

HR Process Improvement: Electronic Personnel Actn Frm		STAGE	Prioritization
<b>PROPOSAL OVERVIEW</b>			
Primary Contact	Anne Milkovich	Email	anne.milkovich@montana.edu
Title/Department	Recommendations Sub-Committee Chair	Phone	(406) 994-5715
Problem Statement	According to surveys, there is significant campus demand for improved EPAF processing. OpenMSU focus groups indicate the shifting of EPAF processing from central to distributed personnel has led to process inefficiencies. EPAF process was the only process that all 12 units participating in the focus groups commented on as needing improvement.		
Proposed Solution	Assign a qualified project team of relevant stakeholders, including central and distributed service providers, to analyze the EPAF process. The project should include analysis of staffing and distribution of labor and duties involved, potentially changing personnel responsibilities as needed, and should incorporate workflow technology to address process issues.		
Key Performance Indicators or Outcome Measures	Reduced processing time Reduced rework and error rates Satisfaction with ease of use		
General Time & Effort Required	MEDIUM. Exact figures to be determined in Design phase. Dependent on implementation of Electronic Document Management and Workflow. Moderate training, communication and adoption management.		
Alternative Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct an EPAF organizational improvement project without workflow automation.</li> <li>• Include EPAF processing in a shared services center pilot.</li> <li>• Hire an outside consultant in conjunction with an internal project team.</li> </ul>		
<b>ALIGNMENT</b>			
Data Support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surveys	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus Groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Expertise
Initiative Objectives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational Efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee Satisfaction	
Departments Served	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Depts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fin & Acct Central <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HR Central
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IT Central	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purchasing Central	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsored Programs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> University Comm
Constituents Served	<input type="checkbox"/> Service Users	<input type="checkbox"/> <100	<input type="checkbox"/> 100-500 <input type="checkbox"/> >500
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service Providers	<input type="checkbox"/> <100	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 100-500 <input type="checkbox"/> >500
Problems Addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper process	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer service	<input type="checkbox"/> Central/Dist model <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of integration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comm/Coord
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Redundancy	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff expertise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Allocation/prioritization <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation
Processes / Services Addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> HR Recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Purchasing	<input type="checkbox"/> IT Support <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsored Programs <input type="checkbox"/> Web Dev & Content
	<input type="checkbox"/> BPAs	<input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EPAFs/Payroll <input type="checkbox"/> IT Governance <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Relations
<b>COST-EFFECTIVENESS</b>			
<b>DISCLAIMER: Conceptual cost-benefit analysis with an order of magnitude estimate range between -50% to +100%.</b>			
Upfront Real Cost	** \$	-	Upfront T&E Cost \$ 20,700
Ongoing Annual Cost	** \$	-	Ongoing Annual T&E Cost \$ -
Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash Savings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Incr. capacity	Estimated New Net \$ (19,700) *
<b>COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			
Alignment Rating	0%	Cost-Effectiveness Rating	0%
		Probability of Success Rating	0%
* Although it is probable that a process improvement project would lead to increased time & effort capacity, the estimated percentage reduction to result from process improvement is unknown at this time.			
** Dependent on implementation of electronic document management and workflow. Upfront real and ongoing annual costs associated with implementing this technology are captured in the Eliminate Paper-based Processes and Inefficiencies proposal.			

<b>HR Process Improvement: Electronic Personnel Actn Frm</b>				
<b>REF</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>METRIC</b>	<b>VALUE</b>
<b>ALIGNMENT</b>				
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
<b>COST-EFFECTIVENESS</b>				
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
<b>PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS</b>				
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

# HR Process Improvement: Electronic Personnel Action Form (EPAF) OpenMSU Proposal

---

## OpenMSU Objectives Addressed

---

- **Reduce cycle times-** implement processes that take less service provider time.
- **Coordinate activities-** implement processes that improve coordination between central and distributed service providers.
- **Increase capacity-** implement processes that take less service provider time to create additional service provider capacity.
- **Improve service provider satisfaction-** meet campus demand for improved HR processes.
- **Improve service customer satisfaction-** meet campus demand for improved HR processes.

## Supporting Data

---

- In response to the OpenMSU Service Provider Survey, 5% of responses (18 comments) commented that HR processes overall were the processes most critical to change and/or streamline at MSU. This was the fourth most comments for any process in response to this question.
- In response to the OpenMSU Service Customer Survey, 28 out of 80 process overall themed comments (processes take too long, too difficult, duplicate effort, paper/manual) were about the HR function.

## Detailed Problem Statement

---

According to the OpenMSU surveys, there is significant campus demand for improved HR processes.

Responsibility for conducting this process has been shifted from central to distributed service providers in recent years. According to distributed service providers involved in OpenMSU focus groups, this shifting of duties appears to have led to process inefficiencies.

All twelve units participating in OpenMSU focus groups commented on the EPAF process as having opportunities for improvement. This was the only process that all focus groups commented on.

## Detailed Solution Statement

---

Conduct a process analysis of the EPAF process to reduce cycle times, increase the capacity of HR service providers and meet campus demand for improved HR processes. The project team should be comprised of relevant stakeholders, including central and distributed service providers, to ensure proper design. The project should include analysis of the appropriate staffing and distribution of labor and duties involved in the process, potentially changing the duties of the personnel involved as needed.

The EPAF project should incorporate workflow technology to help address process issues involving reviews and approvals.

# HR Process Improvement: Electronic Personnel Action Form (EPAF) OpenMSU Proposal

---

## Alternative Solution

- Conduct an EPAF organizational improvement project without automating it through the use of workflow technology.
- Include EPAF processing in a shared services center pilot to provide EPAF support to multiple units.