

HR Process Improvement: Recruiting/Hiring		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 the OpenMSU surveys, there is significant campus demand for improved recruiting/hiring processes. Eight out of twelve units participating in OpenMSU focus groups commented on recruiting/hiring processes as needing improvement.		
Proposed Solution	Assign a project team of stakeholders, including central and distributed service providers, to work with an external consultant to analyze and improve recruiting processes from classification through onboarding. An external consultant is recommended because HR processes are inherently complex and because we do not have the staff capacity or expertise to adequately redesign HR processes.		
Key Performance Indicators or Outcome Measures	Reduced time to hire Employee satisfaction with ease of use.		
General Time & Effort Required	MEDIUM. Exact figures to be determined in Design phase. Effort investment with consultant to determine the current process state. Moderate training, communication and adoption management throughout Human Resources central and distributed.		
Alternative Solutions	Conduct a recruiting/hiring process improvement project without the assistance of an external consultant.		
<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"/> IT Central	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purchasing Central	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fin & Acct Central <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sponsored Programs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HR Central <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> University Comm
Constituents Served	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service Users <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service Providers	<input type="checkbox"/> <100 <input type="checkbox"/> <100	<input type="checkbox"/> 100-500 <input type="checkbox"/> 100-500 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> >500 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> >500
Problems Addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper process <input type="checkbox"/> Redundancy	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer service <input type="checkbox"/> Staff expertise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central/Dist model <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of integration <input type="checkbox"/> Allocation/prioritization <input type="checkbox"/> Compensation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comm/Coord
Processes / Services Addressed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HR Recruiting <input type="checkbox"/> BPAs	<input type="checkbox"/> Purchasing <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance	<input type="checkbox"/> IT Support <input type="checkbox"/> EPAFs/Payroll <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsored Programs <input type="checkbox"/> IT Governance <input type="checkbox"/> Web Dev & Content <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	\$	7,200	Upfront T&E Cost \$ 8,600
Ongoing Annual Cost	\$	-	Ongoing Annual T&E Cost \$ -
Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash Savings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Incr. capacity	Estimated New Net \$ (15,100) *
<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.			

<b>HR Process Improvement: Recruiting/Hiring</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

### OpenMSU Objectives Addressed

---

- **Reduce cycle times-** implement processes that are completed over a shorter period of time and 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 recruiting/hiring processes.
- **Improve service customer satisfaction-** meet campus demand for improved HR processes.

### Supporting Data

---

- In response to the OpenMSU Service Provider Survey:
  - 23% of responses (105 comments) commented that recruiting/hiring was an activity that took significantly longer than it should at MSU. This was the most comments for any activity in response to this question.
  - 12% of responses (45 comments) commented that recruiting/hiring was the process most critical to change and/or streamline at MSU. This was tied (with BPA) for the most comments for any process in response to this question.
  - 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.
- The University of California, San Diego's benchmark for its average cycle time for "# Days Positions are Open until Hiring Offer is extend (work days)" is about 61 days. For FY 2011, MSU's combined average # days to offer (for classified staff) or hire (for faculty and professional staff) was about 66 days.

### Detailed Problem Statement

---

According to the OpenMSU surveys, there is significant campus demand for improved recruiting/hiring processes. Eight out of twelve units participating in OpenMSU focus groups commented on recruiting/hiring processes as needing improvement.

### Detailed Solution Statement

---

Assign a project team of stakeholders, including central and distributed service providers, to work with an external consultant to analyze and improve recruiting and hiring processes from classification through onboarding. An external consultant is recommended because HR processes are inherently complex and because MSU does not currently have the staff capacity or expertise to adequately redesign HR processes.

## HR Process Improvement: Recruiting/Hiring OpenMSU Proposal

---

Although purchase and implementation of applicant tracking software is currently underway that should improve recruiting/hiring processes, technology enhancements must be accompanied by process improvements to be effective. According to Bill Gates, founder of Microsoft, “The first rule of any technology used in a business is that automation applied to an efficient operation will magnify the efficiency. The second is that automation applied to an inefficient operation will magnify the inefficiency.”

### **Alternative Solution**

- Conduct a recruiting/hiring process improvement project without the assistance of an external consultant.