, roles, curricula, certification paths, tutor assignments, content, internal budgets, user payments and chargebacks, and scheduling for learners, instructors and classrooms;
- Providing access to content, involving the medium (classroom, online), method (instructor-led, self-paced), and learners (employees, customers);
- Developing content, including authoring, maintaining, and storing;
- Integrating content with third-party courseware;
- Assessing learners’ competency gaps and managing skills acquisition and status;
- Providing and supporting authoring of assessments;
Adhering to standards such as SCORM and AICC which allow for importing content and courseware that complies with standards regardless of what authoring system it was created in;

Supporting configuration of the LMS to function with existing systems and internal processes;

Providing security such as passwords and encryption.

While this list of features can be helpful in understanding what LMS can do, as a systemic application it fundamentally provides the structure for the entire learning process within an organization.

A survey of 20 LMS companies (Association of Learning Management Systems, 2013) shows that the average first year cost for a minimum of 5,000 users is $90,000 (for a hosted system). The average yearly cost after that is approximately $50,000. A typical implementation takes approximately six months. Cornerstone and Saba are two frequently mentioned LMS providers in the academic space.

We recommend that the introduction of the learning system occur after installations of other software have been completed and are yielding benefits. There are several reasons for waiting. First, and most obvious, the cumulative expenses involved with technology purchases and upgrades in general make it economically infeasible. Second, it is logistically impractical: the University System does not have the requisite talent in place to make the implementation of the system a success. The University of Maine System will initially have to incorporate organization development, knowledge management and training into its capabilities’ repertoire. Third, as HR transforms itself, it will need an early success to prove that a system really is greater than the sum of its parts. Taking on too much at one time would be ill advised. Instead, we advocate finalizing the payroll/benefits upgrades and introducing a strategically critical and time- and cost-saving recruitment system, discussed below.

**Recruiting Systems**

It is nearly impossible to effectively manage the recruitment-hiring-onboarding-background checking-and reporting process without technological assistance. These are areas of high frustration in academia and rightly an area in which the Maine System has elected to concentrate efforts. Effective recruiting (by “recruiting” we mean the entire end-to-end process) is a primary way for Human Resources to boost the productivity of the enterprise by filling vacancies more quickly and onboarding new hires more efficiently—actions with real currency.

Recruiting systems typically perform the following activities:

- Create a library of posting templates and job descriptions
- Allow job hunters to search for jobs, manage application materials and monitor their application status on the ADA- and Section 508 applicant portals
- Offer applicant screening methods through intelligent selection tools
• Pre-qualify, assess, rank, and compare candidates using data from both assessment results and supplemental questions

• Maintain qualified pools of applicants for frequently filled or adjunct positions

• Customize workflows to match the organization's requirements and support multiple paths for different employment types

Software for higher education should include special functionality for faculty such as the creation of search committees, electronic document submission, and rating capabilities.

The onboarding component of recruitment software generally:

• Converts applicants to employees as part of the hiring proposal process

• Creates, sequences, and assigns onboarding tasks

• Includes document uploads, forms, document distribution and text instructions

• Creates unique onboarding events based on employee type

Most systems also have robust compliance reporting capabilities. Additionally, background checking and employment verification often are bundled with these products.

The major provider of recruiting software to the higher education community is the SaaS (Software-as-a-Service) company PeopleAdmin who generously provided estimates for the cost of implementation of their software. We are not, in this report, advocating the use of one product over another, but given the competitive nature of this business space, we use these estimates as a way to relate the general costs of the software. Software implementation for end-to-end recruitment software is approximately $70,000 in year 1, and $45,000 per year thereafter. Most recruitment software can be integrated with PeopleSoft.

**Establishing an Organizational Template (a foundation for design)**

This section summarizes design criteria based on the critical success factors such as interoperability mentioned earlier and ongoing discussions with the Review Team. The Team agreed that a final design, once implemented, would:

• Standardize processes as much as possible in order to reduce variance and ensure quality

• Enhance the overall level of positions across the board, allowing for deeper expertise and greater flexibility to respond to a wide range of issues

• Reduce duplication of effort by consolidating functionalities

• Distribute key capabilities to the campuses as required, allowing individuals the latitude to act based on local conditions and issues

• Provide clear career development and job progression opportunities for individuals within sub-functions and across HR
Augment current service offerings of HR, including a communications function, enhanced technology, and a more robust OD function

Rely heavily on up-to-date HRIS system capabilities on the campuses so information can flow to and be accessed where it is needed

Minimize the number of hand-offs required to complete transactions to increase efficiency and define clear contacts for ownership of processes

Two areas of disagreement among Team Members will have to be reconciled before a new design can be put in place; one issue concerns reporting relationships and the other placement of COEs.

**Reporting Relationships**

The question of reporting relationships arises most strikingly when the interests of business and functional entities cross. “Who is the Head of HR on a campus ultimately beholden to: the President of that campus or the Chief Human Resource Officer who sits in another location?”

Our opinion is that organizational designs should reflect reality, and the reality is that Presidents will want Human Resources to work in tandem with the interests of their campus. This implies a solid line reporting relationship to the President. Nevertheless, by definition alone a system requires connectivity. That suggests that a very heavy dotted line be traceable from the campuses to a centralized authority, else none of the benefits of a system will unfold. In other words, Human Resources must be responsive to the needs of the campuses, well integrated with the operations of their host organizations, and act in concert with the strategic directives of the function to which they belong.

Therefore, one important aim of an organizational structure would be to remove unwanted repercussions of intra-campus reporting relationships, namely, Human Resource isolationism. Exclusive adherence to the campuses presents two problems for Human Resources. First, it replicates Human Resources throughout the system and reduces opportunities for scale. Second, fiscal dependency on the individual campuses decreases the collective purchasing power of Human Resources and produces an environment in which each unit fends for itself. This creates problems for the smaller campuses that may not have sufficient financial/people resources to deliver services. For this reason, we feel strongly that a reporting relationship to a CHRO is essential to ensure “One HR” in the University of Maine System.

This Chief Human Resource Officer would serve as the ultimate accountable position. The senior group would pool their intellects, interests and needs to set standards, policies, and annual budgets (subject to review and approval). The agendas of the smaller campuses might be advanced by a high-level sponsor such as a Vice-President resident in the central System Office. An individual in such a position would serve as a constant point of contact, source of support, and shaper and conveyor of collective interests.

**Location of Centers of Excellence**

The second item that has bred debate pertains to the eventual location of the Centers of Excellence. These Centers provide systemic expertise in a number of functional areas. These areas were identified and agreed upon by the internal review group. Therefore, the issue is not in
the “what” but in the “where.” The group was divided on this topic. Some felt the Centers of Excellence should all reside in one (non-campus) location reporting up to a Vice President of COEs while others felt COEs should be split and “reside” on one (or more) of the major campuses.

This dichotomy of opinion is understandable and, as it happens, we believe that both factions are correct. The success of a Center of Excellence requires both the determination of institution-wide standards and the advancement of those standards by supporting accurate interpretation and sound implementation. Therefore, where feasible, we suggest splitting the functionality of a COE between a centralized policy- and design-making branch and a decentralized staff who are charged with responsibly acting in a local environment in accordance with system-wide mandates. This is especially true for the larger campuses where standards will be recurrently tested, and the issues will be frequent and difficult such as those involving labor and employee relations.

We believe that this dual COE structure has several advantages:

- A centralized functionality provides the all-important cultural signaling of a unified versus fragmented Human Resources

- The co-location of high level expertise in a common location offers coordination across the experts and promotes consistent messaging throughout the organization

- With modest additions in personnel, the centralized COE capability can be extended to provide ongoing support to the smaller campuses

- The positioning of experienced COE personnel on the large campuses ensures uniform application of standards, effective execution, and operational excellence

**Further Considerations for Implementation**

Based on our assessment, we believe that the effects of improved processes, workflows, and technology will result in the reduced need for FTE. An FTE target in the low 70s (as discussed previously) is attainable after three years and would result in 10% – 15% of compensation savings, or close to $600,000. At the same time, operating efficiency, quality and service delivery should improve. In addition, according to our estimates, we believe that these results can be achieved while elevating the overall talent base of Human Resources (and, indeed, we consider it mandatory to produce the changes desired). Most savings will accrue over time but once found they can be partly re-invested to nourish a cycle of continuous improvement.

There will be a period of transition as Human Resources phases in new technologies and operating procedures. In this regard, the department will need to consider how this will work. Our comments, below, offer a preliminary guide pertaining to the implementation of technology:

- We foresee placing oversight for the electronic, methodological, and process aspects of recruiting in a centralized System Office, but keeping hiring judgments and the high-touch elements of recruiting within the province of the campuses.
Based on our experiences and data sources, the staffing of payroll requires .1 HR FTE for every 100 employees. That would suggest that the Maine System would require between 12 and 13 FTE to support payroll based on services for 5,700 employees and 7,000 students. This estimate is likely high since ostensibly students would not place too great a demand on the system. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to assume that all of these FTE would be centralized. This is because some payroll functions such as data classification and entry are typically distributed in the field whereas tasks such as approvals, processing and reporting are easier to execute and more cost-effective when centrally located. This brings up a side issue but an important one nevertheless. Although we are recommending the centralization of many routine processes and the attendant technologies, it is clear that technology is never centralized in a strict sense. Information is distributed and, as such, the campuses should bear in mind that they would require technological capabilities and HRIS professionals on site.

A temporary need for additional people will be required to manage the increased technology infrastructure, interact with vendors, and train employees and managers on usage—while HR continues to accommodate the regular, ongoing stream of work. This may be accomplished through redeployments, staff augmentation through independent contractors or part-time help, or the vendor’s personnel.

As previously noted, in order to accommodate the e-learning systems, the requisite competencies for execution need to be brought into the institution first. Once implemented, LMS systems can have special advantages in addition to the ones their designers intended. It is possible for e-learning systems to pay for themselves through chargebacks to departments, especially for content that the departments would otherwise have to pay for. In addition, there is nothing prohibitive about using the technology for purposes outside of the University such as running certification programs.

Sibson believes that investment in technological infrastructure will be quickly recouped in the form of compensation savings and, less tangibly, through the benefits of more efficient payroll processing and benefits administration as well as a more responsive and expeditious front-to-back recruitment system.

In addition, Human Resources has a rare opportunity to re-imagine itself: to think anew about what it is and how it may best contribute to the academic mission of the University. We see in movement toward a true system the chance for Human Resources to leverage its collective intellect and abilities more thoroughly and thoughtfully. We see in in the Team’s reflections the opportunity to add new dimensions to its service bailiwick which it has, to date, gone without. The prospect of working as a cohesive, one HR unit has promise that staff, faculty, and students will recognize as progress. Traditions do not succumb easily, however, and the proof of the new system will have to come through demonstrated successes.