HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

WPAF AS-IS Process Verification

Electronic WPAF System Implementation

Last Revised: 20100923

REVISION CONTROL

Document Title:	Current AS-IS Process
Author:	Phil Rouse – Quality Improvement Analyst/ITS Project Office
Process:	Overview and PAD Calendar-specific Processes (by Group Number)

Revision History

Version	Revision Date	Revised By	Summary of Revisions	Section(s) Revised
1	June 2013	P Rouse	Initial Review of Process	Overview
2	July 2013	P Rouse	Modifications from 6/25 and 6/28 meetings.	Overview and PAD
3	August 2013	P Rouse	Adjusted PAD Group processes	PAD Groups
4	September 2013	P Rouse	Preparation for Faculty Affairs Committee	Basic Proofreading.
5	September 23, 2013	P Rouse	Addition of Timeline Information, references	2.2, 4.2, 5.0,6.0

Review / Approval History

Review Date	Reviewed By	Action (Reviewed, Recommended or Approved)
Sept. 13, 2013	C. Mullery	Reviewed and Approved
September 19, 2013	FAC	Presented to Faculty Affairs Committee for review/information exchange.
September	University Senate	

Table of Contents

1.0   Process Summary

The processes for tenure-track faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) for tenure-track faculty, including the Working Personnel Action File review and Modified Performance Review (MPR) is currently manual. This includes the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) Modified Performance Review (MPR) temporary faculty Range Elevation Portfolio (REP) review processes. The current processes conform to the Unit 3 collective bargaining agreement, as well as the HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix J that deals specifically with policies and procedures for faculty retention, tenure and promotion.

The process begins when the faculty member is appointed or reappointed and placed in one of seven groups which are determined annually and based on the Provosts administrative memorandum outlining the submission and review dates (Faculty Personnel Action Dates). The deadlines established in this annual memo are intended to allow sufficient time for review at all levels and may not be altered. Academic Personnel Services takes the lead on placing faculty into the correct groups, based on the appointment/reappointment letters. APS then shares the PAD Groups with the academic colleges, who review and confirm the groups, based on their tracking.

All PAD Group processes involve the creation of a physical binder by faculty members in one of the seven groups, in which the faculty member must gather, print, and assemble paper forms that document their work in accordance with the HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix J. The review, evaluation, recommendation, notification, and decision-making process currently exists in a chronological paper trail of review letters (at the specified dates), which are based on the review of the binder or multiple binders. At each review level, recommendation or decision letters are shared with the faculty member, as well as all previous reviewing committees, department chairs, deans, and eventually the provost and/or President.

The most cumbersome aspect of the current process is that it places the burden of printing and assembling very large collections of work, letters, student evaluations, on the faculty. The binder creation (WPAF, MPR, and REP) involves the manual completion of several paper forms such as cover pages, the Personnel Data Sheet Form, and a Professional Development Plan Form (if required). Sections must be formatted and organized manually into a 9-section binder or binders (depending on the quantity of materials), which is a time-intensive process. There are helpful training sessions to prepare faculty members for this process.

When the binder is submitted at the first review date, the file is closed and may not be altered prior to review.

Faculty members whose work is being reviewed, have the option of making a rebuttal and/or providing a response at each level of review, based on the outcome. The number of reviews and dates of review are determined by the Faculty Personnel Action Dates schedule which is produced each year by the Provost and distributed as an Administrative Memorandum. The deadlines for submissions and reviews may not be changed.

The process results in an evaluation, recommendation, and/or decision which will affect the status of each participating faculty member (WPAF) or temporary faculty member (REP) the following cycle.

2.0   Main Process Phases

2.1   Purpose of the Process

The purpose of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), Modified Performance Review (MPR), and Range Elevation Portfolio (REP) binder submission, review and decision process is to provide tenure track faculty (WPAF and MPR) and temporary faculty (REP) a vehicle to submit materials for review. Depending on the Personnel Action Dates (PAD) Group of the tenure track faculty member (temporary faculty for REP), there is a schedule for each group that must be followed to meet the required review and notification processes at the various levels of review. The process moves the binder through all of the required reviews/approvals/decisions and results with a decision that reappoints the faculty member, placing them in a PAD Group for the subsequent year.

2.2   References

The following documents have been sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee Chair as part of this packet. I have read and consulted these documents through the initial mapping phase and will continue to use these documents for guidance during the next planning phase and determining potential "To Be" processes.

Title	Dated	Author
Process Overview Diagram	September 2013	P Rouse
APS PAD Group Process Map	September 2013	P Rouse
HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix J& K	J:August 2013 K: June 2008	
Collective Bargaining Agreement, CFA – Unit 3	September 2012	
University Faculty Personnel Committee(UFPC) 2011-12 Annual Report	April 2012	UFPC
Administrative Memorandum VPAA 13-04 – 2013-2014 Faculty Personnel Action Dates	March 2013	Provost Snyder
Resolution on Electronic Working Personnel Action Files #25-12/13-FAC; April 2, 2013	Approved May 17,2013	University Senate

3.0   Process Observations

3.1   General Analysis

The process conforms to the requirements set forth in the collective bargaining agreement and the HSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix J& K.

The most cumbersome and inefficient aspect of the current process is that it places an undue burden on the faculty of having to produce, print, and manually assemble very large collections of work, letters, student evaluations, when it would be more efficient to do so electronically. The binder creation requires documents to be printed, which wastes paper and time. Some of the WPAF binders are so large that they require multiple binders to house the number of documents in the file. The time commitment to create the binder(s) while the faculty member is actively teaching courses also creates a time crunch that produces stress.

Time and paper is additionally wasted in the notification process(es) that occur multiple times during each individual review. Multiple paper letters go out each time the file is reviewed and a decision or evaluation is made. These could easily be made more efficient in an electronic format, allowing a fuller review time period for all the parties concerned, while utilizing notifications or alerts to inform interested people about the process, when decisions or reviews are made.

Security is one of the primary concerns with the process, which is currently managed manually by placing files in central locations for review, or locking them up when the files must be inaccessible to all. The binders take up physical space and access to the binders must be managed manually. There is a paper log that tracks who signed out the binder for review. College-level file custodians manage this process and spend time managing the files and access to the files when there are electronic solutions that can do this much more effectively.

There is only one binder or set of binders; one physical copy of the documentation for review. This means the binder can only be reviewed by one person at a time, which makes the reviews of committees problematic. Electronic records could be accessed and reviewed by multiple people at the same time, as long as they had permissions to do so.

The manually nature of notifications and letters of review, can be sped up or automated to notify the faculty member more quickly, while also making the review letter easily accessible for review.

4.0   Time Line - Next Steps

The next step is to list the criteria of what the "To Be" process must accomplish and conform to, in order to meet the various requirements gathered in the review documents. The criteria are best gathered by a full review of the documents listed in section 2 of this document, which has already begun.

4.1   Determine Criteria for "To Be" State

The criteria for the "To Be" state must conform to the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Unit, the HSU Faculty Handbook, (Appendix J and K) and other documentation listed above.

Determining the "To Be" process means presenting one or more options that comply with the requirements and criteria, and allowing feedback from interested groups to decide the best course of action. As these proposals develop, it will be important to have periodic, regular reviews that guide the selection of the future process, especially with Academic Personnel Staff and the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The core areas of the "To Be" process are:

- Security of the documents/files.

    o Controlled access during the review process depending on who has access at what point of the process.

    o Highest level of electronic security and reliability possible.

- Functions for ease of file sharing access and management.

    o Easily accessible to faculty and review committees/administrators.

    o Easy to upload documents for review.

    o Use of templates to organize an electronic portfolio into required sections.

- Performance of the system.

    o 24/7 accessibility and reliability (On and off campus).

    o Storage capacity and system availability.

    o Emergency backup procedures and SLA for re-establishing outages.

4.2   Determine Project Scope

The Project Scope determines what needs to be accomplished in order to complete the process of making the "to-be" process operational, identifies the resources that will be applied to make it so, specififes which features and functions will be available, what solution will meet the criteria and the timeline, and sets a plan to organize the work to be done.

4.3   Prepare Formal Project Plan

After the scope sets the course of action and key dates, the project is planned in a chronological format that organizes the work in a manner to meet the established timeline.

5.0   Timeline (Long Term) Key Dates

The key dates for meeting important periods will be determined more specifically in the Scope and Project Plan. Some of the general key dates to be considered are as follows:

- **January 15, 2014:** The start of the Spring 2014 semester. A "Nice to Have" key date to have the Electronic WPAF solution available for interested tenure track faculty and temporary faculty submitting Range Elevation Portfolios. This is a key period for gathering documents and evaluations, so at a minimum, the ability to submit and store the WPAF documents and/or Range Elevation Portfolios needs to be operational by some time in the month of March, so training/information sessions can be conducted before the semester ends.

- **March/April 2014:** The Spring semester will be the best opportunity to provide training to all people who will need to familiarize with the Electronic WPAF process. Tenure-track faculty, temporary faculty preparing a Range Elevation Portfolio, all review committees, college file custodians, department chairs, deans, the Provost, and President, will all need information sessions available to them so they know what their role in the process will look like in the new environment.

- **Summer Months 2014:** This period is likely to be active with participants uploading documents and organizing their respective WPAFs and REPs.

- **August 2014:** This is a critical date when the electronic review process must be operational. Whether a workflow process, or other solution, it will need to be operational by the end of the month, which corresponds with the due date for all WPAF file submissions.

- **May 2015:** This will mark the end of the first academic year. WPAF and REP participants will have two more academic years(2015-16 & 2016-17) to participate "voluntarily." This two-year period can be used to improve the related processes before the WPAF and REP electronic files become mandatory for all participants.

6.0   Communication Plan

The University Senate has charged the Faculty Affairs Committee with oversight of the conversion and has asked that they work with the University Faculty *Personnel* Committee, College Personnel Committees, the Council of Chairs, and other interested parties.

The HSU President, Provost and Vice Presidents, have since verified the importance of this project and placed it on the campus priority list for this academic year, outside of the ITS Project Prioritization process.

As the process of developing draft solutions goes forward, it will be important to regularly share progress updates, ideas and plans to this wider group for feedback, confirmation, and collaboration.