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Provide a written overview of the year-long process for your working group.
Investigate how long these four processes take. Then determine how we can solve any roadblocks to speeding some processes up.

2016-17 Accomplishments
The subcommittee reviewed a spreadsheet from Finance and Business, and then met with members from the Finance and Business team to discuss.
The subcommittee reviewed information from ESS, and then met with the AVP from ESS to discuss.
Recommendations

Subcommittee will continue to meet with both ESS and Business/Finance to pin down timelines for various tasks.

2017-18 Next steps

- What should the goals / activities be for the subcommittee?
- Who should be responsible?

A collective team of Nancy, Jim, and Kyle will continue to work with both groups to follow the service level agreement plan, known as Business Process Goals. This includes benchmarking of selected metrics to review progress.

Please review the list below and “X” the appropriate box(es).

- Potential resources required
- Any reports generated by this working group
  - Business Process Goals
  - Business Process Goals – Enrollment and Student Services
- Metrics to be used
- No additional reference material

Any additional information you wish to share.
Business Process Goals

**Purpose:** The long-term goal of this activity is to develop and implement a campus-wide process for business improvements.

**Rationale and Action:** In order to improve processes and remain effective, UNLV leadership asks unit leaders to develop goals for turnaround times for a set of internal processes, together with systems to measure and report turnaround times.

**Context:** The Top Tier Infrastructure and Shared Governance pathway goal committee identified various campus units for the initial exploration of goals, based on feedback received during the past two years through internal Top Tier meetings, during the rollouts to external and internal audiences in which Year 1 results were shared, and through comments on the website feedback forms, along with suggestions from Regents.

**Process:**

*Initial Phase*

Ultimately, business process goals will affect numerous campus areas. The first four units for inclusion include Financial Aid, Purchasing, Human Resources, and Admissions. Leaders of these four units will be able to identify internal process for which they can set reasonable goals. Provost Chase has also indicated that she is looking at turnaround time for faculty hiring paperwork.

Once the processes are identified,

1. the units themselves will propose goals for average turnaround time, and
2. unit leadership will provide information as to how they measure these times now, if they already do that, or to propose a measurement system if they do not currently measure these times.

It is anticipated that much of this information is already available in documents such as annual reports and that creating a reporting process will not involve too much additional work.

*Throughout the Year*

Throughout the upcoming academic year, Top Tier leadership, three vice presidents (Diane, Gerry, and Juanita), and unit leaders will meet bi-monthly (approximately) to review and discuss results as they unfold. These bi-monthly meetings will also provide opportunities to discuss obstacles to improvement and potential remedies.

*Long-term:*

After this one-year experiment, it should be possible to identify other units on campus and additional processes for examination. There will also be an opportunity to establish a more permanent system beyond the current Top Tier planning activity.
Business Process Goals
Enrollment and Student Services
Summary as of March 2017

• Admits for FTF from when admission packet is complete until admitted went from 6 weeks in CY 14 to less than one week currently.

• Admits for Transfer students when admission packet is complete until admitted went from approximately 10 weeks in CY 14 to two weeks currently.

• Modified the degree substitution/waiver process to include a single form for all exceptions so that Academic Advisors can more efficiently communicate with the Registrar’s Office and these items be recorded in PeopleSoft. This improvement has improved Degree Audit processes from approximately 7 days to less than 48 hours.

• Transfer Evaluators are designating more course attributes at the time of transfer articulation to ensure additional courses are meeting graduation requirements at the front end, rather than processing requests at the back end at time of graduation. This has reduced the number of Degree Audit exceptions within Gen Ed by 30% prior to January 2016 versus our current processes.

• Registrar created an active dialog and discourse with both the Advising Community and Academic Departments responsible for approving or denying transfer course equivalencies, has significantly furnished efficiency in the Transfer Articulation System (TES) process. Prior to July 2016, the average time to completing a TES request from initiation to closing was 4 months. Currently the average time to completing a TES request is within 24 hours.

• The elimination of several Registrar assigned email accounts and direct communication through the Footprints ticketing request (system shared with OIT) system has reduced the turnaround time for responding to inquires made by faculty, staff, students, and the community. Prior to using Footprints, responses could be as long as 72 hours, is now within 24-48 hours.

• The Registrar’s Office now produces academic and term calendars 6 years out versus two-years. This allows for better planning and earlier set-up for functions such as Financial Aid and better planning on the part of Academic units.