Operations Committee Charge and Charter

The Operations Committee is a core component of the University's structural reset process. Its purpose is to define the operating model and cost structure required to support a financially sustainable institution while preserving the mission and student experience of Regis University. The committee works in parallel with the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and provides recommendations to senior leadership regarding cost reductions, reallocations, revenue opportunities, process redesign, and operational simplification.

Committee Charge

The Operations Committee is charged with:

1. **Defining an Affordable Operating Model**
   - Determine the level of administrative and operational support the University can sustainably fund based on its target enrollment and revenue model
   - Recommend appropriate service levels, staffing models, and organizational structures
2. **Evaluating Structural Costs**
   - Identify costs that are fixed, semi-fixed, and variable
   - Distinguish between:
     - Costs that can be reduced in 1–3 years
     - Long-term structural costs requiring extended planning
3. **Identifying Opportunities for Reduction and Reallocation**
   - Assess all non-academic functions for efficiency, duplication, and alignment with institutional priorities
   - Recommend where to invest, sustain, modify, reduce, or realign resources
4. **Simplifying Institutional Complexity**
   - Evaluate processes, systems, and organizational structures that add cost or administrative burden
   - Recommend simplification of workflows, reporting relationships, and service delivery
5. **Estimating Financial and Operational Impact**
   - Quantify recurring savings, one-time implementation costs, timing of savings, and operational risks
6. **Supporting University-Wide Structural Balance**
   - Deliver recommendations that, combined with academic portfolio decisions, create a sustainable cost structure and long-term operating model

Committee Charter

Purpose

To develop recommendations for an operational structure that aligns with the University's mission, enrollment scale, and financial capacity.

Scope
The committee will review all non-academic and administrative functions, including but not limited to:

- Financial Affairs and Student Accounts
- Human Resources
- Information Technology
- Physical Plant
- Campus Safety
- Mission and Ministry
- Student Affairs
- Admissions (using report from consultant)
- Financial Aid Administration
- Advancement and Alumni Relations (using report from consultant)
- University Marketing
- Auxiliary Services
- Legal Affairs
- Institutional Data Services
- Registrar
- Athletics Administration
- President’s Office

Guiding Principles
- Mission over tradition
- Structural solutions over incremental reductions
- Transparency over protection of existing structures
- Shared accountability
- Data-informed decision making
- Service to students as the primary objective

Decision Framework
Each unit or function will be categorized as:

- **Invest** – Expand resources where strong return or strategic necessity exists.
- **Sustain** – Maintain with disciplined oversight.
- **Modify** – Redesign to improve effectiveness and efficiency.
- **Reduce/Realign** – Scale back, consolidate, or restructure.
- **Sunset** – Eliminate functions no longer aligned with institutional priorities.

Recommended Committee Membership
Chair
A respected leader with strong institutional credibility and the ability to challenge assumptions objectively.
Recommended Chair: Jointly appointed operational leader and faculty representative. Brook Thompson and Ken Sagendorf

Core Members

Area	Recommended Representation
Finance	Brook Thompson
Human Resources	Lori Burghardt
Information Technology/Aux Services	Josef Rill
Physical Plant	Associate Director, David Beasley
Student Affairs	Sarah Smith
Admissions	Catherine Rohde
Athletics	Andy Wheeler
Institutional Data Services	Nels Ahlberg
Faculty	3 faculty members appointed through shared governance Ken Sagendorf, Kristen Jager, Nick Kallen
Staff	Jenna Miles, Fredricka Brown (SAC)
Board	1–2 trustees as advisors—Preston Walton
CFO/Provost	Ex officio Stephanie Morris and Jake Bucher
Chief of Staff	Sheryl Tirol, Committee Communications

Suggested Size
12–18 members

Responsibilities and Work Plan

Phase 1: Organizational Design and Baseline Assessment

Begin by first defining the organizational framework to not risk evaluating departments against inconsistent assumptions.

The sequence is as follows:
1. Define staff architecture.
2. Establish organizational design principles.
3. Collect baseline staffing and cost data.
4. Evaluate units against the approved framework.

Phase 1A: Staff Architecture and Organizational Design Framework

Objective

Define the leadership structure and management layers the University can sustainably support.

Key Decisions

- Which organizational levels will exist (e.g., VP, AVP, Director, Manager)
- Criteria for each level
- Span-of-control expectations
- Conditions that justify exceptions

Example Questions

- How many executive layers are appropriate?
- Which roles require AVP status?
- What is the target number of AVP/Dean positions?

Deliverables

- Approved organizational hierarchy
- Role criteria by level
- Preliminary decisions on title rationalization
- Positions placed within the staff architecture
- organizational structure

Phase 1B: Baseline Assessment

- Inventory all operational budgets & staffing
- Identify fixed vs. variable costs
- Benchmark major cost categories and staffing ratios
- Document major pain points and process inefficiencies

Each unit is then evaluated against the agreed framework.

Phase 2: Structural Review

- Evaluate each function against:
    - Mission alignment
    - Student impact
    - Regulatory necessity
    - Financial efficiency
    - Organizational complexity

- Develop alternative service and staffing models

Phase 3: Recommendation Development

- Prioritize recommendations

- Estimate financial savings and implementation costs
- Assess risks and transition requirements

Phase 4: Integration and Final Reporting

- Coordinate with the Academic Portfolio Committee
- Align operational recommendations with academic decisions
- Present a consolidated structural reset plan to SLT and the Board

Expected Deliverables

1. Operating cost baseline and structural cost map
2. Unit-by-unit categorization (Invest, Sustain, Modify, Reduce, Sunset)
3. Multi-year savings and investment projections
4. Organizational design recommendations
5. Implementation roadmap with timelines and dependencies
6. Risk assessment and mitigation strategies

Meeting Cadence

- Weekly 2–3-hour meetings during active review
- Subgroups may meet independently
- Monthly progress reports to Senior Leadership
- Formal presentations to the Board at key decision points
- Open forums with the community

Decision Authority

The committee serves in an advisory capacity.

Body	Role
Operations Committee	Analysis and recommendations
Senior Leadership Team	Reviews and refines recommendations
President	Final executive recommendations
Board of Trustees	Reviews major structural changes

Success Measures

The committee's work will be successful if it:

- Identifies a sustainable operating cost structure
- Reduces unnecessary complexity
- Improves service effectiveness
- Aligns resources with mission and strategic priorities
- Contributes to achieving structural financial balance