

HACC Assessment Record

Department/Campus: Human Resources

Unit: Operations/Administration

Assessment Start Date:	March, 2013	
Goal: <i>(Campus, department or unit)</i>	HR Goal: To serve the HACC community in aligning institutional policies with federal and state employment laws and in managing all phases of employee processes.	
Objective: <i>(Measurable)</i>	Operations and Administration goals: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oversee the administration of HR information systems (HR Banner, Halogen, PeopleAdmin) 2. Oversee EPAF processes. 	
Alignment to Strategic Plan: HR-to-Strategic Plan Matrix	Goal III: Operational Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 13: Adopt best practices in higher education for financial planning and management. • Objective 17: Identify, implement, support and evaluate innovative use of technologies. 	
Sources of Evidence to be used: <i>(Measures that would point to achievement of goal/objective. Examples: databases, focus group feedback, surveys. See p. 10 of Guide.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BANNER reporting re: adjunct payments • Department/office records (adjunct payments) • Date Stamps by approver (adjunct payments) 	
Type of Assessment : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information– Gathering <i>(needs assessments, inventories, establishing baselines)</i> • Performance–Evaluating <i>(How well are we doing? Have we improved?)</i> 	Performance-Evaluating	
IF ASSESSMENT IS PERFORMANCE-EVALUATING:		
*Benchmarks and Performance Targets are critical when evaluating performance. They may or may not be as critical when gathering information, although a rubric may be developed to organize categories under consideration.	Benchmarks or Standards (See pp. 11 – 13 of Guide)	Performance Target (See pp. 13 – 17 of Guide)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeliness of payment • Processing time • Record accuracy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in payment request review time from 3 to 1 days. • Reduction in inaccuracies to approaching 0%.
Findings: <i>(What did we learn from this assessment? What did the evidence say?)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was taking 3 days for the HR office to verify accuracy of adjunct payment requests • Records were not in alphabetical order, rather they were ordered by organizational unit, making the process more time-consuming. • The line-by-line review process (from Exhibit 1 to Exhibit 2) 	

	<p>was manual and exceedingly time-consuming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of a checks-and-balances system, the time-consuming process was largely duplicated by the Payroll office.
<p>Decision-Making: <i>(What changes of practice are indicated? What budget priorities are established? What accomplishments should be celebrated and showcased?)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new custom report was created from BANNER that alphabetized and compared line items to automate much of the review process. (See Exhibit 3). • The report points out only “differences” that can then, in turn, be studied and rectified by HR/Payroll staff.
<p>Assessment Closing Date:</p>	<p>May, 2013.</p>
<p>Notes:</p>	<p>Supporting Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adj_fac_sem_pay_process.pdf • Exhibits 1, 2, and 3.pdf