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Assessment Process & Activities
## Assessment Activities Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data &amp; Document Review</th>
<th>HR Leader Interviews</th>
<th>HR Internal Focus Groups</th>
<th>External Collaborator Interviews</th>
<th>External Focus Groups</th>
<th>Process Assessment</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Process documentation • Training information • HR policies • Position descriptions • State classified documentation • Total rewards information • Metrics as available • IPEDS reports • HR goals and strategy materials • Performance reviews • Trebuchet assessment materials • Task Force survey feedback</td>
<td>• Melissa Morgan • Teri Suhr • Tracy Hutton • Annette Murdock-Tangye • Nick Cummings • Diana Prieto • Lynn Johnson</td>
<td>• Payroll • Benefits • Classification/Compensation • Talent Acquisition • HR Solutions • HR Service Center • HRIS &amp; Records</td>
<td>• Office of Equal Opportunity Information Services • General Counsel • Provost Office • Business &amp; Financial Services • Task Force</td>
<td>• Main HR Liaisons • General HR Liaisons (2) • Leadership: Chairs and Vice Chairs of FC, APC and CPC, Cabinet, Council of Deans &amp; University Operations • Campus Advisory Groups</td>
<td>• As-Is &amp; To-Be Process • Search • AP Classification • State Classification • Payroll Processing through Error Resolution • Personnel Action Approvals • Leave Processing &amp; Administration To-Be Process • Disciplinary Actions • Change Management</td>
<td>• University of Colorado • University of Missouri • University of Utah • Washington State University • Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University • Oregon State University • North Carolina State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview & Focus Groups

- **Within HR**: Each staff member was engaged either in an interview or focus group to solicit feedback.
- **External to HR**: Focus groups and interviews were designed to capture feedback from stakeholders in a variety of capacities:
  - Key collaborators with HR
  - CSU leaders
  - Entities that frequently partner with HR or utilize HR services
  - Committee representation across multiple stakeholder groups
- Questions asked of participants were customized by group/stakeholder type.
- Topics for discussion covered strengths and opportunities observed across:
  - Strategy and metrics
  - Leadership support & decision making
  - Culture & morale
  - Communication & collaboration
  - Systems & processes
  - Structure & capacity
  - Service expectations
  - Employee experience

*hrQ independently selects the stakeholders/stakeholder groups to engage, as well as develops the interview and focus group protocols.*
Process Assessment Approach

List of Processes for Assessment determined by:

1. Generating initial list of processes for consideration from feedback gathered in HR interviews, HR focus groups, “Dean memo” and Task Force survey

2. Voting exercise completed in External Focus Groups to develop a short-list of processes for consideration

3. Discussions with HR Sr. Leadership to confirm final list of processes for review

As-Is & To-Be Process
- Search
  - AP Classification
  - State Classification
- Payroll Processing through Error Resolution
- Personnel Action Approvals
- Leave Processing & Administration

To-Be Process/Methodology
- Disciplinary Actions
- Change Management
Processes Suggested for Phase 2 Review

- Out-of-Cycle Promotions
- Reclassifications
- New Student Hiring
- Salary Exercise
- HR Reporting
- Supplemental Pay
- I-9 Updates

### Participant Voting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP classification</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position creation / modification</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search (general)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciplinary actions</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state classification</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel actions</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payroll error resolution</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position requisition approval</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job evaluation</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-of-cycle promotions</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance management</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reclassification</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time tracking &amp; submission</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new student hiring</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salary exercise</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplemental pay</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-9 updates</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background check</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open pool search</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Liaison training</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits eligibility</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty hiring</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account distribution changes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT hiring</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status changes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level Agreements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payroll processing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New hire onboarding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process Assessment Highlights
Search Activity

• Hiring has steadily increased, lending itself to need for efficiency and effective resource management to meet customer expectations and needs

• According to our benchmarks, most lead Search using the following practices:
  - Trained HR Business Partners
  - Talent Acquisition drives the hiring process
  - OEO not involved in AP and State Search process
  - Have only essential approvals

• These practices have facilitated the following results:
  - Efficiency
  - Stakeholder satisfaction with acceptable time-to-hire
  - Trusted HR partners to consult hiring managers
  - Managed risk through involvement by staff who are educated on employment law, including equity and anti-discrimination practices
### FINDINGS & OBSERVATIONS

- Central HR has taken an “as you go” approach to implementing a job architecture, particularly in reference to Administrative Professionals.
- Feedback that approach to project implementation was as a result of project funding (versus Central HR choice).
- Represents the most significant core breakdown of trust and relationship between HR and CSU.
- Very limited evidence of stakeholder engagement/change management in the classification process.
  - Limited communications, most of which are “pushed”
  - Overwhelming and consistent feedback that there is a lack of understanding, trust and transparency in the process.
- Process has taken many years and has been handled by limited staff, some of whom have changed.
- Consistent feedback that different staff have taken different approaches to classification, resulting in inconsistencies in how positions are titled and classified (within current framework project).
- Tie between classification and compensation has not been implemented, which is the core reason for implementing a job architecture.
  - Feedback that compensation data purchased in support of the project is >2 years old (obsolete).

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- Utilize outside support to complete AP Framework project and conduct clean-up efforts as necessary.
  - Implement robust change management and stakeholder engagement plan with multiple type of participation opportunities.
    - Communicate and teach the process.
    - Actively solicit feedback.
  - Complete classification activities; assess quality of implemented classifications.
    - Revisit overall classification outcomes.
    - Revisit/revise areas where significant stakeholder feedback indicates issues.
    - Assign pay bands accordingly.
- Obtain new compensation data.
- Work with compensation experts who will support both the design and implementation of the project to completion.

### SOURCES

- HR document review; website review.
- Internal HR interviews and HR focus groups.
- External focus groups and interviews.
Personnel Actions

Rejections occur when required information or qualifications the customer is expected to provide are either incomplete or do not meet requirements.

High volume of rejections can be a lagging indicator of the following:
- Complex processes
- User knowledge gap of process/policy
- Skill gap to complete task
- System operational effectiveness

1605 rejections in last 16 months
(Jan. 1, 2018 – May 2, 2019)

Note: All personnel actions are printed and filed, leading to significant workload when there is system capability to view history and for record keeping.
Organizational Design Approach
Org Design Principles

The design must enable and facilitate strategic operational objectives

Design should be stress tested for growth tolerance, scalability and performance against probable organizational risks

Design the organization and positions INDEPENDENT of current incumbents or current state practices

Adhere to best practices including spans of control, career growth options, alignment of metrics and focus on collaboration

Org structure must be designed with a focus on what is best for the organization and should not be limited by current situational constraints.

A gradual evolution may be required for an organization to fully implement its ideal structure. As such, the design should be vetted to withstand changes over time.
# Organization Design Process

In order to develop the ideal structure for any organization, we must have a clear understanding of:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The HR functions and performance required to achieve CSU’s strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Input from key stakeholders, review of current best practices and industry benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Overall level of effort and skills needed for each of the functions from #1 - volume, hours, constituents supported, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Enablers/disablers to the function – technology, process requirements, tools, culture, organizational expectations, etc. that impact or influence the level of effort or skill/competency requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Alignment of the functions into groups that achieve the most efficiency and effectiveness, and to the most appropriate resource within each group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cost structure, efficiency and effectiveness of various options and alternatives to the structure, as well as the application/removal of enablers/disablers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group Feedback: Organizational Structure

- Overwhelming and consistent feedback on the need for transparency and trust between Central HR and CSU, as well as improved service & performance of transactional HR activities, talent acquisition timeline and performance management.

- Somewhat inconsistent feedback on centralization versus decentralization of HR activities:
  - Agreement that high volume transactional HR should be self-serve and/or based at the department level.
  - Agreement that complex, non-routine HR issue resolution should be facilitated by centralized HR subject matter experts.
  - Some feedback that the level of centralization v. decentralization was not important, only that the required HR SME and performance was delivered.

- Majority feedback challenging centralization was not due to structural implications, but to lack of trust with current Central HR organization performance.
HR Liaison Survey Findings

- Survey distributed to HR Liaison email list serve to understand perception of HR roles and general level of effort provided by Liaison community

- Many (83) HR Liaisons self-report that they provide consultative support to their client groups on topics such as HR policy, performance management, discipline and talent strategy; however, there is no clear indication that the Liaison’s providing consultative (higher risk) support are adequately equipped to do so

- Other survey takeaways
  - Resource allocation imbalance with some departments/rollups staffed above typical HR:EE ratios, and others significantly under typical ratios
  - Evidence of lack of HR Liaison role clarity: examples of departments/roll ups where multiple HR Liaisons report having FT HR Liaison roles, where only 1 ‘true’ HR Liaison represents the department/s (reflects differences in EE level understanding of role)
  - A total of 60 additional FTEs are allocated to HR Liaison roles (2399 hours/week)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of HR Liaisons providing consultative support</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, self-report survey feedback inherently has errors that impact the accuracy of results. The purpose of this survey was to understand individual perceptions of roles, types of activities performed, and provide a general estimate of FTEs focused on HR activities across CSU. Actual role definitions, level of effort and capacity planning should be based on a detailed assessment of decentralized HR Liaison roles.
HR Liaison Role

FINDINGS & OBSERVATIONS

- HR Liaisons are fully decentralized
- Lack of role clarity and consistency for HR Liaison role across CSU is a substantial risk for the organization
  - No HR subject-matter expertise required of the role
  - No internal tracking of HR Liaisons (count, functions, allocations)
  - No tracking of activities performed by HR Liaison community
  - No onboarding or training protocol for HR Liaison community

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Develop formal HR Liaison roles
  - Sr. HR Liaison – with formal HR training and formal CSU role training to provide consultative HR support (FT roles, may be shared across similar departments)
  - HR Liaison – with formal CSU role training to provide transactional HR process support (PT-FT roles depending on volume)
- Develop a formal onboarding and ongoing training program for HR Liaisons that must be completed before granting system access
- Utilize recommendations from training/communication sections to create HR Communities of Practice to support ongoing relationship building, learning and collaboration
  - Reference UW Madison for best practices

SOURCES

- HR Liaison Survey
- Internal HR interviews and focus groups
- Central HR documentation & HRIS data
HR Centralization

Benefits of HR Centralization

• Lower operating costs through economies of scale
• Efficiency and simplification of internal processes
• Improve compliance and internal controls
• Enhance employee experience and accessibility to HR staff

- National Association of State Personnel Executives, HR Centralization vs. Decentralization;
- Deloitte Partnership for Public Service, “Human Resources Shared Services: Progress, Lessons and Opportunities”

Statistics on HR Centralization

• 70% of high performing HR functions have a centralized, prevailing model
• HR Centralization Rates of Non-profit, Nongovernmental Organizations & Academic Institutions
  - 10% Decentralized
  - 25% Hybrid
  - 65% Centralized

- Karen Shellenback. Mercer Select Intelligence, “HR Structures Today”

Recommendation: Move towards greater centralization
"Significantly, 71% of high performing HR organizations deploy all three elements of the prevailing model: COEs, HRBPs, and HR Shared Services"
CSU HR Model Components

HR Business Partners – focus is on client service
- HRBP model allows for greatest balance of key objectives: delivery of strategic HR service, utilization of CSU resources, and focus on compliance to policy
- Utilized by all but 1 benchmarked university
- HRBP-hybrid model is already evident in some areas of CSU out of organic growth and will easily transition into an HRBP structure, as well as accommodate various levels of centralization

Centers of Excellence – focus is on program design
- Allows for greatest focus on and transition to strategic human capital subject matter expertise (building both capability and capacity in key areas aligned to strategic objectives)
  - Talent Management (Talen Acquisition & Talent Management)
  - Training & Organizational Development (Training, OD, Change & Communications)
  - Total Rewards (Compensation & Benefits)

HR Shared Services – focus is on operational efficiency
- Allows for greatest leverage of resources and facilitates process efficiency across HR activities
  - HRIS
  - HR Service Center
  - HR Project Management
  - Records

Recommendation: Implement HRBPs, HR Shared Services & COEs
Functional Transitions

Recommendations that impact functional areas are made to help enable the achievement of strategic objectives as well as enable greater process efficiency.

Office of Equal Opportunity

- Realign OEO’s role in ‘AP and SC Search’ to performing training and audit functions
  - Reduces approvals
  - Allows OEO to continue process support through training and consultation
  - Creates better process efficiency
  - Supports the empowerment of client groups in their application of OEO principles
  - Aligns to benchmarking

Payroll

- Move Payroll to Business and Financial Services
  - Functionally aligns well with finance
  - Payroll currently demonstrates a reliance on tax expertise within Business & Finance
  - Does not add strategic value to HR
  - Aligns to benchmarking

Training & OD

- Move Training & OD within Central HR
  - Rapidly enhances strategic capabilities within HR
  - Functionally aligns well with talent management functions and HRBP activities
  - Greater economies of scale are gained by moving it within HR and supporting HR community needs
  - Aligns to benchmarking
HR Capacity & Capability Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability or Capacity Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career development/mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change management &amp; communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated HR Service providers with deep HR SME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee onboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General HR project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR analytics &amp; reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR liaison engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR liaison onboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR training (technical &amp; functional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRIS project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRIS/systems expertise (technical &amp; functional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web updating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/video training content development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources**

- Interview & focus group feedback
- Assessment of current available materials, documents, process work and functional offerings
- HRIS data and training-related system/policy issues (e.g. workflow rejection reasons)
- Early and high OGC involvement in employee relations and discipline
- System utilization and configuration challenges; partnership with IS
- HR best practices
- Lack of project management and change management methodology, as well as communication/training offerings
- AP framework project approach/history
- Nature of HR Liaison role
FTE & Capacity Considerations

Capacity recommendations are informed by a variety of information

• Central HR overtime report – very little overtime reported; areas where overtime was incurred can largely be addressed through process optimization
  – Time spent on error resolution & manual entry can be reduced in Payroll should be reduced through system configuration changes, system notifications and filling Payroll Manager vacancy
  – Time spent on printing/filing and action rejections in Payroll and Records should be reduced by process changes, system configuration and stakeholder training

• Work backlog – Classification & Compensation and HR communications are most impacted
  – Items in queue and duration of time required to process is significant in class and comp with most significant client dissatisfaction reported due to processing time
  – Records has no work backlog and sufficient turnaround time was reported
  – Central HR website redesign was referenced as a key project need for 6 years with no progress having been made

• Project / Functional Maturity – classification and “AP Framework” project reflects what should be one-time project work (v. ongoing volume/effort)
Benchmarking Information & Metrics

Information gathering was focused on capturing the following details from comparison organizations:

- Organization design
- Capacity and HR to Employee ratios
- Functions performed internally versus externally
- Role of OEO in the Search Process
- Metrics and KPIs
  - All talent acquisition and class & comp metrics
  - HRIS & TMS system utilization
- Best practices, challenges, and perspective
Benchmarking Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University System</th>
<th>Role of OEO in Search</th>
<th>Payroll Location</th>
<th>HR Liaison Model</th>
<th>Training &amp; OD</th>
<th>EE:HR Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Approvals &amp; Training</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Outside HR</td>
<td>172.7 (corrected for payroll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td><em>no information</em></td>
<td>Employee Services</td>
<td>Yes; also field HR Generalists that report to Campus Leaders</td>
<td><em>no information</em></td>
<td>different model; ratio n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td><em>no information</em></td>
<td><em>no information</em></td>
<td>162.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>Approvals and Training</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>No, HRBP model (field HR Representatives report to Central HR)</td>
<td>Within HR</td>
<td>134.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Yes (Liaisons are Central HR employees)</td>
<td>Within HR</td>
<td><em>no information</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>No, HRBP model (recently restructured to move away from HR Liaison model to create HRBPs stationed within divisions that report to Central HR)</td>
<td>Within HR</td>
<td>147.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>No, HRBP model (field HR Generalists report to Central HR)</td>
<td>Within HR (very limited)</td>
<td>146.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>No, HRBP model (HR Service Teams that include HR Consultant and HR Assistant)</td>
<td>Within HR (limited)</td>
<td>202.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of California, Berkeley and University of California, Los Angeles were also benchmarked for Search process information / OEO involvement in AP and State Classified search, and limit OEO’s involvement in search to training, consultation as needed, and audit.

* 27 FT HR Liaisons added to represent the FT Liaisons who are currently providing Consultative HR support (adding all 60 Liaison FTEs changes ratio to 80.
Positions requested by CSU HR:
- HRIS Professional (expects approval 7/1)
- Classification and Evaluation Analyst (expects approval 7/1)
- Payroll Technician (hired but not approved, funded via vacancies)
- Service Center Representative (hired but not approved, funded via vacancies)
- Communications Professional
- Administrative Assistant II
- Records Technician

Org chart FTEs = 44 (current)
Interim proposed FTEs = 50 (assumes 3 HRBP to start from Campus)
Recommended Final Org Chart

- Org chart FTEs = 44 (current)
- Interim proposed FTEs = 50
- Future proposed FTEs = 57 (5 from T&OD, 13 HRBP from campus, less 9 Payroll)

HR:EE Ratio = 133

Capacity projections for HRBP and Recruiter functions are estimates based on industry benchmarking and CSU HR Liaison feedback. Exact capacity requirements will depend on decided level of centralization, process improvements, process task ownership changes, and a deeper assessment of HR work performed “in the field” (currently reflects self-report survey feedback only).
# Stress Test

CSU’s HR organization design must be able to withstand a variety of stressors and continue to facilitate the achievement of the strategic objectives without a need for significant redesign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Potential Mitigation</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Go / No Go</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU-Operations reorg (move to shared services)</td>
<td>Minimal but potential talent loss (voluntary / involuntary); need for some process redesign</td>
<td>Develop project team to lead redesign; enhance talent pool</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant non-compliance event</td>
<td>Strain current systems and recruiting capability; financial loss; potential talent loss (voluntary / involuntary)</td>
<td>Develop “task force” plan for shifting resources; contingent options</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PR event</td>
<td>Employment branding negatively impacted; increased talent acquisition/retention challenges</td>
<td>Increase talent acquisition capabilities and talent pipelining</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR organization design decision to further decentralize</td>
<td>Additional compliance risk integrated into the organization; split client services function and realign to department, college or division</td>
<td>Build more control in units; create required minimum capabilities of HR Liaison roles; prioritize all communication, prioritize training and onboarding functions; segment HRBP activities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Implementation Strategy

Transition to the new structure should be gradual (6-18 months) and be based on Central HR's achievement of readiness indicators (e.g. SLAs consistently met, key leadership roles filled, key processes issues resolved).

Stabilize – Demonstrate Consistent Performance of Transactional HR

- Implement Interim Org Structure
- Fill leadership positions
- Correct most significant process issues
- Develop/deliver SLAs
- Educate constituents
- Prioritize training change, all comms
- Obtain outside support
- AP Framework Project
- Intranet site redesign
- Work toward dotted-line reporting with HR Liaisons

Transition – Gradual Centralization with Increased Focus on Strategic HR

- After key activities (left) are complete, begin transition to final design
- Add support staff
- Move payroll and T&OD
- Transition some HR Liaison roles to HRBPs
- Continue work on process optimization
Findings & Recommendations
The current state of CSU HR is impacted by a complex set of dynamics.
Summary of Findings

- CSU Human Resources is transactional and reactive in nature, yet the broader organization is demanding strategic human capital support.
- The HR department is struggling to perform transactional level HR due to cumbersome processes, resource limitations, internal team dynamics, and insufficient change and communication activities to its stakeholders.
- HR resources including staffing levels and technology have seen very little change over several years, and have not kept up with the organization’s needs.
- Staff morale has been impacted by multiple factors including resourcing, leadership/empowerment and perceived client dissatisfaction, yielding a limited focus on continuous improvement efforts (individuals within HR are working hard, but the team is not working together with enough efficiency or effectiveness to meet the organization’s needs).
- In application, HR functions are managed through compliance and control rather than through trust and empowerment of its constituents.
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Task force work will continue into the fall
- Final decisions regarding how to move forward thereafter
Thank you
Contact Information

Kristen Cooksley
Kristen@hrqinc.com

Melissa Leland
mleland@hrqinc.com
A. Supplemental Slides
Focus Group Voting

Voting by Functional Area

Classification & Compensation: 371
- Recruitment: 145
- HR Solutions: 105
- Payroll: 89
- Records: 81
- Cross-functional / Interdepartmental: 33
- Other: 14
- Benefits: 7

Voting within Classification & Compensation

- AP classification: 113
- Position creation / modification: 79
- State classification: 40
- Job evaluation: 33
- Reclassification: 28
- Salary exercise: 17
- Supplemental pay: 14

Note: Items are organized based on stakeholder feedback and may not reflect actual functional alignment.
Other Survey Findings

- The majority of HR Liaisons work on HR activities on a part-time basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT/PT Breakdown</th>
<th>Count of FT/PT Liaisons</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTHR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Of the part-time Liaisons that provide less than 8 hours a week of HR activities, 29 provide HR consultation to their client groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of HR Liaisons providing consultative support</th>
<th>Part Time = &lt;8 hours HR work/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The client focus of HR Liaisons varies significantly with some dedicated to specific department/s and others allocated to colleges and divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Office Type</th>
<th>College or Division</th>
<th>Specific Department</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTHR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Most FT HR Liaisons work as part of a team; about half of PT HR Liaisons work as part of a team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Team</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTHR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Iteration Process

hrQ Organization Design Process is based on decades of experience in organizational design and higher education in conjunction with strong client partnership

- hrQ develops the preliminary design option/s based on a comprehensive organizational assessment, alignment to the organizational strategy and stakeholder feedback
- Project sponsor provides feedback on preliminary design/s
- hrQ integrates feedback on flexible design elements and presents revised, final organization structure

hrQ may adjust the final organizational design in the following scenarios:

- In light of **new facts or data** that were previously not considered in the development of the structure
- On **flexible design elements** where hrQ believes an alternative structure will not have an impact on the effectiveness of model overall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Employees¹</th>
<th># Departments/Offices</th>
<th>Total Hours per Week in HR²</th>
<th>Count of FT HR Liaisons</th>
<th>Count of PT HR Liaisons (&lt;40 hrs/wk)</th>
<th>Consultative Services Provided</th>
<th>Consultative Services Provided by PT³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health &amp; Human Sciences</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Sciences</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Forest Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVMBS College Office</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost / EVP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Engagement</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Enrollment and Access</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for External Relations</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for University Advancement</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for University Operations</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified by OEO</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ OEO data included additional departments not included in Employee Count by Department report
² May be incomplete due to nonresponse to survey; conflicting responses within depts
³ Part-time defined by <8 hours per week, on average

Assumption: If an EE provides HR support less than 8 hours a week, HR is not their primary function. As such, there is a low likelihood that they have formal HR subject matter expertise or training, yet are providing ‘consultative HR support’ to CSU.

This reflects HR Liaison’s working less than 8 hours a week on HR (capturing roles LEAST likely to be true HR SMEs)