

Mark R. Hamilton, President  
Phone: (907) 450-8000  
Fax: (907) 450-8012  
EMAIL: [sypres@alaska.edu](mailto:sypres@alaska.edu)



UNIVERSITY  
of ALASKA  
*Many Traditions One Alaska*

202 Butrovich Building  
910 Yukon Drive  
P.O. Box 755000  
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5000

February 22, 2008

TO: Jim Johnsen, VP for Administration  
Dan Julius, VP for Academic Affairs  
Pat Pitney, VP for Budget Planning and IR  
Wendy Redman, VP for University Relations  
Steve Smith, Chief Information Technology Officer

FROM: Mark R. Hamilton, President

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark R. Hamilton".

COPY: SW Vice Presidents

SUBJECT: External Administrative Review

The MacTaggart/Rogers Report has been distributed to the Board of Regents and to Statewide and MAU leadership. We now move to the critical stage of evaluating and potentially implementing the recommendations. The timeline for our review is provided below and on the following pages you will find more detail on the process as well as specific assignments for each of the report's recommendations.

REVIEW TIMELINE

February

- Distribute report to Board of Regents (BOR) and key administrators
- Assign specific recommendations to SW executives for review
- Discuss at President's Cabinet

March

- SW executives discuss with councils and governance groups
- SW executives draft options with pros/cons
- Discuss at President's Cabinet

April

- Brief BOR on report and progress
- SW executives discuss with councils and governance
- Discuss at President's Cabinet

May

- SW executives present recommendations to President's Cabinet
- President determines action plan

June

- Board of Regents approves changes requiring its approval

July 1

- Implement the first round of recommended changes (Note that the report recommended a three year period for full analysis and implementation of changes.)

## REVIEW PROCESS

The report contains more than 20 recommendations for altering roles and responsibilities for administrative programs and service delivery across the UA system. In order to ensure that we are well supported in making decisions to accept, modify, and implement these recommendations, I want a clear, consistent, and straightforward approach.

First, the senior executive primarily responsible for the work most affected by the recommendation will lead its review.

Second, the responsible executive will consult with appropriate councils and governance groups through the process. This is especially important because numerous recommendations not only impact other departments and/or MAUs, but directly involve more than one department or MAU.

For each recommendation, you should develop a document summarizing the following points:

- Relevant background information/data (e.g., staffing, budget, organizational structure, history).
- Interests and concerns of the parties involved.
- Standards for compliance, effectiveness, cost savings, and best practice.
- A few options for addressing the recommendation, which may include accepting it as is, rejecting it, or modifying it. An approximate timeline (not to exceed three years) and estimate of cost or cost savings should be included for each option.
- Analysis of each option in light of the Interests and Standards already outlined.
- Concise recommendation to the president, i.e., to accept, reject, modify, or make suggestions as to implementation.

A draft of this document should be ready for discussion by the President's Cabinet on April 15. In addition, we will devote the majority of time in Statewide's operating review session in early May to this topic.

Responsibility for leading review of specific recommendations is summarized on the following page. While leadership for the review of each recommendation is assigned in all cases to a SW vice president, it is expected that through delegation and the like, additional executive staff with specific subject area expertise will be very much involved.

REVIEW PROCESS ASSIGNMENTS

Recommendation	Report Reference	Lead SW Executive	Relevant Councils
Increase SW/MAU interaction at executive level	Page 28, Bullets 1-3	VP Redman	President's Cabinet (PC)
Aggregate SW departments	Page 29, Bullet 1	VP Redman	BC, SAC
Strengthen marketing of research, service	Page 29, Bullet 2	VP Redman	SAC, RAC, Marketing
Develop collaborative budget process	Page 29, Bullet 5	VP Pitney	SAC, BC
Refill SW chief facilities capacity	Page 30, Bullet 1	VP Johnsen	Facilities, BC
Decentralize Risk Management	Page 31, Bullet 2	VP Johnsen	BC
Implement Enter. Architecture	Page 30, Bullet 3	CITO Smith	ITC, BC, APEG
Implement service catalogue	Page 30, Bullet 4	CITO Smith	ITC, BC, SAC
Continue Project Executive Group	Page 30, Bullet 5	CITO Smith	ITC, BC, SAC
Focus ITC	Page 30, Bullet 6	CITO Smith	ITC, BC
Outsource more to Sungard	Page 31, Bullet 1	CITO Smith	ITC, BC
Resolve MyUA	Page 31, Bullet 2	CITO Smith	ITC, BC, APEG
Clarify executive expectations	Page 31, Bullet 5	VP Johnsen	PC, BC, SAC, HRC
Clarify roles of councils	Page 31, Bullet 6	Johnsen, Smith, Redman, Julius	All
Transfer SW programs to MAU	Page 31, Bullet 8	VP Julius	SAC
Restructure HR	Page 32, Bullet 2	VP Johnsen	BC, SAC, HRC
Restructure OIT	Page 32, Bullet 3	CITO Smith	ITC, BC, SAC
Increase SW staff at UAA	Page 32, Bullet 4	VP Johnsen	BC, SAC
Increase clarity of ICR and reallocate some to MAUs	Page 33, Bullets 2-3	VP Johnsen	RAC, BC
Develop SW/MAU exchange program	Page 33, Bullet 6	VP Johnsen	BC, SAC, HRC
Improve knowledge of SW budget	Page 34, Bullet 4	VP Johnsen	BC, SAC
Develop new strategic plan	Page 34, Bullet 5	VP Julius	BC, SAC
Develop SW performance measures	Page 34, Bullet 6	VP Pitney	BC, SAC