Executive Summary

The college developed two Human Resources Plans (2012-13 & 2013-14) within 6 months of each other due to an Accreditation visit and subsequent Follow up visit. This evaluation focuses only on the 2012-13 as it is the cycle for which the planning evaluation is taking place. It should be noted, however, that many of the recommendations for improvement discussed at the retreat were implemented into the Human Resources Plan 2013-14.

Participants: William Hernandez, Elena Reigadas, Elizabeth Colocho, Ivan Clarke, Stephanie Atkinson, Patsy Morales, Rae Uhde, Brad Young, Ellen Joiner, Joneen Ohlaker, Luis Rosas, Susan Rhi-Kleinert, Tim Davis.

1. How do the college’s Human Resources 2012-13 Plan align with the college’s Educational Master Plan?

Evidence: Definition of HR Plan: The objective of the college’s human resource plan is to align hiring decisions for the college with demonstrated need and prioritization within budget allocation as set forth in program review and unit/cluster planning documents. (p. 2). The Unit plans and cluster plans are aligned to the EMP. The HR Plan is aligned with the EMP in several sections but most extensively (almost exclusively) to Goal #7.

Evaluation: The college’s first attempt at an HR Plan was firmly rooted in Program Review and tied the Program Review into the Unit/Cluster Planning process. This tie to data/evidence was commended by the ACCJC Follow Up visiting team in the Spring of 2013. In their words, we have developed and implemented a “best practice”.

CPC validation of alignment of HR Plan with EMP:
- the written plan is well aligned but exestuation needs to be vetted through a full “iteration”
- HR Plan overall aligns with EMP, but like all plans it needs to be constantly reviewed and updated

2. Did the college achieve the goals outlined by the Human Resources 2012-13 Plan?

Evidence: Overall, the faculty hiring took place within the planning process; at the time of the writing of the first plan, the college was re-organizing due to budget cuts and had not yet determined the direction which is reflected in the document. The evidence is located in the HR Plan 2012-13 on p.12.

Evaluation: The faculty hiring that took place was within the framework and approval of FHPC and the College President; staffing non-faculty hires had been placed on hold until the VPs of each Cluster completed the re-organizations at the charge of the President. The tie to Program Review and Unit/Cluster Plans was present, although not directly linked to budget. An overall budget was provided, but each hire was not able to be understood within the context of an overall budget for hiring and its future implications. (Note: This was addressed in the HR Plan 2013-14).

CPC validation of goal achievement of the HR Plan 2012-13:
- It’s difficult to say. It seems that the 2012-13 process was incomplete and that we are operating in ‘after the fact’ mode.
- In the 2012-13 cycle the HR plan established its position as a recommending body. This position is further refined in the 2013-14 cycle
3. Suggestions for improvement for the process/product of the Human Resources 2012-13 Plan?

Evidence: On p. 13 of the document, several recommendations were made regarding both the plan outcomes and processes. Additional recommendations were made regarding college practices, which have some union implications.

1. The creation of PCRs and approval processes needs to be outlined. There is not a process flow which would show where/when a position should be generated or stopped based upon Cluster prioritizations and budget. This will help the college realize its intent to have a balanced budget each year as well as fulfill its staffing with the prioritizations established through the planning process, ultimately linking budget and planning. This recommendation has been addressed. A form has been created and put into use by the college for requesting positions. It requires 3 levels of approval: Dean, VP of the area, and President. The form indicates how the position is funded (with line item identified) as well as benefit calculation for total ownership cost calculations in projecting salary/benefits. Additionally, the form provides for information to ascertain budget availability should the budget line item be funding more than one position.

2. There have been instances on the campus where faculty have been hired (on a faculty release basis) to complete the work of a classified personnel. This needs to come into Union compliance for the betterment of the college.

3. Pathways for Promotion and Advancement
   a. The process for upgrade/advancement needs to be clarified and objective for classified staff. The opportunities need to be equal and equitable. Without a path for promotional opportunities, we may lose valuable employees.
   b. The process for upgrade/advancement for Academic Administrators (Teamsters Local 911 members). The opportunities need to be equal and equitable. Without a path for promotional opportunities, we may lose valuable employees.

4. Staffing Committee and its role in CPC: at the college’s planning retreat in June 2012, the shared governance agreement was examined. During the robust dialogue, it was determined that the HR Planning Taskforce should make a recommendation as to whether or not the committee is needed; and if it is needed, what its role and scope would be. At this time, the committee recommends having the Staffing Committee for a 1-year pilot project and have the following scope/purpose:
   a. Suggest calling the staffing committee the — Human Resources Committee so that it encompasses all of college rather than imply only applicable to Classified positions.
   b. The HR Committee should serve as a — clearance committee which can examine data/evidence.
   c. Ensure that positions being filled are in the appropriate cluster plans and within the available budget.
   d. Examine budget data in regards to ensure that priorities are aligned with plans/staffing.
   e. Have Grant Committee Co-Chair serve on the staffing committee:
      1. Have awareness of all SFP positions being hired/staffed to ensure budgets of the SFP positions will cover the positions and the time period of the grants with no overrun into Program 100.
      2. Transparency of grant positions which require Institutionalization initially funded as SFP.

5. Union contracts need to become aligned in regards to college committee composition and responsibilities. A example of this is the Work Environment Committee. There are conflicts between the AFT Faculty contract and other union agreements in regards to the work of the W.E.C. committee.

6. The Personnel Commission list generation process is not as responsive to the college’s staffing needs as is needed by the college.

Evaluation: Overall, the above recommendations which could be implemented locally for the 2013-14 plan were implemented.

CPC suggestions for improvement of the process/product of the HR Planning process:
- Align the budget with hiring goals and needs of departments based on data from Program Review. We are operating on a wish list approach.
- Alignment of budget and priorities, data based.

4. Validation by College Planning Committee:

Upon reviewing the HR Plan 2012-13 and reviewing the evaluation summary, the College Planning Committee recommends the following action:
- Continue to align budget allocation with staffing needs.