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Project Summary

• Moving forward from the findings of the President’s Task Force on Administrative Effectiveness, the University of Tennessee sought to pursue best-practice operating model frameworks for the Human Resources, Information Technology, and Procurement functions.

• The objectives of this next phase included:
  • To draft initial operating model frameworks, inspired by industry best-practice and informed by the outputs of the previous engagement
  • To develop a business case for the new operating models
  • To solicit perspectives from the Board of Trustees, System-level leadership, and campus leaders across the three functions to inform the operating model development process
  • As part of this effort, 29 stakeholders representing the Board of Trustees, system leadership and campus-level functional leaders were interviewed.
Operating Model Frameworks & Components

Future State Operating Model Frameworks

Operating model components are intended to outline sufficient information to enable the distributed leadership of the campuses to understand the future state, and build out the detailed content. The wireframe operating model outlines the core features of the future state organization but leaves room for campus and institute input on some details.

Operating Model Components

- **Services Provision**
  Services provided through operating model structures

- **Service Model**
  Framework for service provision

- **Organizational Roles**
  High-level leadership role to support operating model structures

- **Organizational Structure**
  High-level reporting structure for operating model leadership

- **Governance Model**
  Structures to facilitate collaboration, accountability, and decision-making within the operating model

- **Implementation Roadmap**
  High-level timeline of implementation activities
Key Themes and Observations

There were several key themes that emerged throughout the project that have informed the operating model framework development process and will be equally important moving forward.

Decentralization, Duplication, and Underinvestment

- Functions are largely decentralized, duplicative, and overlapping across the campuses, institutes, and system administration.
- Campuses/institutes rely on in-house resources, technology, and processes to support their operations with limited coordination; there has been long term underinvestment in Central structures and resource levels vary across the system.

Dependency on “Heroes” not Process

- Work is dependent upon the efforts of individuals without sufficient support from clear and consistent processes.
- Coordination across the campuses and institutes is personality and relationship-driven rather than established in through governance or formal structures.

Insufficient University-level Governance and Oversight

- Some formal governance structures exist at the system level, but the current models often do not provide effective guidance and shared decision-making.
- It is difficult for campuses/institutes to coordinate on shared investments and priorities.

Generalist Staff Model and Limited Training Creates Skill Gaps

- Many staff occupy “generalist” roles within their functions.
- Staff may not have the needed expertise or may only perform a process infrequently, potentially increasing errors or reliance on others.
- There is insufficient training and support for staff to do their work in the most strategic and effective manner, in alignment with leading practices.
Key Themes and Observations (cont’d)

There were several key themes that emerged throughout the project that have informed the operating model framework development process and will be equally important moving forward.

Legacy of Failed Coordination and Centralization Efforts

- Previous attempts to centralize or better coordinate functions were poorly implemented and have led to skepticism among the campuses and institutes
- Both large and small campuses and institutes believe their interests will not be served under a more consolidated organization

Lack of Performance Metrics and Continuous Improvement

- Performance metrics such as service levels, accuracy/error rates, and staffing ratios are not consistently collected, tracked, and reported
- Leadership may lack visibility into operational performance, especially in comparison to other departments/campuses/institutes
- Continuous improvement programs are not in place

Inconsistent Levels of Service Across Units

- Availability and quality of service may vary depending on factors such as campus/institute size, resources, organization structure, and culture
- Differing levels of service may affect community satisfaction and also may place greater administrative burdens on stakeholders
- Skillsets may vary across campuses/institutes due to differing investments in resources and training and the regional talent market

Risks and Non-Compliance

- Due to variations in processes, the System may be at risk for non-compliance with external policies, laws, rules, and regulations
- Variability of resources across the system could result in insufficient dedication to mitigating key risks, potentially creating exposure for the entire system
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Potential Benefits of Transformation

By further defining and ultimately implementing the wireframe operating models, the University of Tennessee will position itself to accomplish the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationalize and Invest in Technology</th>
<th>Define Services, Roles &amp; Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rationalize reduction of duplicative applications to reduce support costs and improve data sharing</td>
<td>• Establish clear roles and responsibilities between campuses and the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invest in modern technologies for core platforms and applications</td>
<td>• Define responsibilities at the staff level to ensure the right people are performing the right activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhance University Governance</th>
<th>Consolidate Transactional Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance existing or create new governance structures for each function</td>
<td>• Explore ways to standardize high-volume, non-specialized administrative transactions across the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empower governance structures to make decisions and set priorities</td>
<td>• Reduce the time campus staff spend on transaction processing to allow them to focus on more mission-critical support for faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish stronger forums or communities of practice for knowledge sharing, best practices, and coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further Invest in University of Tennessee Staff</th>
<th>Better Measure Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance existing and create new training and development programs for staff to better support faculty and students</td>
<td>• Define service levels and performance metrics within each function to measure performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create clear paths for career development and growth within Units and across campus</td>
<td>• Increase visibility on operational performance to both campus and system leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Find new ways to attract and retain talented staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Future-State Operating Model Frameworks
HR, IT, & Procurement
Human Resources
Operating Model Framework
Operating Model Components

A. Service Model
B. Service Provision
C. Organizational Roles
D. Organizational Structure
E. Governance Model
F. Implementation Timeline
### Service Model Components | Defined

**Community of Expertise**
One collective organization that serves the entire system. Areas of expertise include:
- Employee Relations
- Talent Management
- Total Rewards
- HR Policy & Compliance

**Business Partners**
Each campus and institute has an HRO and staff of HR Business Partners commensurate with the number of employees.

**Transactions Team**
One transaction team is established to serve the entire system, handling non-strategic processes and data management.

**Human Resources Strategy and Leadership**
The Chief Human Resources Officer leads a small organization to define system strategy, policy development, and analytics.
B. Service Provision

List of Key Services and Processes Provided by Each Entity

**Community of Expertise**
- The Centers of Expertise enable and support the work that is done by the Business Partners and Transaction Team
- Possess deep expertise in:
  - Employee Relations
  - Talent Management
  - Total Rewards
  - HR Policy & Compliance

**HR Business Partners**
- Advise and consult departmental leaders on operational decisions & development of departmental systems or protocols that promote HR strategy
- Integrates with COE and leadership team to bring forward work goals

**Transactions Team**
- Service Center (managing inquiries)
- Data Management
- Transaction Processing
- Total Rewards Administration

**Leadership**
- HR Finance & Administration Support
- HR programs (Organizational Effectiveness and Diversity & Inclusion)
- HR Analytics & Reporting
- HR Applications
### Four Areas of HR Expertise Possessed by the COE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Relations</th>
<th>Total Rewards</th>
<th>Talent Management</th>
<th>HR Policy &amp; Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching &amp; Counseling</td>
<td>Design and Compliance</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition</td>
<td>Program &amp; Process Oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management Counseling</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Talent and Workforce Management and Administration</td>
<td>Regulatory Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance/Dispute Management</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Investigations</td>
<td>Work Absence Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Communities of Expertise enable and support the work that is done by the HR Business Partners and Transactions Team.
**Key Role** | **Entity** | **Description**
--- | --- | ---
Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO) | Leadership | Drive institutional HR strategy and planning; manage senior HR leaders including COE directors, Operations Center Director, and Campus/Institute HROs
CHRO Executive Assistant | Leadership | Serve as deputy to CHRO; lead strategy and planning initiatives; develop and drive analytics strategy
Campus HROs | Leadership | Lead HR in each Campus/Institute; liaise with CHRO and CHRO Executive Assistant on system strategy and planning; lead and manage Campus/Institute HR Business Partners
### C. Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Relations Director</td>
<td>Community of Expertise</td>
<td>Develop and drive system Employee Relations strategy and execution; manage COE staff supporting Employee Relations activity; provide direction to Transactions Team on relevant activity; liaise with HROs/HR business partners on relevant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Management Director</td>
<td>Community of Expertise</td>
<td>Develop and drive system Talent Management strategy and execution; manage COE staff supporting Talent Management activity; provide direction to Transactions Team on relevant activity; liaise with HROs/HR business partners on relevant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rewards Director</td>
<td>Community of Expertise</td>
<td>Develop and drive system Total Rewards strategy and execution; manage COE staff supporting Total Rewards activity; provide direction to Transactions Team on relevant activity; liaise with HROs/HR business partners on relevant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Policy &amp; Compliance Director</td>
<td>Community of Expertise</td>
<td>Develop and drive system HR Policy &amp; Compliance strategy and execution; manage COE staff supporting HR Policy &amp; Compliance activity; provide direction to Transactions Team on relevant activity; liaise with HROs/HR business partners on relevant issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Business Partner</td>
<td>Campus/Institute</td>
<td>Partner with HROs in analyzing, interpreting, and forecasting workforce trends for department(s) and identify and monitor key HR metrics (vacancy and turnover rates, aging demographics, etc.); advise and consult with departmental leaders on operational decisions facilitating the development of departmental systems or protocols that promote HR strategy (talent, engagement, and health &amp; well-being); serve as departmental resource on human resource policies and processes; partner with COEs and Transactions Team on service delivery and program planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Team Director</td>
<td>Transaction Team</td>
<td>Lead delivery of services related to employee inquiries (Service Center), Data Management, Transaction processing, and Total Rewards Administration; Manage the Transaction Team members; liaise with HR Business Partners on business needs; liaise with COEs on tiered support delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart provides directional guidance on the composition of staff across the HR Service Model.

- How many Business Partners do we need?
  - Employee to HR Business Partner ratios vary widely across HR organizations.
  - Between 1:200 to 1:400 is considered average across all industries (or between 15-25% of HR FTEs).
  - Where the HRBP role is more generalist, the ratio is lower versus organizations which implement a more strategic HRBP role.
  - Research suggests that the higher ratios are reserved for those organizations that have removed core HR activity from the roles – leaving HRBPs to a role more similar to an internal consultant.

- The exact number of staff will vary by the size of organization and the scoping of service areas.

Source: Bersin, Deloitte Consulting LLP, 2019
Decisions on division of responsibility for HR functions need to be confirmed with System, Campus, and Institute stakeholders.

- **CHRO Executive Assistant (Strategy & Analytics)**
- **Transactions Team Director**

**Chief Human Resources Officer**

- **Community of Expertise Directors**
- **COE Staff**

**Chancellors, Directors & CBOs**

**Campus/Institute HROs**

**HR Business Partners**
## Human Resources

### D. Organizational Structure

#### Chief Human Resources Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting        | • Direct: Chief Financial Officer  
                  • Indirect: N/A |
| Geography        | • Knoxville |
| Accountability   | • Governance Structure  
                  • Strategic Plan  
                  • Enterprise-Wide Performance Metrics (Strategy and Analytics KPIs)  
                  • Central/Local Performance Evaluation |
Wireframe Operating Model | Human Resources

D. Organizational Structure

CHRO Executive Assistant

Chief Human Resources Officer

CHRO Executive Assistant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting          | • Direct: CHRO
                     | • Indirect: N/A                                                       |
| Geography          | • Knoxville                                                            |
| Accountability     | • Governance Structure
                     | • Strategic Plan
                     | • Enterprise-Wide Performance Metrics (Strategy and Analytics KPIs)
                     | • Central/Local Performance Evaluation                                |
Wireframe Operating Model | **Human Resources**

D. Organizational Structure

Campus/Institute HROs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reporting**    | • Direct: Campus Chancellor/Institute Director  
                    • Indirect: CHRO |
| **Geography**    | • Assigned Campus/Institute |
| **Accountability** | • Governance Structure  
                        • Campus/Institute Performance Metrics (Satisfaction Rates, etc.)  
                        • Central/Local Performance Evaluation |
Wireframe Operating Model | Human Resources
D. Organizational Structure

Campus/Institute HR Business Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting        | • Direct: Campus/Institute HRO  
|                  | • Indirect: N/A                 |
| Geography        | • Assigned Campus/Institute     |
| Accountability   | • Governance Structure         
|                  | • Campus/Institute Performance Metrics (Satisfaction Rates, etc.) |
Transactions Team Director

Chief Human Resources Officer

Campus/ Institute HRO

Transactions Team Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting        | • Direct: CHRO  
                  | • Indirect: Campus/Institute HRO |
| Geography        | • Any |
| Accountability   | • Governance Structure  
                  | • Performance Metrics (Satisfaction Rates, Processing Times, etc.)  
                  | • Central/Local Performance Evaluation |
D. Organizational Structure

Community of Expertise Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting        | • Direct: CHRO  
|                  | • Indirect: N/A |
| Geography        | • Any |
| Accountability   | • Governance Structure  
|                  | • Performance Metrics (SLAs, Satisfaction Rates, etc.)  
|                  | • Central/Local Performance Evaluation |
Supporting Teams Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>HR Leadership Supporting Staff</th>
<th>Community of Expertise Supporting Staff</th>
<th>Transactions Team Supporting Staff</th>
<th>HR Business Partners Supporting Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Lines:</td>
<td>• Direct: CHRO Executive Assistant • Indirect: N/A</td>
<td>• Direct: COE Director • Indirect: N/A</td>
<td>• Direct: Transaction Team Director • Indirect: N/A</td>
<td>• Direct: Campus/Institute Business Partners • Indirect: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography:</td>
<td>• Any</td>
<td>• Any</td>
<td>• Any</td>
<td>• Assigned Campus/Institute OR Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Services to:</td>
<td>• All (System/Campuses/Institutes)</td>
<td>• All (System/Campuses/Institutes)</td>
<td>• All (System/Campuses/Institutes)</td>
<td>• Assigned Campus/Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example Supporting Teams Org. Structures

- **HR Leadership**
  - CHRO
  - CHRO Executive Assistant
  - CHRO Executive Assistant Supporting Team

- **Community of Expertise**
  - CHRO
  - Total Rewards COE Director
  - Total Rewards COE Supporting Team

- **Transactions Team**
  - CHRO
  - Transactions Team Director
  - Total Rewards COE Supporting Team

- **Campus/Institute HR**
  - UT Martin HRO
  - UT Martin Business Partner #1
  - UT Martin HR Business Partners Supporting Team
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E. Governance Model

**Wireframe Operating Model | Human Resources**

**Membership**
- All Campus/Institute Chief Business Officers
- System Chief Financial Officer
- Campus/Institute HROs
- HR Business Partners
- System Chief Human Resource Officer
- Transaction Team Director
- Community of Expertise Directors
- HR Business Partners
- System Chief Human Resource Officer

**Executive Committee**
- Establish strategic direction for HR, IT, and Procurement
- Approve organization structure and major policy changes
- Resolve final escalated issues

**Human Resources Functional Committee**
- Focus on constituent experience and service quality
- Monitors and provides input on SLAs
- Identify continuous improvement opportunities
- Resolves escalated operational issues

**HR Operations Committee**
- Manage operations and staff
- Manage day-to-day operational metrics and performance
- Implement policy and process changes

- Risks, issues, and questions flow upwards
  - Risks, issues, and questions are escalated upwards to be resolved and addressed as needed
- Decisions flow downwards
  - Decisions made at higher levels of governance are promulgated downwards
  - Distinguishing the different levels of governance helps clarify decision-making authority and define clear channels for communication between leadership, HR, and the UT community

**The University of Tennessee**
### Service Model Transformation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire CHRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Governance Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Customer Satisfaction and Activity Analysis Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define System-wide Scope of Services for HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Community of Expertise and Transaction Team Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Service Level Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Training Requirements for Business Partners and Transactional Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine HR Staff Sizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Community of Expertise Team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Business Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Process Redesign &amp; Policy Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand up Transaction Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP Implementation</td>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...and ongoing
Information Technology
Operating Model Framework
Operating Model Components
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B. Service Provision
C. Organizational Roles
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F. Implementation Timeline
A. Operating Model | Overview

Based on our IT Transformation Framework, we have designed UT’s future state IT operating model by layer to meet the distinct needs of the campuses and institutes:

- An IT governance structure that supports effective oversight and strategic direction
- A funding model that increases UT IT ROI
- An organizational model that is strong in its core and modular to adapt to a changing IT landscape
- More consistent delivery of services that are defined and measured
- The sections that follow describe the specific concepts and recommendations required to achieve this future state vision
  - 1. IT Governance
  - 2. IT Financial Management
  - 3. IT Organizational Model
  - 4. Applications
  - 5. Infrastructure
  - 6. IT Service Management
  - 7. Enabling Capabilities
UT’s proposed governance model is designed based on **effective approaches used by other universities** and leading edge IT organizations.

- The structure **provides sponsorship, partnership, and collaborations** across UT’s diverse IT constituencies.
- Governance better **aligns IT to the vision of the System** as groups are modified or created to focus on critical areas.
- IT governance is enhanced through the **deployment of an Enterprise Architecture team**.

UT’s future IT governance is a **coordinated set of processes, tools and bodies** to help drive collaborative strategy and direction at UT.
To support enhanced governance and more effective delivery of IT services, UT will create a new approach to funding and prioritizing IT investments.

A new funding approach will provide for a deeper understanding of what, who and how IT dollars are being spent.

The funding model will improve the way dollars are allocated, and support more collaborative investments because of improved management of the IT portfolio.

UT will use a spend assessment to determine the areas that can be better supported by bulk buying and enterprise contracts, and support effectiveness of these contracts through System wide IT standards.

UT will need to take a new approach to managing its annual investment in IT to optimize the new operating model.
A new organizational model allows IT to **strengthen the core of IT services at UT**

Key enabling supports to the model include:

- A more effective **recruiting and hiring strategy**,  
- A **comprehensive IT training** program,  
- Revised **career paths** and;  
- Effective **performance management and rewards**.

UT will move to a new vision for its IT organizational model **across the full lifecycle of talent management**
Wireframe Operating Model | **Information Technology**

A. Operating Model | Applications

- IT has clear **development cycles and environments**
  - Establish a **standardized set of processes** for System Development Lifecycle
  - Architect and establish standard environments including Development and Test environments to **promote consistency on all platforms**

- IT understands their **data at an enterprise level** and can leverage it to drive innovation
  - Create a **Master Data Management** strategy
  - Drive **new ideas to shape the future of the Digital UT Campus** through innovation
  - Rationalize applications and **drive toward Cloud adoption** following the Cloud First policy (SaaS and PaaS)

---

**Academic and administrative units will align to an enterprise application strategy, freeing IT resources** to make mission-driven innovations
A. Operating Model | Infrastructure

- IT delivers the critical infrastructure that the entire University utilizes, increasing efficiency for customers within IT and the Units.

These core services consist of:
- Secure data center services
- End-to-end data network operations
- Cloud compute and storage (IaaS)
- Data and application backup and recovery
- Enterprise email, calendaring and collaboration
- Availability, capacity, security and performance management
- Disaster recovery

- Units have the option to manage their applications, data and projects on flexible technology facilitated by IT in the Cloud

IT will serve the UT system by delivering core infrastructure services with high reliability and responsive support for leading technology services.
A. Operating Model | IT Service Management

- Defined Service Catalog and Service Level Agreements:
  - Clear definition of what services are provided by IT and how to obtain services
  - Defined Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with stakeholders
  - Maintenance of service catalog, SLAs and service level management

- Improve services delivered to end-users
  - Measurements of services performed compared to SLAs
  - A unified tool to capture the incidents, requests and assets that will drive metrics and behavior
  - IT process management and ongoing improvement

IT provides a **high level of service** to customers through defined agreements, metrics and processes
Wireframe Operating Model | **Information Technology**

A. Operating Model | Enabling Operations

- The Project Management Office (PMO) will **coordinate the management and delivery of projects** across IT.
- The Vendor Management team will **work with central Procurement to streamline and coordinate** all IT hardware, software, and services spend.
- The campus CIOs will **serve as liaisons between the campuses/institutes and system**.
- The Enterprise Architecture team will **establish the blueprint for the design, development and operations** of IT systems.
- The Service Planning & Management team will **utilize ITIL principles to deliver effective IT service management practices** to run operations effectively.
- The Organizational Change Management (OCM) team will **communicate a clear change imperative and vision**, and promote visible and consistent leadership involvement.

Enabling capabilities promote the **coordination and long term success** of ongoing operations and strategic initiatives.
UT should seek to maximize what is done centrally, while acknowledging there are practical and strategic reasons for some activity to reside locally.

**Local IT Operations**
- Managed by the Campus/Institute CIOs
- Supported by Local IT Staff
- Enabled by System IT Operations
  - Department/Unit Specific Applications
  - Campus Help Desk Services
  - Campus End User Computing Services
  - Campus Infrastructure Field Services
  - Campus Applications

**System IT Operations**
- Managed by the System CIO
- Supported by resources in all locations
- Enables Local IT Operations
  - System Infrastructure Services
  - System Application Services
  - System Information Security Policy
Wir eframe Operating Model | Information Technology
B. Service Provision | Functional Service Overview

The IT operating model may be realized with an aspirational structure of eight well-defined functions.*

Decisions on division of responsibility for Hybrid IT functions need to be confirmed with System, Campus, and Institute stakeholders.

* The names of the functions are provisional and are subject to change
** Within the structure, various project management models are possible
Wireframe Operating Model | Information Technology
B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Strategy, Planning & Policy

- Strategy and Innovation
  - IT strategy development
  - Innovation
  - Project portfolio management

- Project Management
  - Project management methodology and standards
  - Project management deep expertise

- Architecture
  - Enterprise architecture planning and standards management

- Finance
  - Budgeting
  - Accounting
  - Chargeback

- Human Resources
  - Payroll
  - Human resources

- Vendor Management
  - Vendor selection and pricing
  - Vendor relationship management
  - Contract management
  - Vendor performance management
Wireframe Operating Model | **Information Technology**

B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Campus Applications

- **Campus Applications**
  - **Dept/Unit Specific IT Applications**
    - Build and Test
    - Post Go-Live Maintenance
  - **System Applications Coordination**
    - System Applications and Infrastructure Liaison
Wireframe Operating Model | Information Technology
B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Campus Service Management

- Service Management
- System Liaison
- Service Level Agreements
Wireframe Operating Model | **Information Technology**

B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Campus IT Operations

- **Websites**
  - Development
  - Support

- **Strategy, Planning, & Policy**
  - System IT strategy collaboration
  - Innovation support

- **Marketing and Communications**
  - Communication and marketing materials development and distribution
  - Media relations
B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Security

This diagram illustrates the Information Technology operating model, focusing on the security aspect. The model includes

- **Information Security**
  - Information protection
  - Encryption

- **Systems Security**
  - Security of systems
  - Firewalls
  - User authorization and access

- **Risk and Compliance Management**
  - Risk and compliance monitoring, response, and remediation
  - Risk identification and evaluation
  - Security awareness and training

- **Threat and Vulnerability Management**
  - Malware prevention
  - Threat and vulnerability assessment
  - Event monitoring and management

- **Third Party Security**
  - Third party security evaluation and monitoring

Each sub-function also addresses:

- Coordination with systems security
- Coordination with information security
Wireframe Operating Model | Information Technology
B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Applications

- Data Management
  - Requirements gathering
  - Data dictionary
  - Business intelligence tools
  - Database design
  - Database implementation and configuration
  - Database testing
  - Fixes and upgrades

- IT Internal Web Services
  - Requirements gathering
  - Website and mobile design
  - Website and mobile implementation
  - Website and mobile configuration
  - Website and mobile testing
  - Fixes and upgrades

- Financial Applications
  - Requirements gathering
  - Solution design and development
  - Solution implementation and integration

- HR/ Payroll Applications

- Student Information Applications

- Other Applications

- Chief Information Officer
  - Strategy, Planning & Policy

- Campus Applications
- Campus Service Management
- Campus IT Operations
- Security
- Applications
- Infrastructure
- IT Service Management
- Educational Technologies
- Research Computing

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
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B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Infrastructure

- **End User Computing Engineering**
  - Device selection and testing
  - End user computing application selection

- **Server Engineering**
  - Requirements gathering for physical servers and operating systems
  - Server design
  - Server implementation and configuration
  - Server testing
  - Fixes and upgrades

- **Network Engineering**
  - Network and telecom requirements gathering
  - Cabling and field services
  - Network and telecom design, implementation, and configuration
  - Testing
  - Fixes and upgrades
  - External networking

- **Data Center Engineering**
  - Facilities design and modifications
  - Rack configuration

End user computing application testing
End user computing application configuration
Fixes and upgrades
Fixes and upgrades
External networking
B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – IT Service Management

**IT Service Management**

- **Help Desk**
  - Service desks and call center
  - Tier 1 and Tier 2 support
  - End user training
  - Documentation

- **Service Management**
  - ITIL process design and implementation
  - Performance tracking and reporting

- **End User Device Operations**
  - End user computing application release and deployment management
  - Device imaging
  - Device request and provisioning

- **Metrics reporting**
- **Quality management**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE**
Wireframe Operating Model | Information Technology
B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – Educational Technologies

- Educational Technologies
  - Learning Environments
    - Requirements gathering
    - Learning environment design, planning, development
  - Web Services
    - Requirements gathering
    - User experience
  - Educational Support
    - Requirements gathering
    - Evaluations of learning technologies
    - Engagement with Facilities Management Services
    - Research
    - Website/mobile design, development, implementation
    - Website/mobile testing
    - Research
    - Solution design
    - Solution piloting, integration into the curriculum, and implementation
    - Help with statistics
    - Research and its dissemination
**Wireframe Operating Model | Information Technology**

B. Service Provision | Functional Detail – High Performance Computing

- **Research Technology**
  - High performance computing cores/clusters
  - Supporting infrastructure and applications

- **Faculty Liaison**
  - Pre-award and post-award support for PIs
  - Other related functions
### Key Role | Function | Description
--- | --- | ---
System Chief Information Officer | Leadership | - Similar to the “CIO” of a commercial organization (externally focused)
- Single leader accountable for the entire IT organization
- Set vision, strategy, priorities, and budget for IT organization
- Build and maintain relationships with the UT executive team (President, CFO, CHRO, CPO, etc.)
- Build and maintain relationships with the academic units (Chancellors, Deans, etc.)
- Build and maintain relationships with 3rd party organizations for collaboration purposes (research institutes, partners, etc.)
- Responsible for completing annual performance reviews for direct reports

Campus/Institute Chief Information Officers | Leadership | - Partner with the System CIO in setting technology vision, strategy, priorities and budget for system/local IT
- Liaise system IT services on Campus/Institute needs
- Lead all local IT services – strategy and planning, local applications, service management, websites, marketing and communication
- Participates in IT governance structure
- Lead execution of local IT programs/projects in coordination with the system project management office
## C. Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Enterprise Strategy</td>
<td>Strategy, Planning, &amp; Policy</td>
<td>Drives efforts aimed at improving IT services across all IT functions, leads cross-organization planning efforts (strategy, innovation, and portfolio management), develops and enforces project management standards, creates an enterprise architecture that defines the interrelationships between processes, information, and applications, coordinates vendor relations and contracting, and leads IT finance and human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Security Officer</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Protects information and maintains confidentiality and integrity of data, advises IT leadership (both internal and university departments and schools) on enterprise security strategy, security architecture, and security design standards, and advises on compliance issues regarding information security, systems security, and privacy regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C. Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Applications</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Leads application design, development, implementation, maintenance, and support for all applications (including, but not limited to, ERP systems and educational applications), and drives application management process improvement and standardization efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Leads infrastructure design, development, implementation, maintenance, and support (including, but not limited to, infrastructure, data center, networking, servers, storage, and end user computing), and drives infrastructure management process improvement and standardization efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Service Management</td>
<td>IT Service Management</td>
<td>Leads day-to-day IT operations (including, but not limited to, applications, infrastructure, data center, networking, servers, storage, help desk, and end user computing) and drives operations management process improvement and standardization efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Information Technology

### C. Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Educational Technology</td>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>Drives assimilation of educational technology into each school’s educational and research activities, provides consultation on educational and research technology planning and on implementation of technology services that advance education and scholarship at USC, fosters the development and awareness of emerging technologies that lead to the effective advancement of teaching and learning with technology, and develops websites and mobile sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Research Computing</td>
<td>Research Computing</td>
<td>Drives and collaborates with leadership in the design, development, installation, and maintenance of hardware and software for the research computing systems. Responsible for managing the planning, implementation, availability, performance, security, maintenance, and repair of high-performance computing infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions on division of responsibility for Hybrid IT functions needs to be confirmed with System, Campus, and Institute stakeholders.

*Campus and Institute CIOs will have support staff to lead each sub-function. The organizational structure only reflects key leadership roles.
Membership

- All Campus/Institute Chief Business Officers
- System Chief Financial Officer
- System CIO
- Director, Strategy, Planning, & Policy
- CISO
- Campus CIOs
- Functional Directors

- IT Directors & Managers
- Key IT staff SMEs
- Campus CIOs (as necessary)
- Campus stakeholders (as necessary)

Executive Committee
- Establish strategic direction for IT
- Develop Enterprise IT Strategy in alignment with strategic priorities; provide executive oversight and resource prioritization for key IT initiatives
- Approve organization structure and major policy changes
- Resolve final escalated issues

Enterprise Services Board
- Focus on constituent experience and service quality
- Monitors and provides input on SLAs
- Identify continuous improvement opportunities
- Resolves escalated operational issues

Governance Working Groups
- Determine key needs or advancements of specific IT functions (e.g., Enterprise Architecture, Data Management, Change Management, ERP, etc.) that will help the organization better service its campus customers

Risks, issues, and questions flow upwards
- Risks, issues, and questions are escalated upwards to be resolved and addressed as needed
- Decisions made at higher levels of governance are promulgated downwards
- Distinguishing the different levels of governance helps clarify decision-making authority and define clear channels for communication between leadership, IT, and the UT community

Decisions flow downwards
## Service Model Transformation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialize/Refine/Confirm Operating Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Service Quality and Activity Analysis Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit/Hire System CIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch IT Governance Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Enterprise and Local IT Scope of Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint/Recruit/Hire Functional Area Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint/Recruit/Hire Campus/Institute CIOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Job Descriptions and Career Paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize and Deploy New Organizational Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Service Level Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Training Requirements for Functional Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint/Recruit/Hire Functional Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/Redesign Business Process &amp; Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procurement & Contracting
Operating Model Framework
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**Overview**

**Operating Model Components**

Key Assumptions

A. Service Model

B. Service Provision

C. Organizational Roles

D. Organizational Structure

E. Governance Model

F. Implementation Timeline
Key Operating Model Assumptions

- Leave campus-based resources in place and retain their current orientation toward procurement (Procurement Service Center) and contracting (Strategic Procurement).

- Accounts payable and Pcard functions remain outside the scope of the operating model.

- There should be one Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) who is accountable to coordinate and achieve established goals and Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) across the system. The coordinating activity includes both procurement (buying team resources) and contracting (contract management resources). It is center-led, not centralized.

- Procurement talent located on campuses will require matrixed responsibilities and standardized role descriptions across the system. Campuses will retain hiring and performance management duties for these positions, however, the CPO and system will have authority to participate and influence talent management decisions.

- Many campus-based resources will engage in: managing activity related to their campus along with participating in system-wide teams (Procurement Service Center & Strategic Procurement) that are incentivized to establish best practices, standardized methods, and spread specialized knowledge across the system.
The University of Tennessee has approximately 35 FTEs devoted to procurement and contracting activities which may support the framework of the Operating Model.

An investment in upgraded roles and responsibilities may be needed to advance the team strategically and enhance system-level coordination.

Taking a One Team, University of Tennessee mindset is important.

Pursue a phased implementation of the Operating Model and focus on delivering excellence and expertise across the system within the existing procurement & contracting roles. There may be opportunities to expand procurement’s role and influence in time utilizing the center-led organization structure.

Service Level Agreements (SLAs) should be developed with each Campus / Institute to proactively manage expectations and maintain focus on local cost, quality, and service requirements.

Locations with sufficient scale to warrant a Procurement Leader (coordinator of procurement activity for a campus location) include UTSA/Knoxville Area, UTC, UTHSC, and UTM.
**A. Service Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Model Components</th>
<th>Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Leaders</td>
<td>Campus based procurement leaders residing at UTSA/Knoxville Area, UTC, UTHSC &amp; UTM directly accountable to the CBO and other key stakeholders for local goals. Maintain talent management responsibilities for campus-based staff. Active participants and leaders on system level teams responsible to improve University of Tennessee KPIs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Communities of Expertise (CoE)| A combination of system level and campus/institute-based team members in the pursuit of best practices, standard methods and goal attainment in Contract Management & Strategic Sourcing organized in CoEs to pursue:  
• Information Technology;  
• Facilities (Maintenance Operations);  
• Life Sciences and Medical; and  
• Business & Administrative Services. |
| Procurement Service Center    | A combination of system level and campus/institute-based team members in the pursuit of best practices, standard methods and goal attainment related to requisition management and customer service activities. |
| Procurement System Leadership | The Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) leads an organization to direct system strategy, policy development, standardized practices, spend management coordination, customer service excellence, strategic relationship management (suppliers, customers, stakeholders) and special program coordination supported by business intelligence to achieve defined goals & outcomes. |
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**A. Service Model**

### Communities of Expertise (CoE)

- Support local activity, pursue best practices, standards and UT goals for contract management & strategic sourcing
- Possess & develop deep expertise in:
  - Information Technology
  - Facilities (Maintenance Operations)
  - Life Sciences & Medical
  - Business & Administrative Services

### Procurement Leaders

- Manage campus-based activity to improve spend mgt. decisions, process efficiency, customer service and value creation
- Coordinate local team members to actively participate in CoEs, Procurement Service Center and leadership team initiatives to execute on UT goals & KPIs

### Procurement Service Center

- Requisition processing and support
- Help Desk Coordination
- Procurement Training

### System Leadership CPO

- Procurement Strategy, Operations
- Procurement System Administration
- Talent Management Direction
- Business Intelligence & Reporting
- Website Maintenance & Support
- Goals & KPIs
Three Areas of Expertise Possessed by the Strategic Procurement Team

**Contract Management**
- Contract Strategy
- Contract Execution (Terms & Conditions, Risks, Negotiations)
- Contract Performance & Administration
- Renewal Management
- Contract Tools

**Strategic Sourcing & Supplier Management**
- **Strategic Sourcing** (RFP & Bid Documents, data analysis, business cases)
- **Strategic Suppliers** (Business Reviews, Scorecard, Share Data, Innovation)
- **Key Customers & Stakeholders** (Goals, efficiency, customer service, spend mgt.)

**Category Management**
- Category Analysis, Strategy Development and Execution Monitoring:
  - Information Technology
  - Facilities (Maintenance Operations)
  - Life Sciences & Medical
  - Business & Admin Services
  - Diversity Business Engagement

*The Strategic Procurement Team seeks best practices, standard procedures, and consistency across all locations. They contribute and develop expertise in the three functional areas listed above as well as the broad spend categories listed under Category Management. They enable and support the work of Procurement Leaders and pursue UT System goals and initiatives.*
## Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Procurement Officer</strong></td>
<td>System Leadership</td>
<td>Drive institutional Procurement &amp; Contracting strategy, planning and execution; manage system level resources; coordinate and monitor goal achievement for Procurement Leaders, Strategic Procurement Team, the Procurement Service Center and Procurement Support Team. Develop system talent management strategy and participate as appropriate in talent acquisition and performance management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Procurement Lead</strong></td>
<td>System Leadership</td>
<td>Develop and drive category, contract management, and strategic relationships planning and execution; manage contract compliance and performance; manage strategic supplier and customer relationships; coordinate with the Business Intelligence team as needed; provide direction to the Procurement Service Center on relevant activity; liaise with Procurement Leaders as needed. Supported by a team of system &amp; campus-based resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement Support Lead</strong></td>
<td>System Leadership</td>
<td>Develop and drive procurement support strategy and execution; manage procurement technology and the Business Intelligence team; support procurement communication activities including website maintenance; provide direction to the small business program; liaise with Procurement Leaders on relevant issues. Supported by a team of system-based resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement Service Center Lead</strong></td>
<td>System Leadership</td>
<td>Develop and drive requisition management and transaction workload strategy and execution; seek consistent Buying Team responses to procurement-related inquiries and coordinate Help Desk administration. Responsible for customer service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Organizational Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Leaders</td>
<td>UTSA / Knoxville Area, UTHSC, UTC, UTM</td>
<td>Provides strategic and proactive procurement support to colleges and divisions across campus to accomplish transactional efficiency, customer service, spend management, and jointly determined goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Service Center Team</td>
<td>System &amp; Campus / Institute</td>
<td>Provide requisition processing support; identify systemic problems needing resolution; provide excellent customer interactions; support customer education, training, and policy compliance. Coordinate Help Desk functionality and response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Support Team</td>
<td>System &amp; Campus / Institute</td>
<td>Support the CPO, Procurement Leaders, and all members of the Procurement Team with activities including system administration, website development and maintenance, small business program, business intelligence, and other procurement communication requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Procurement Team</td>
<td>System &amp; Campus / Institute</td>
<td>Manage all aspects of contract administration and management including strategy development and contract performance activities. Utilize contract management tools to support best practices including standardized terms and conditions, contract templates, repositories, etc. Coordinate with legal resources to properly assess risk. Team will provide category strategy, expertise and execution for UT selected areas such as Information Technology, Facilities (Maintenance &amp; Operations), Life Sciences &amp; Medical, Business &amp; Administration Services, and other as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D. Organizational Structure

Decisions on division of responsibility for Procurement & Contracting functions need to be confirmed with System, Campus, and Institute stakeholders.

* The names of the functions are provisional and are subject to change

** Within the structure, various project management models are possible

Chief Procurement Officer

Procurement Service Center Leader
- Buying Team
- Help Desk
- Training

Strategic Procurement Leader
- Contract Mgt Team
- Strategic Sourcing Team
- Category Teams

Procurement Support Leader
- Business Intelligence
- System Admin / Website / Training
- Procurement Programs

Procurement Leaders

Chancellors, Directors, and CBOs

UTSA / Knoxville Area
- Procurement Programs
- Chattanooga
- Martin

Health Science Center

Chattanooga
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**D. Organizational Structure**

### Chief Procurement Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reporting**    | ▪ Direct: CFO  
▪ Indirect: Executive Committee  
▪ Advisory: Procurement Council |
| **Geography**    | ▪ UTSA |
| **Accountability** | ▪ Governance Structure  
▪ Performance Metrics (Cost, Quality, Service, Process Efficiency, Innovation)  
▪ Strategy Development  
▪ Policy and Procedure Compliance  
▪ Talent Management |
D. Organizational Structure

Procurement Service Center Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Direct: CPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Indirect: Procurement Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ UTSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Governance Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Performance Metrics (Customer Service &amp; Process Efficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Systemic Problem Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Help Desk Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Pcard Analysis &amp; Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief Procurement Officer

Procurement Leaders
D. Organizational Structure

**Strategic Procurement Leader**

- **Chief Procurement Officer**
- **Procurement Leaders**
- **Strategic Procurement Leader**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting        | ▪ Direct: CPO  
▪ Indirect: Procurement Leaders |
| Geography        | ▪ UTSA |
| Accountability   | ▪ Governance Structure  
▪ Performance Metrics (Value Creation, Process Efficiency, Innovation)  
▪ Category Management  
▪ Contract Management  
▪ Strategic Sourcing |
## D. Organizational Structure

### Procurement Support Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reporting**    | ▪ Direct: CPO  
▪ Indirect: Procurement Leaders |
| **Geography**    | ▪ UTSA |
| **Accountability** | ▪ Governance Structure  
▪ Performance Metrics (Value Creation, Process Efficiency, Innovation)  
▪ Category Management  
▪ Contract Management  
▪ Strategic Sourcing |
D. Organizational Structure

### Procurement Leaders

#### Chief Procurement Officer

#### Chancellors, CBOs & Directors

#### Position Feature Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reporting        | ▪ Direct: Chancellors, CBOs, & Directors  
                  | ▪ Indirect: CPO |
| Geography        | ▪ UTSA / Knoxville Area, UTHSC, UTC, UTM |
| Accountability   | ▪ Governance Structure  
                  | ▪ Performance Metrics (Cost, Quality, Service, Process Efficiency, Innovation)  
                  | ▪ Campus Requisition Management  
                  | ▪ Campus Contract Management  
                  | ▪ Campus Talent Management  
                  | ▪ System Coordination |
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E. Governance Model

Membership
- System CFO (Chair)
- Campus CBOs
- CPO
- Legal / General Counsel

Executive Committee
- Establish strategic direction for Procurement
- Approve organization structure and major policy changes
- Review key metrics and spend analysis trends
- Resolve final escalated issues

Procurement Council
- Confirm Procurement Strategy Plan
- Review key supplier arrangements and category management strategy
- Evaluate and propose contractual terms and conditions
- Focus on customer experience and service quality – monitor and provide input on SLAs
- Identify procurement improvement opportunities
- Resolve escalated operational issues
- Provide feedback on procurement technology solutions

Spend Council
- Confirm spend data standards & taxonomy
- Develop spend data reporting standards
- Review high level spend analysis
- Evaluate spend trends and identify expense management opportunities/initiatives

Risks, issues, and questions flow upwards
- Risks, issues, and questions are escalated upwards to be resolved and addressed as needed
- Decisions made at higher levels of governance are promulgated downwards
- Distinguishing the different levels of governance helps clarify decision-making authority and define clear channels for communication between leadership, Procurement, and the UT community

Decisions flow downwards

 membership categories:
- CPO
- Procurement Leaders
- Selected Key Campus Customers, Stakeholders and/or SMEs
  - Research & Science
  - Health Sciences & Medical
  - Facilities
  - Information Technology
  - Student Services
  - Residence Life
  - Libraries
  - Business Services
  - Athletics

Executive
Functional
Operations
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F. Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Model Transformation Timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define System Scope of Services for Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Job Description and Hire CPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Governance Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Procurement Goals &amp; KPIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Leads for the Strategic Procurement, Service Center and Support roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Service Level Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Job Descriptions and Training Requirements for all Team Member roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Procurement Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify roles for existing Team members (Strategic Procurement, Service Center, Support, Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Business Process Redesign &amp; Policy Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand up the System Procurement Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Technology Roadmap Review</td>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Considerations & Tactics
Implementation Considerations
Cross-Functional Transformation Enablers

Employee and Financial Capacity
Given that UT staff and budgets are already stretched thin, available financial and staff capacity will determine initiatives’ scopes and timelines. Capacity can be expanded through partnerships across the system.

Transparency
All initiatives would benefit from comprehensively informing UT system leaders and staff of rationale, timeline, and scope as early as possible. Institution-wide transformational project success requires transparency and buy-in from a diverse array of stakeholders.

Governance Structure
To achieve success, each transformation requires both executive sponsors and dedicated staff project managers. All initiatives should also have clear timelines and defined goals with regular progress meetings to ensure accountability.

Change Management
Changing models, processes, and organizational structures can generate significant work disruption and stakeholder apprehension. Recommendations will require significant change management and communication activities to successfully mitigate faculty, staff, and other stakeholder concerns and drive change.
Implementation Considerations

Tactical Next Steps

1. Socialize and refine operating models. Adapt document to become UT System endorsed operating models versus consultant recommendations.

2. Develop sponsorship strategy to champion the operating model transformation and carry it forward at critical leadership levels.

3. Stand-up project management structure that assigns ownership for transformation planning and implementation activities.

4. Develop change management and communications plan for dissemination across the system.
Appendix
### Stakeholder Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake Reagan</td>
<td>Procurement Director (Head of Procurement for UTK)</td>
<td>8/5/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/14/2019</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra Alston</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor, HR, UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>8/5/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gendron</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer, UT Chattanooga</td>
<td>8/7/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/20/2019</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Reeves</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer, UT Knoxville</td>
<td>8/7/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Belew</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer, UT Martin</td>
<td>8/9/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laure Pou</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Chancellor, HR, UT Chattanooga</td>
<td>8/9/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lucal</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor, HR, UT Knoxville</td>
<td>8/12/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya Johnson</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer</td>
<td>8/13/2019</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Mathews</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer, UT System</td>
<td>8/13/2019</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Paganelli</td>
<td>AVP Financial Administration</td>
<td>8/13/2019</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Donavant</td>
<td>Manager, Procurement Services, UT Martin</td>
<td>8/15/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Forrest</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Financial Affairs (Interim Procurement Services Director)</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cimino</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer, UT Knoxville</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra McPherson</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer, UT Martin</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ferrara</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer, UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Harder</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer, UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>8/19/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Lawshe</td>
<td>Director, Procurement Services, UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>8/19/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rhodes</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>8/21/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Fawver</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer, UT Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>8/21/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Boyd</td>
<td>President, University of Tennessee System</td>
<td>8/21/2019</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Washington</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources, UT Martin</td>
<td>8/22/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Brown</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer, UT Chattanooga</td>
<td>8/22/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Gibson</td>
<td>Executive Director, IT for UT Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>8/27/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomi Rogers</td>
<td>HR and Operations Manager, UT Institute of Public Service</td>
<td>8/27/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail White</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer, Institute of Public Service</td>
<td>8/28/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Gordy</td>
<td>IT Manager for the Institute of Public Service</td>
<td>8/28/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Compton</td>
<td>Chair of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>8/29/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Bohner</td>
<td>HR Director, UT Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>8/29/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Miles</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>9/16/2019</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>