Governance Model
The purpose of the governance model deliverable is to define how decisions about the Shared Services Organization will be made within the context of the broader UT Austin environment. An effective governance organization promotes accountability, stakeholder participation, and defined integration points for decision-making.

The objective of the Governance Model is to propose a model that can be brought to the campus dialogue for discussion with stakeholders across the university.

- The governance model is a proposal for a shared services governance model.
- The governance model is not a complete analysis of current university governance structures and bodies or a suggestion for changes to wider university governance as a whole.

This deliverable is a Plan Phase work product. Information in the final shared services recommendations may be different from what is in the deliverable, in response to stakeholder feedback.
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The proposed shared services governance model leverages a combination of leading governance practices and, where practical, existing UT Austin groups.

• Shared Services leading practices for governance
  — A clearly defined charter for each body in the governance model including roles & responsibilities, membership, and operational processes.
  — A clearly defined information flow and escalation paths.
  — The “Voice” of the customer is critical to decision-making.

• Current Governance: A new set of governance bodies is required for shared services
  — No one current governance body at UT Austin currently encompasses the scope all functions of shared services.
  — More than 30 current governance bodies and other groups at UT Austin are stakeholders in UT Shared Services.

• Proposed Model: The proposed shared services governance model uses leading practices to establish new governance bodies specific to shared services while still leveraging the members of current bodies
  — One Joint Steering Committee: Transitions the Shared Services Project Steering Committee to being a permanent committee, thus driving alignment with UT strategic priorities as well as alignment between the different functions of Shared Services.
  — One Advisory Council: Integrates the managerial and functional expertise and input of cross-functional administrative (HR, Finance, Procurement) business officers and IT directors.
  — Four Functional Committees (one per function): Provides function-specific expertise and focus for HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT to promote efficient and effective service delivery that meets the day-to-day functional/technical service needs of SSO customers.
The proposed governance model was developed by leveraging current governance structures and bodies where possible and defining new structures and bodies where those proved insufficient.

**Planning Phase**

- **Understand Existing Governance Structures**
  - Conduct research and meetings to understand the governance structures that currently exist at UT Austin.
  - Focus on governance bodies that are involved, to varying degrees, in the decision-making process regarding HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT functions that are in-scope for shared services.
  - Identification of existing governance structures and bodies.

- **Evaluate Existing Governance Structures**
  - Evaluate which existing governance structures and bodies could be included in the Shared Services Organization’s governance model.
  - Determine any new governance structures and/or bodies required where gaps exist.
  - Proposed shared services governance model.

**Campus Dialogue**

- **Discuss Proposed Model with Stakeholders**
  - Discuss the proposed shared services governance model with stakeholders to ensure appropriate groups and individuals have been included in the decision-making framework and that the decision-making process is transparent to stakeholders.

- Finalized shared services governance model.

**This Phase**

**Next Steps**
The governance model is a deliverable of the Shared Services Planning project Service Delivery Model work stream.

**FY2012-13**
- **April**
  - PMO
  - CBO Assessment
- **May**
  - Service Delivery Model
- **June 2012**
  - Revised Business Case
- **July**
  - Change Management Plan
- **August**
  - IT Future State Operating Model
  - Finance/Procurement Future State Operating Model
  - HR Future State Operating Model

**FY2013-14**
- **September**
  - Draft Shared Services Plan
- **October**
  - Update Transform UT website
- **November**
  - Discuss with stakeholder groups
- **December**
  - Present to existing forums (e.g. Town Hall, FYI Session)
  - Roadshows to colleges, schools and units
- **January**
  - Incorporate feedback and update Shared Services Plan
  - Roll-out update Shared Services Plan to Campus
Shared services governance ensures a strong, continuously improving Shared Services Organization that is accountable to both its customers and the university.

Effective governance provides the following:

- Strategic Direction
- Accountability
- Communication & Feedback Loop
- Functional/Technical Expertise
- Policy & Process Decision-Making
- Performance Monitoring & Tracking
- Transparency

Components of an effective shared services governance model include:

- **Purpose:** Governance provides a framework for making decisions that define expectations, explain accountability, and verify performance.

- **Functional & Operational Capabilities:** Governance leverages functional/technical expertise across all in-scope functions (i.e. HR, Finance, Procurement, IT).

- **Role & Responsibilities:** The governance structure clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the governance bodies and the interaction between governance bodies and the Shared Services Organization.

- **Defined Stakeholders:** Stakeholders of shared services are clearly defined and integrated into the governance process.

- **Defined Membership and Committee Formation/Operational Processes:** The committee formation process and meeting cadence is clearly outlined, ensuring membership is fully representative across stakeholder groups and that processes are transparent to SSO stakeholders.
Shared Services Governance Model:
Provides strategic, operational, and technical **oversight and direction** and defines the decision-making process to ensure the organization’s operations and outcomes are always aligned with the UT Austin’s strategic priorities and customer needs.

Governance is not to be confused with line-management. Line management is fully accountable for the end-to-end operations of the organization, including performance and budget.

**Shared services governance promotes collaboration and innovation while ensuring alignment with strategic priorities, policies, and procedures.**
A mature governance model not only guides the strategic direction through feedback mechanisms and inclusion of functional expertise, but also helps make clear policy and process decisions, and ensures the organization is accountable for high performance.

**Shared Services Governance: Maturity Levels**

- **Policy & Process Decision-Making**: develops and promotes policies, processes, and projects that are aligned with the organization’s priorities and serve its customers.
- **Performance Monitoring & Tracking**: monitors performance of the organization and drives continuous improvement initiatives that ensure continued high quality of service and creation of value.
- **Transparency**: promotes transparent governance processes (e.g., committee selection process, funding decision processes).
- **Strategic Direction**: provides clear strategic guidance to the Shared Services Organization.
- **Communication Feedback Loop**: creates a strong partnership between the Shared Services Organization, its customers, and key stakeholders through two-way communication.
- **Functional Expertise**: integrates input from functional experts into the decision-making process.

- **Non-Existent**: governance processes have not been developed or implemented.

**Maturity Level**

- Low
- Medium
- High
Shared Services Governance: Breadth of Capabilities

By integrating diverse functional expertise, shared services governance provides the knowledge and the strategic, operational, and technical decision-making capability required for the Shared Services Organization.

**Across all levels of detail**

- **Strategic Direction**: governance provides the mechanisms through which the strategic goals of the organization are defined and communicated.

- **Operational Direction**: governance provides the mechanisms through which operational policies and processes are defined and projects and improvement initiatives are prioritized.

- **Functional/Technical Direction**: governance provides the mechanisms through which function-specific (HR, Finance, Procurement) and technical (IT) needs and priorities are identified.

**Across all areas of functional expertise**

- At varying levels of detail, governance provides the functional/technical expertise (i.e. HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT expertise) required to promote functional improvements and make well-informed, pragmatic decisions.

---

* Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) – is a set of practices for IT Service Management.
Shared Services Governance: Stakeholders

*Stakeholders of shared services can be thought of in three groups: consumers, partners, and employees.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSO Customers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Shared Services Consumers**

Consumers are the specific individuals who need and use the services that shared services provides.

Influence: Voice input and concerns through representatives serving on governance bodies.

Consumer groups include:
- Retained Functional Staff
  - Includes staff working within in-scope functions in the CSUs (i.e. external to SSO)
- End users:
  - Includes Faculty, Researchers, Administrators, Staff, Students, External Users*

**Shared Services Partners**

Shared services partners ultimately decide if their College, School, or Unit will leverage shared services and to what extent.

Influence: Voice input and concerns through representatives serving on governance bodies; opt in/out of shared services.

Partner groups include:
- Senior Leadership: Administrators (Deans / Vice Presidents of the university’s CSUs
- HR and Business Officers in the CSUs
- External decision makers**

**Shared Services Employees**

Shared services employees are all staff employed by the Shared Services Organization.

Influence: Voice input and concerns through representatives serving on governance bodies.

Employee groups include:
- SSO Leadership
- SSO Operational Managers
- SSO Functional/ Technical Practitioners

---

*External Users can be visiting academics, visiting administrators, or other campus visitors (e.g. auditors), who may require end user support.*

**External decision maker can be a research facility or program operation that is affiliated with the university but not wholly managed or owned by the university (e.g. AT&T Conference Center, KUT Public Media Studios).
Representatives from all stakeholder groups sit on governance bodies in order to ensure the knowledge, views, concerns, and requests for service of all stakeholders are integrated into the decision-making process.

Members of stakeholder groups serving on governance bodies are directly involved in making and suggesting improvements to shared services.

The governance bodies gain effectiveness when there is sufficient representation across stakeholder segments:

- Affiliation (i.e. Administrator, Faculty, Staff, Student)
- College, School, Unit Size and Specialty
- Functional/Technical Expertise (i.e. HR, Finance, Procurement, IT)

* Retained Organization refers to all UT Austin CSUs external to the SSO.
The membership selection process is clearly defined.

- **Identify Individual membership criteria:**
  - Promote varied representation across stakeholder groups.
  - Define term length and limits (2-3 year terms are recommended, with a limit of 2 terms).
  - Determine voting and non-voting positions.

- **Membership considerations for governance group:**
  - Confirm there are no voting blocks.
  - Establish the selection process and membership responsibilities.

- **Invite Members to join:**
  - Chair of the Planning Project Steering Committee asks for volunteers and nominations from the current Project Steering Committee.
  - Project Steering Committee members nominate others or volunteer to serve in the future governance Steering Committee.
  - Confirm nominees meet the membership criteria and are willing to serve.
  - The Chair consults with the President and the Provost to select the governance membership.
  - Invite identified members to serve on governance committee.

- **New Project Steering Committee convenes early in the first month of pilot activity.**
The governance agenda and format is clearly defined.

• Define Meeting Cadence & Agendas
  — Determine how often the committees will meet.
  — Define common cyclical agenda items.
  — Determine how specific agendas will be set.

• Establish Task Forces
  — Create temporary task forces to focus on specific time-bound issues as-needed (e.g. projects, technical evaluations).
  — Select existing governance committee members or other stakeholders not currently serving on any committee that have special expertise in the task force’s area of focus to serve as members.

Each committee will have a charter which clearly defines its purpose, roles & responsibilities, membership selection criteria, and meeting cadence and agenda setting. This is communicated with stakeholders to foster transparency.
Summary: Current UT Austin Governance Structures

There are more than 30 existing stakeholder and decision-making bodies at UT Austin.

- Current governance bodies at UT Austin can be categorized according to their current role in governing or contributing to decisions for HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT at UT Austin:
  - Bodies with decision-making power over HR, Finance, Procurement, or IT.
  - Bodies providing input to HR, Finance, Procurement, or IT.

- No one current governance body at UT Austin currently encompasses the scope of all functions of the proposed Shared Services Organization.

- More than 30 current governance bodies and other groups at UT Austin are stakeholders in UT Shared Services.
The identified bodies can be categorized according to their current role in governing or contributing to decisions for HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT at UT Austin.

- **Bodies with decision-making power over HR, Finance, Procurement, or IT:**
  - Strategic – strategic bodies have decision-making power regarding the strategic direction of HR, Finance, Procurement, and/or IT.
  - Operational – operational bodies have decision-making power regarding the operational policies and processes of HR, Finance, Procurement, and/or IT, as well as prioritization of projects and improvement initiatives.
  - Functional/Technical – functional/technical bodies have decision-making power regarding functional (HR, Finance, Procurement) and/or technical (IT) needs and priorities.

- **Bodies providing input to HR, Finance, Procurement, or IT:**
  - Stakeholder – stakeholder bodies provide input into the strategic, operational, or functional/technical decision-making process regarding HR, Finance, Procurement, and/or IT but have no direct decision-making power.
Central HR receives input into the decision-making process from the HR Consortium and HR Spectrum, but final decision-making power resides centrally.

**Characteristics of Current HR Governance:**

- **Strategic Direction:** While stakeholders provide input, the final decision-making power regarding the strategic direction of HR at UT Austin resides centrally.

- **Communication & Feedback Loop:** A communication and feedback loop exists between central HR and the CSUs through the HR Consortium (strategic/operational) and HR Spectrum (functional/technical).

- **Functional/Technical Expertise:** Members of HR Consortium and HR Spectrum bring HR functional expertise regarding policy and process matters into the decision-making process.

Sources: UT Austin Governance Meetings July-August 2013, [http://www.utexas.edu](http://www.utexas.edu)
Central Finance & Procurement receives input into the decision-making process from several stakeholder groups, but final decision-making power resides centrally.

Characteristics of Current Finance & Procurement Governance:

- **Strategic Direction:** While stakeholders provide input, final decision-making power regarding the strategic direction of Finance & Procurement at UT Austin resides centrally.

- **Communication & Feedback Loop:** A communication and feedback loop exists between central Finance & Procurement and the CSUs through University Business Officers Council (UBOC), TXAdmin, and UT Market Advisory Group and the HRMS, IQ, and FRMS advisory groups.

- **Functional/Technical Expertise:** Members of strategic and operational stakeholder bodies bring functional expertise regarding policy and process matters into the decision-making process while HRMS, IQ, and FRMS groups provide technical expertise regarding system-specific issues.

Sources: UT Austin Governance Meetings July-August 2013, [http://www.utexas.edu](http://www.utexas.edu)
### Current Governance: IT

*IT governance committees are responsible for setting the strategic, operational, and technical direction of IT at UT Austin.*

#### Strategic Decisions (University-Level)
- **Strategic IT Accountability Board (SITAB)**
- **Faculty Council IT Committee**

#### Strategic Stakeholder Input
- **Administrative IT Leaders Group (AITL)**
- **Business Services Committee (BSC)**
- **Administrative Business Leaders (ABL)**
- **Faculty**
- **Staff**
- **Students**

#### Operational Decisions
- **Operational IT Committee (OIT)**
- **Research & Educational Technology Committee**
- **Canvas Task Force**

#### Functional/Technical Decisions
- **IT Architecture & Infrastructure Committee (AIC)**
- **Voice over IP (VOIP) Task Force**
- **Identity & Access Management Subcommittee (IAM)**
- **Web Technologies and Infrastructure Subcommittees (WTI)**

*Staff* in blue text indicates staff members.

---

*Administrative Systems Advisory groups (IQ, HRMS, FRMS) are not included in the Current IT Governance structure as they do not escalate or report into existing IT Governance.*

**Sources:** UT Austin Governance Meetings July-August 2013, [http://www.utexas.edu/cio/itgovernance/](http://www.utexas.edu/cio/itgovernance/)
The Shared Services Steering Committee includes academic, administrative, UT System and project team representatives.

**Shared Services Steering Committee Chair**

Kevin Hegarty  
VP and CFO

---

**Academic Reps.**

- **Randy Diehl**  
  Dean, College of Liberal Arts

- **Tom Gilligan**  
  Dean, McCombs School of Business

- **Ted Gordon**  
  Department Chair, Department of AADS

- **Chelsea Jones**  
  Student Leadership

- **Joe Sosler**  
  Assistant Dean, College of Pharmacy

- **Jamie Southerland**  
  Associate Dean for Business Affairs

- **Alexa Stuifbergen**  
  Dean, School of Nursing

---

**Administrative Reps.**

- **Cindy Brown**  
  Assistant VP and Business Officer, Research

- **Pat Clubb**  
  VP for University Operations

- **Erika Frahm**  
  Chair, UT Staff Council

- **Debra Kress**  
  Associate VP for Human Resources

- **Gage Paine**  
  VP for Student Affairs

- **Charles Roeckle**  
  Deputy to the President

- **Dan Slesnick**  
  Senior VP for Resource Management

---

**UT System Reps.**

- **Scott Kelley**  
  Executive Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, UT System

- **Andrea Marks**  
  VP and CFO, UT Health Science Center, San Antonio

---

**Project Sponsors**

- **Brad Englert**  
  University CIO and ITS COO

- **Mary Knight**  
  Associate VP, Office of the VP and CFO

---

Source: [http://www.utexas.edu/transforming-ut/committees/administrative-services/shared-services-committee](http://www.utexas.edu/transforming-ut/committees/administrative-services/shared-services-committee)
The majority of Shared Services Committee Members are also members of the various other identified governance bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Additional membership in selected bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hegarty</td>
<td>VP Council, University Budget Council, SITAB, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Diehl</td>
<td>Dean’s Council, SITAB, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gilligan</td>
<td>Dean’s Council, SITAB, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Gordon</td>
<td>Previous member of Faculty Council (2010-2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Sosler</td>
<td>UBOC, TXAdmin, HR Spectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Southerland</td>
<td>BSC, UBOC, TXAdmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Stuifbergen</td>
<td>Dean’s Council, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Jones</td>
<td>Student Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Brown</td>
<td>BSC, UBOC, HR Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Clubb</td>
<td>VP Council, University Budget Council, SITAB, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Frahm</td>
<td>Staff Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Kress</td>
<td>BSC, HR Consortium, Staff Council (sponsor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Paine</td>
<td>VP Council, OIT, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Roeckle</td>
<td>University Budget Council, SITAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Slesnick</td>
<td>OIT, UBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Englert</td>
<td>SITAB, Faculty Council IT Committee (without vote), OIT, BSC, R&amp;E, AIC, UBOC, Faculty Council (without vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Knight</td>
<td>UBC, BSC, UBOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.utexas.edu](http://www.utexas.edu). Membership is as listed on the various websites and member lists of the groups as of the end of August, 2013. and is subject to change.
The proposed shared services governance model requires the establishment of new governance bodies specific to shared services while still leveraging the members of current bodies.

Shared Services Governance Proposed Bodies

**Joint Steering Committee**

**PURPOSE:** The Joint Steering Committee is **strategic** and confirm that the SSO is accountable and provides high-quality, continuously improving services to customers and remain aligned with the priorities, vision, and mission of the university.

**MEMBERSHIP:** One Joint Steering Committee that transitions from the Shared Services Project Steering Committee to a permanent committee made up of Deans, AVPs, a faculty member, staff representative, and a student representative.

**Operational Advisory Council**

**PURPOSE:** The Advisory Council (cross-functional) is **operational** and confirms that the SSO performing to expectations and is accountable to its customers.

**MEMBERSHIP:** It is composed of executive level faculty and staff with HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT expertise from the Colleges, Schools, and Units (CSUs).

**Functional Committees**

**PURPOSE:** Four Functional Committees (one per function) are **technical** and provide expertise for each of the SSO functions (i.e., HR, Finance, Procurement, and IT) in order to promote efficient, effective and continuously improving service delivery.

**MEMBERSHIP:** It is composed of CSU process owners; managers/supervisors of functional/technical administrative staff that have deep understanding of function-specific processes.
The proposed shared services governance bodies interact with all levels of the Shared Services Organization.
Shared services management and governance are separate but must interact at all levels in order for the Shared Services Organization to be effectively governed.

**Proposed Governance Responsibilities**

**Key Responsibilities**

- Defines the priorities and targets for shared services.
- Approves funding for large projects and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.
- Acts as the final recourse for SSO operational issue escalation (e.g., budget planning, technology infrastructure).
- Monitors high-level performance.
- Prioritizes and proposes projects for continuous improvement.
- Proposes changes to the service categories offered by the SSO following central function endorsement.
- Acts as an intermediary escalation point for SSO operational issues.
- Monitors performance against targets.
- Establishes temporary task forces for specific issues/projects.
- Collects and prioritizes log of continuous improvement initiatives and changes to the service categories proposed by central functions, CSUs, or SSO.
- Identifies SSO operational issues to escalate.
- Establishes temporary task forces for specific issues/projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Governance</th>
<th>University Strategic Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Services Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>• Resolves high-severity SSO operational issues, and customer service disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Management</td>
<td>• Approves prioritized continuous improvement initiatives and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional/Technical Operations</td>
<td>• Produces plans for improvements and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implements shared services targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolves intermediary SSO operational issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies and formulates continuous improvement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documents potential SSO operational issues and risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Advisory Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolves high-severity SSO operational issues, and customer service disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approves prioritized continuous improvement initiatives and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produces plans for improvements and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implements shared services targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolves intermediary SSO operational issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies and formulates continuous improvement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documents potential SSO operational issues and risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Working Groups</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolves high-severity SSO operational issues, and customer service disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approves prioritized continuous improvement initiatives and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produces plans for improvements and changes to the service categories offered by the SSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implements shared services targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolves intermediary SSO operational issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies and formulates continuous improvement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documents potential SSO operational issues and risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

University Strategic Priorities

- Establishes temporary task forces for specific issues/projects.
The proposed shared services governance bodies leverage members of current governance bodies where appropriate and seeks new members where a gap exists.

Communication between **ALL** shared services governance bodies and other university stakeholder groups.

Notes:
1. Description of current governance bodies provided on slides 29-33.
2. "Retained Organization" refers to all UT Austin CSUs external to the SSO.
The central functional organizations will be represented on governance bodies, provide endorsement for functional policy changes, and be consulted on service changes. The legal organization will review governance activity, as needed, to confirm legal compliance.

**Proposed Central Functional Organizations and Legal Participation**

Central Functional (Central HR, Finance, Procurement, IT)

- Central functional representatives confirm the SSO strategic direction is aligned with the policies and the strategic direction of the central organization.
- Certain leadership positions from the central functional organizations hold permanent positions on the Advisory Council. These members have agenda setting authority, recommend policy changes, and chair the functional committees.
- Central functional organizations recommend policy changes, propose changes to service categories offered by the SSO, or other improvement initiatives through representatives serving on committees.

Legal

- Legal will ensure any changes to service categories offered by the SSO, changes in policy, and projects are in compliance with the law on an as-needed basis.
- Legal representatives will not serve on governance committees but will be consulted as appropriate.
The decision rights of Shared Services governance bodies vary depending on the decision type, investment level, and impact of change or issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Strategic Decisions</th>
<th>Investment Decisions</th>
<th>Service Changes</th>
<th>Policy/Process/Procedure Changes</th>
<th>Performance Issue Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Process/Procedure Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Issue Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td>Input Decision</td>
<td>Input Decision</td>
<td>Input Decision</td>
<td>Input Decision</td>
<td>Input Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UBC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Decisions over non-IT budget &amp; confirm major IT funding sources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITAB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Decisions over IT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS Joint Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS Operational Advisory Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS Functional Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The threshold requiring escalation of investment decisions, and the exact policy, process, and procedure changes that can be made at every level will be defined in the next phase. Service, policy, process, and procedure changes also require endorsement from central functional organizations and legal on an as needed basis. The VP Council, Deans Council, and POAG will also be consulted as appropriate.
## Proposed Joint Steering Committee Details

### Joint Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>The purpose of the Joint Steering Committee is to ensure the SSO(s) across all functions provide high-quality, continuously improving services to all customers and remain aligned with the priorities, vision, and mission of the university.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Metrics Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Quality** | Monitor quality of service metrics to ensure outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.  
Develop action plan to address underperformance. |
| **Customer Service** | Monitor customer service metrics based on input provided by the Shared Services Organization’s Customer Relationship Management (CRM) function to ensure outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.  
Develop action plan to address underperformance. |
| **Budget** | Monitor adherence to budget to ensure outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.  
Monitor degree of benefits capture to confirm outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.  
Develop action plan to address budget issues. |
| Roles & Responsibilities |  |
| **Strategic Decisions** | Define the long-term goals and the strategic direction of the SSO.  
Periodically evaluate SSO objectives and scope with long-term university goals and direction. |
| **Investment Decisions** | Monitor degree of benefits capture to confirm outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.  
Review, prioritize, and approve significant project investments that fall above a pre-defined threshold.  
Sponsor significant new projects and provide strategic portfolio/program oversight.  
Request approval of the university Budget Council if decisions impact budget. |
| **Service Catalog Changes** | Approve changes to the service categories offered by the SSO (which L1/L2 level processes are in the SSO). |
| **Policy/Process/Procedure Changes** | Obtain endorsement from VP/Deans council for significant SSO policy changes where appropriate. |
| **Communication** | Communicate any decisions to governance bodies, the SSO, and external stakeholders. |
| Cadence & Agenda |  |
| **Meeting Frequency** | Meets quarterly (or as needed). |
| **Agenda** | Agenda items include standard topics such as reviewing performance metrics, major investment requests, and service catalog change requests proposed by the Advisory Council.  
Additional agenda items can be requested by committee members or any member of the university and are approved by the chair. |
| **Escalation** | Manages performance/quality issues with university-wide or significant budgetary impacts. |
| Membership |  |
| **Membership Criteria** | Senior leadership, representatives from stakeholder categories (affiliation/CSU size/functional expertise), SSO Leader(s)  
Clear, prescriptive membership rules to be defined in the design phase. |
| **Membership Selection** | Leverage membership of the planning project’s Shared Services Steering Committee, and other senior leadership. |
| **Term Length** | 2-3 year terms. |
| **Term Limit** | Limit of 2 terms (unless position is ex-officio/functionally required). |
| **Voting Rules** | 2/3 vote required to make a decision.  
No voting blocks (2/3 or more of members) representing a specific CSU or functional area.  
Defined voting positions and non-voting positions. |
# Proposed Advisory Council Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Advisory Council</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The purpose of the Advisory Council is to ensure shared services is offering the right type of functional services in the right way to its customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Performance Metrics Monitoring</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>▪ Define and monitor quality of service metrics and report to the Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Service</strong></td>
<td>▪ Define and monitor customer service metrics based on input provided by the Shared Services Organization’s CRM function and report to Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>▪ Review adherence to budget and report to Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roles &amp; Responsibilities</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Investment Decisions** | ▪ Monitor degree of benefits capture to confirm outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.  
▪ Review and approve discretionary projects requested by Functional Committees.  
▪ Develop business cases and prioritized list of large recommended investments for Steering Committee. |
| **Service Catalog Changes** | ▪ Prioritize and propose changes to the service categories offered by the SSO (which L1/L2 processes are in the SSO) once changes are endorsed by the central functional organization. |
| **Policy/Process/Procedure Changes** | ▪ Evaluate and prioritize continuous improvement initiatives proposed by Functional Committees.  
▪ Update processes and policies internal to SSO, proposing to Steering Committee when significant.  
▪ Chairs of Functional Committees (members of the Advisory Council) ensure any proposed policy, service change, or project is reviewed by Legal and Central Functions before it is approved or proposed to the Steering Committee to ensure legal and policy compliance. |
| **Communication** | ▪ Communicate any decisions to governance bodies, the SSO, and external stakeholders. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cadence &amp; Agenda</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Frequency</strong></td>
<td>▪ Meets monthly (or as needed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Agenda** | ▪ Agenda items include standard topics such as reviewing continuous improvement initiatives, process change requests, or project requests from Functional Committees.  
▪ Additional agenda items can be requested by committee members and are approved by the chair. |
| **Escalation** | ▪ Manages operational issues affecting the SSO organization and customers across functions.  
▪ Escalates significant performance/quality issues with university-wide impacts. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Membership</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Membership Criteria** | ▪ Business officers from across all functions from the retained organization including the central functional organizations; members of the Advisory Council from central functional organizations will serve as chairs of the Functional Committee within their functional area.  
▪ Representative of stakeholder categories (affiliation/CSU size/functional expertise).  
▪ SSO Operational Managers. |
| **Membership Selection** | ▪ Leverage membership of UBOC, HR Consortium, UT Market Advisory Group, and Operational IT (OIT).  
▪ Other business officers must be identified where there is a gap in current bodies.  
▪ Clear, prescriptive membership rules to be defined in the design phase. |
| **Term Length** | ▪ 2-3 year terms |
| **Term Limit** | ▪ Limit of 2 terms (unless position is ex-officio/functionally required, such as central function permanent position). |
| **Voting Rules** | ▪ 2/3 vote required to make a decision or to escalate issue to Steering Committee.  
▪ No voting blocks (2/3 or more of members) representing a specific CSU or functional area.  
▪ Defined voting positions and non-voting positions. |
## Proposed Functional Committee Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th><strong>The purpose of the Functional Committees is to promote efficient, effective and continuously improving service delivery that meets the day-to-day functional/technical service needs of all SSO customers.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Metrics Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>▪ Review function-specific operational quality of service metrics and report to Advisory Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>▪ Review function-specific operational customer service metrics based on input provided by the Shared Services Organization’s CRM function and report to Advisory Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>▪ Review adherence to budget specific to the Functional Committee’s functional area and report to Advisory Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles &amp; Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Decisions</td>
<td>▪ Request budget for improvement initiatives, new projects, or new technology.  ▪ Track degree of benefits capture to confirm outcomes are aligned to strategic priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Catalog Changes</td>
<td>▪ Propose changes to the service categories offered by the SSO (which L1/L2 processes are in the SSO). ▪ Service changes can be proposed by members of central functional organizations, CSUs, or the SSO (changes must have final endorsement of central functional organization before proposal to Steering Committee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Process/Procedure Changes</td>
<td>▪ Identify and prioritize continuous improvements initiatives. ▪ Propose changes to processes and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>▪ Communicate any decisions to governance bodies, the SSO, and external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadence &amp; Agenda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>▪ Meets twice per month (or as needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>▪ Agenda items include standard topics such as reviewing customer feedback and concerns, identifying improvement initiatives and assessing progress of current initiatives. ▪ Additional agenda items can be requested by committee members or any member of the university and are approved by the chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>▪ Manages operational issues where scope of impact is function-specific and of a functional/technical nature. ▪ Escalates operational issues affecting the SSO organization and customers across functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Selection</td>
<td>▪ Leverage membership of HR Spectrum, BSC (ABL/AITL), R&amp;E, and AIC (WTI/IAM) and Administrative Systems Advisory groups (IQ, HRMS, FRMS). ▪ Other process owners must be nominated by business officers where there is a gap in current bodies. ▪ Clear, prescriptive membership rules to be defined in the design phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Length</td>
<td>▪ 2-3 year terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Limit</td>
<td>▪ Limit of 2 terms (unless position is ex-officio/functionally required, such as central function permanent position).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules</td>
<td>▪ 2/3 vote required to make a decision or to escalate issue to Advisory Council. ▪ No voting blocks (2/3 or more of members) representing a specific CSU. ▪ Defined voting positions and non-voting positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The below scenarios provide examples of decision paths taken for investment of different sizes.

**Investment Below Advisory Council Threshold:**

1. **SS IT Functional Committee**
   - Discuss, review, and propose enhancement to the DRUPAL platform with expected investment below threshold.

2. **Central IT**
   - Ensure policy compliance of proposed enhancement.

3. **SS Advisory Council**
   - Approve enhancement.

**Investment Above Advisory Council Threshold:**

1. **SS IT Functional Committee**
   - Discuss, review, and propose major upgrade of DRUPAL platform with expected investment above threshold.

2. **Central IT**
   - Ensure policy compliance of proposed enhancement.

3. **SS Advisory Council**
   - Discuss and propose enhancement.

4. **Joint Steering Committee**
   - Discuss and propose enhancement.

5. **SITAB**
   - Approve enhancement.

**Proposal:** Enhancement to the DRUPAL platform
Following the planning phase, *the proposed governance model will be shared with stakeholders.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Step Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Share proposed governance model.</td>
<td>Share the proposed governance model with UT Austin community.</td>
<td>Campus Dialogue Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluate current project governance structure.</td>
<td>Confirm with the Executive Steering Committee membership their willingness to serve through the next phase of Shared Services.</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Revise operational governance model.</td>
<td>Revise operational governance model during the pilot phase based on feedback and lessons learned from the pilot.</td>
<td>Pilot Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>