Service Provider Development	STAGE	Prioritization

PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

Primary Contact	Dennis DeFa	**Email** dennis.defa@montana.edu
Title/Department	Chief Human Resource Officer	**Phone**

Problem Statement	MSU does not have a means to ensure that service providers are getting the training they need, to track that training has been received, to assess that the right training is being provided or to ensure it is of adequate quality. Minimal training is provided by some functional areas. Few programs are available to support a high-performance culture, such as training in unit performance management.
Proposed Solution	Implement a Professional Development and Training organization as part of the HR Office as proposed by the Chief Human Resources Officer. Assign a project team to assist in the development of this organization as it applies to OpenMSU service providers in finance, accounting, HR, IT, purchasing, sponsored programs, Web development, content management.
Key Performance Indicators or Outcome Measures	Employee satisfaction with quality and quantity of training Availability of training records
General Time & Effort Required	LARGE. No known dependencies. Exact figures undetermined. Significant development of a Professional Development and Training organization within the HR Office. Moderate communication and adoption management across campus. Limited maintenance.
Alternative Solutions	1. Establish an administrative council of central and distributed staff to guide operations such as training, staffing, standardized processes. 2. Create a university-wide database to publish available training and track completion.

ALIGNMENT

Data Support	☑ Surveys ☐ Focus Groups ☑ Professional Expertise
Initiative Objectives	☑ Operational Efficiency ☑ Employee Satisfaction
Departments Served	☑ Academic Depts ☑ Agencies ☑ Fin & Acct Central ☑ HR Central ☑ IT Central ☑ Purchasing Central ☑ Sponsored Programs ☑ University Comm
Constituents Served	☐ Service Users ☐ <100 ☐ 100-500 ☐ >500 ☑ Service Providers ☐ <100 ☑ 100-500 ☐ >500
Problems Addressed	☐ Paper process ☐ Customer service ☐ Central/Dist model ☐ Lack of integration ☐ Comm/Coord ☐ Redundancy ☑ Staff expertise ☑ Staff capacity ☐ Allocation/prioritization ☐ Compensation
Processes / Services Addressed	☑ HR Recruiting ☑ Purchasing ☑ IT Support ☑ Sponsored Programs ☑ Web Dev & Content ☑ BPAs ☑ Budget/Finance ☑ EPAFs/Payroll ☐ IT Governance ☐ Employee Relations

COST-EFFECTIVENESS

A cost-benefit analysis was not conducted because the project is less defined and therefore not easily quantifiable.

Upfront Real Cost	$ -	**Upfront T&E Cost** $ -
Ongoing Annual Cost	$ -	**Ongoing Annual T&E Cost** $ -
Benefits	☐ Cash Savings ☐ Incr. capacity	**Estimated New Net** $ -

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Alignment Rating	0%	Cost-Effectiveness Rating	0%	Probability of Success Rating	0%

Service Provider Development

REF	CATEGORY	FACTOR	METRIC	VALUE
ALIGNMENT				
A.1	Institutional:	Mission	Outcome aligns directly to support of MSU discovery, creativity, service mission.	0
A.2	Initiative:	Increased efficiency	Outcome results in optimized process, productivity, and throughput.	0
A.3	Initiative:	Improved satisfaction	Outcome results in improved employee job satisfaction.	0
A.4	Scope:	Horizontal problems	Outcome addresses all the identified horizontal problems of the organization	0
A.5	Scope:	Processes/services	Outcome addresses all the identified process or service problems	0
A.6	Scope:	Functional areas	Outcome addresses all of the functional area departments in the initiative scope	0
A.7	Constituents:	Constituent reach	Outcome directly addresses deepest identified constituent needs.	0
A.8	Constituents:	Constituent span	Outcome directly addresses needs of the widest number of constituents.	0
COST-EFFECTIVENESS				
C.1	Cost:	Ongoing	Ongoing cost is minimal or none.	0
C.2	Cost:	Upfront	Upfront cost is minimal or none.	0
C.3	Fiscal:	Cost Savings	Outcome reduces cash outflow.	0
C.4	Functional:	Time Savings	Outcome reduces time on process.	0
C.5	Opportunity:	Resource Availability	Necessary FTE and other resources are available and underutilized.	0
C.6	Opportunity:	Alternatives Availability	Time & effort cannot be better spent on any possible alternative.	0
PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS				
P.1	Institutional:	Critical Success Factors	CSFs are achievable with a high probability of occurring easily.	0
P.2	Institutional:	Funding Availability	Upfront and ongoing funding is sufficient for the life of the project.	0
P.3	Institutional:	Cultural willingness	The institutional culture is ready and willing to adopt this solution over alternatives.	0
P.4	Planning:	Training	Training needed is minimal and has been adequately planned for.	0
P.5	Planning:	Measurement	Outcome performance is measurable and will be reported.	0
P.6	Planning:	Stakeholders	Stakeholders are identified; expectations are reasonable and manageable.	0
P.7	Scope:	Complexity	Complexity is minimal; scope is defined and manageable.	0
P.8	Sustainability:	Ongoing Support	Ongoing support needed is minimal or readily available at low cost.	0

OpenMSU Objectives Addressed

Enhance service provider development

Supporting Data

In response to the OpenMSU Service Provider Survey, there were 79 training themed comments, placing training in the top two of comment theme areas for this survey.

Detailed Problem Statement

MSU does not have a means to ensure that service providers are getting the training they need, to track that training has been received, to assess that the right training is being provided or to ensure it is of adequate quality.

Although some departments (UBS, Purchasing and OSP) regularly provide training on performing duties within their functions to distributed service providers, much of it is only provided a few times of year, and no training is provided to campus providers for some functions (such as for Web development and content management). Also, there are few training and professional development programs available that would support a high-performance culture, such as training in performance management and in using metrics to manage unit performance.

Detailed Solution Statement

Implement a Professional Development and Training organization as part of the HR Office as proposed by the Chief Human Resources Officer. Assign a project team to assist in the development of this organization as it would apply to service providers for OpenMSU functions (finance & accounting, HR, IT, purchasing, sponsored programs administration and Web development and content management).

Alternative solutions

- Establish an administrative council composed of central and distributed staff to guide university-wide administrative operations such as:
    - o Ensuring that service providers are adequately and equitably compensated and that appropriate staffing levels are maintained,
    - o Ensuring that development and training of service providers is effective,
    - o Standardizing administrative processes and technologies (including whether processes should be conducted by central or distributed service providers), and
    - o Responding to emerging regulations that affect administrative practices.

- Other ideas for improving training and professional development and instituting a high-performance culture can be found on the UC Berkeley Operational Excellence site at: http://oe.berkeley.edu/dpreports/documents/H_TargetedTalentDev_ResReqwithwatermark.pdf.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

A cost-benefit analysis was not conducted because the project is less defined and therefore not easily quantifiable.