# Project Charter

## Los Angeles County Office of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Classified Personnel Evaluation Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Initiator</td>
<td>Mercedes Gutierrez, Ed.D., Coordinator, Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Sponsors</td>
<td>Darren McDuffie, Ed.D., Chief Human Resources Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Mercedes Gutierrez, Ed.D., Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Manager</td>
<td>David Tarr, AD&amp;S, Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Manager</td>
<td>Sarah Niemann, Ed.D., Director, Human Resource Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Low Med High x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document should be completed and presented to the administration for approval. It is an executive overview intended to facilitate discussion and to provide formal authorization to proceed. This entire document should require between two and four pages when complete. It is not a detailed planning document. Information will likely be limited in terms of reliability and completeness. Budgeting and scheduling information is preliminary in nature and will be determined in the planning phase.

## Problem or Purpose Statement

Describe in one or two sentences the overall problem the project is trying to solve or the purpose of the project. Be sure to identify the problem to be solved. This should not be a simple list of things to do or deliverables to be produced. Focus on why this needs to be done and what will be accomplished.

The current evaluation process for the Service Employee International Union (SEIU), Local 99 is outdated, non-electronic, and lacks fidelity for its intended outcome of the ongoing and continuous dialogue between unit members and management. The current model results in grievances and appeals processes that often point to a gap in building relationships and dialogue between a supervisor and employee.

Employee engagement is part of the Superintendent’s strategic plan as is a key performance indicator. Scorecard 3 (1.5) strategic plan calls to “develop a pilot for a revised evaluation form for SEIU staff to better meet the needs of classified staff and the organization.”

On April 28, 2016, the SEIU, Local 99, ratified a successor agreement which allowed LACOE Management and SEIU to convene the Performance Evaluation Review Committee (PERC) in order to initiate an Office-wide study of the current SEIU classified personnel evaluation process, and recommended the development of a new form and process which will be piloted prior to full implementation throughout the Office. The committee developed a comprehensive recommendation report which addresses the requirements of the process and a sample form (Attachment A).

Office-wide interests from Labor Relations, Personnel Commission, Curriculum & Instructional Services, Greater Avenues for Independence, Facilities and Construction Services, and Technology Services are addressed through this proposed pilot and new evaluation model.

The purpose of this charter is to request cabinet approval of a pilot evaluation using the Neogov performance management software. The Committee considers the Neogov product to have industry
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best practices built-in that will provide valuable lessons learned to be applied to the requirements and selection of the tool to be used for Phase II and Phase III. The scope of this charter is about the process, and not the product to be ultimately deployed. The pilot will be used to capture requirements which can be used later for a selection process.

Educational Justification and Benefits

Describe how this affects student learning and/or achievement. Justification might include the desire for reduced costs, increased productivity, or conformance to regulations.

- There is no direct impact to student programs or classroom instruction.
- As an organization, the pilot may have increased productivity, or conformance to regulations, therefore increasing service delivery to educational programs and county-wide services.

Key Objectives

Describe the most important objectives (schedule, quality, financial, technical, educational, etc.).

Key Objectives -

- Meet scorecard 3 (1.5) of the strategic plan which calls to “develop a pilot for a revised evaluation form for SEIU staff to better meet the needs of classified staff and the organization.”
- To pilot groups identified in Facilities & Construction, Curriculum & Instructional Services (CIS), Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN), and Technology Services (TS).
- Aligning the Office’s values, mission, vision, and goals of the Strategic Plan Scorecard into the evaluation process.
- Move from a paper-based evaluation and implement a pilot on-line evaluation system.
- Apply lessons learned from the pilot to the requirements of the ultimate solution whether it is Neogov, EET or another product, to be used for general deployment in Phase II and Phase III.
- To encourage collaboration and open communication between managers and employees in a developmental and competency based evaluation model.
- Improve the evaluation process for classified employees and their managers, and improve accountability in the process.
- Increased employee engagement, higher morale, and productivity.
- Develop an implementation timeline for the pilot in order to meet objectives by December 30, 2017.

Other Objectives -

- Document communication with employees prior to a Performance Improvement Plan with the employee.
- Enhance areas of training to supervisors and employees under a competency based model.
- Develop processes between management and employee and promote goal setting with benchmarks.
- Support the “Green Initiatives” of the Office by moving to an electronic solution.
- Refine competencies as needed to keep a focus on what is important for a specific position.
- Ultimately, select one system for all management and SEIU evaluations to avoid training and supporting more than one system.

### General Strategy

*Describe in no more than three or four paragraphs the overall approach (not specific tactics or activities) for achieving project objectives. Potential topics: whether the deliverables will be implemented in phases; whether contractors/subcontractors will be used; whether a "pilot project" or prototypes will be used.*

An initial pilot of approximately 50 staff members have been identified between four divisions composed of the following classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Number of Staff Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Construction</td>
<td>• Lead Maintenance Worker</td>
<td>• 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>• Division Secretary</td>
<td>• 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>• CDPS</td>
<td>• 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CDPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Services</td>
<td>• Sr. Computer Operator</td>
<td>• 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer Operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A three phase process will be utilized for pilot testing and adoption.

**Phase I**

An initial pilot will be conducted with the above referenced proposed classifications in the Divisions that have agreed to participate. The pilot will integrate key competencies derived from the Personnel Commission job classification descriptions.

**Phase II**

Based on the pilot’s initial results, a recommendation to the negotiating team will be made in order to continue the pilot into a second phase. This phase would involve all classifications in the pilot divisions.

**Phase III**

After the pilot is completed and lessons learned are documented, the Committee will evaluate the Neogov solution and an EET enhancement for best fit or another system if appropriate. Based on the results of the best fit analysis, one system will be recommended for a switch of 100% of evaluations for staff to the chosen solution. A charter will be written to review and select a solution and implement it Office-wide for management and SEIU. Los Angeles County Education Association and California School Employees Association cannot incorporate the chosen solution due to collective bargaining requirements.
Upon negotiation and ratification via collective bargaining with SEIU will the evaluation process with the selected solution go Office-wide for management and SEIU. A communication plan, in collaboration with the appropriate stakeholders (SEIU, Human Resources, and Communications), will be implemented as part of an organization-wide notification with related training.

Please see Attachment A for more details and a mock up of the new evaluation form.

**Initial Milestone Schedule**

*Note that this is not a detailed schedule. List the expected (or required) dates for key events. Examples could include the project start and end dates, phase end dates, completion of major deliverables, etc. Enter either estimated hours and/or date. Rule of thumb: more than six or seven milestones is probably too detailed for a charter.*

A more detailed description of the timeline can be found in Attachment A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Estimated Start and End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee draft new form, review competency language and conduct dry run of new form</td>
<td>Completed by August 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Project Charter</td>
<td>August 24, 2017 – September 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train Pilot Group Managers and Unit members</td>
<td>September – December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot solution setup/development</td>
<td>October – December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Pilot</td>
<td>January – June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of Pilot</td>
<td>June – July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiations with Ratification</td>
<td>Spring – Summer 2018 (to discuss ETA to sunshine)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Estimates**

*Identify the estimated cost of the overall project or the next phase. This is likely to be an order of magnitude estimate in the early planning phase, as compared to a firm (budget) estimate. Financial estimates should be within 25% of actual. These costs could include anything that requires a Purchase Requisition such as external training, consultants, travel, stipends, etc.*

The costs associated with this project involve initial setup and annual license costs for Neogov. The following costs integrate the following factors:

- Vendor expenses for Neogov licensing and setup
- PERC Committee time for manual setup, training and communication
- Indirect consultation from PERC Committee regarding decisions affecting post-pilot enhancements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Time Costs (completed by 8/24/17)</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERC committee formation and draft new form and process</td>
<td>PERC employee time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demos of Neogov, Frontline and EET</td>
<td>PERC employee time</td>
<td>Frontline eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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One Time Costs (completed by 8/24/17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neogov Development/setup</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neogov Annual license</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with LACOE HRS and PC Competencies</td>
<td>PERC committee manual setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Conduct User Training</td>
<td>PERC committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive Evaluation to HRS</td>
<td>LaserFiche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Time Costs Total: PERC employee time

Phase I Pilot Setup Costs (9/17 to 6/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neogov Development/setup</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neogov Annual license</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with LACOE HRS and PC Competencies</td>
<td>PERC committee manual setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Conduct User Training</td>
<td>PERC committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive Evaluation to HRS</td>
<td>LaserFiche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase I Pilot Setup Total Costs: $10,500

Resources

List all necessary internal resources – equipment, departments, software, and people. This should be broken out by functional teams (i.e.: financial programmer, Operations, Networking group, desktop support).

Functional core team members:

PERC Committee
- Management
  - Mercedes Gutierrez, Ed.D., Human Resource Services
  - Scott Pilch, Personnel Commission
  - Jessica Williams, GAIN
  - Jema Estrella, Facilities & Construction
  - David Tarr, ADS, Technology Services
- SEIU, Local 99
  - Ramon Capiral, Facilities & Construction
  - Richard Lowe, Technology Services
  - Mindy Keller, CIS
  - Cynthia Preciado, GAIN
  - Deirdre Parker, DSP

Technical core team members:
- David Tarr

Infrastructure Resources:
- Neogov infrastructure for their cloud-based solution

Initial Assumptions

Identify any high-level assumptions that may be relevant to understanding this document. Assumptions might address the availability of funding, resources, or new technologies, expected growth in enrollment, etc.

- Piloted form and process will serve as the actual 2017-18 evaluation for all members of
the pilot group.

- Obtain Cabinet approval to proceed with the recommended pilot approach. A re-evaluation of the charter will be provided after the pilot’s conclusion in order to respectively proceed with Phases II and III.
- New process meets the requirements of the LACOE Strategic Plan Scorecard #3, item 1.5.
- Office to continue pay for Neogov Insight after pilot due to its existing relationships with Personnel Commission.
- Additional evaluation requirements for supervisors.
- Training on competencies for managers and SEIU members will be handled by GAIN, HRS, Personnel Commission and SEIU.
- Not going forward will result in continued grievances for violations under Article VIII, or increased evaluation appeals to the various division directors.
- Technology Services will conduct a Neogov cloud service review for security and legal compliance.
- Neogov can export evaluations to pdf files.

Initial Constraints
Identify anything that significantly limits the project team’s options in planning and executing project activities. These might include applicable laws and regulations, mandated target dates, financial limitations, resource limitations, etc.

- Initial configuration with Neogov will involve manual setup/import of employee/supervisor data and competencies
- Target pilot start date of January 2, 2018.
- Overlap of the pilot during the annual evaluation window under the current SEIU contract, which may cause confusion among managers, or employees.

Major Risks
Identify significant risk events (high-probability and/or high estimated impact) that are relevant in terms of authorizing this project or upcoming planning activities. Be sure to include the risk of not doing the project.

- A Risk of not doing the project:
  - Not fulfill the LACOE Strategic Plan Scorecard #3, item 1.5.
  - Violate the SEIU Rose Agreement which moves the change process through collective bargaining.
  - Will leave management and SEIU in an antiquated model, and fail to move from a paper to a technology based format.
  - Negative impact to the organizational growth/trust with SEIU and Management by not having a documented means of facilitating ongoing dialogue.

- Risks of going forward
  - Increased costs due to ongoing technology development and support and infrastructure for an EET solution.
  - Ongoing licensing and support costs for a Neogov solution, or development costs for an enhancement to EET.
  - Additional work for supervisors.
  - Complaints of the pilot due to some employees resistance to change.
Out of Scope

Identify specific related items that will not be included in this project (training, products, documentation, software features, and upgrades).

- Identifying SEIU and related management to participate in the pilot.
- Measuring pilot effectiveness. The pilot’s effectiveness will not be measured through the use of Neogov, but rather through focus groups with pilot participants, a survey, the number of grievances, and evaluation appeal requests. These in turn will lead to post-pilot refinements that can be addressed in the re-evaluation of the charter for Phase II.
- Provisioning additional public computers for access in a common area for employees that may not have computer terminal access.
- No training resources from Technology Services ITO required at this time.
- The new BEST CGI Advantage includes performance evaluation functionality, but this is considered out of scope for BEST deployment up to April 2022.

Stakeholders

Please list all stakeholders and their interest in this project.

- Superintendent & Executive Cabinet: Alignment with the LACOE Strategic Plan, Scorecard # 3
- PERC: Agree on a process and form in order to make recommendations that impact collective bargaining under Article VIII (Evaluation) of the SEIU agreement.
- Labor Relations: Ensure the committee has convened and provided its recommendations to the negotiating team.
- SEIU Local 99: Both the local chapter, and the field chapter have requested a change in the current process, and are committed to moving their membership forward with the change. The field organizer also has a vested interest in the success of the process in order to recommend it to other districts.
- Personnel Commission: Competencies are to be aligned to the appropriate classifications, and embedded in the evaluation process.
- TIS: Infrastructure support.
- ADS or Neogov: Application support for development and on-going maintenance.

Completion Criteria

Please list the items/events that will signify that this project is complete.

- Meet scorecard 3 (1.5) of the strategic plan which calls to “develop a pilot for a revised evaluation form for SEIU staff to better meet the needs of classified staff and the organization.”
- Pilot success and repeatable approach will be tested and implemented for subsequent phases. SEIU to agree with changes, and roll out with all members.
- Completion of training for pilot participants.
- Measure program success through the number of grievances and appeals submitted under the new model during the pilot for pilot participants.
- Before and after survey in Phase I and then one in Phase 2 in order to solicit feedback from all participants.
- Examples of collaboration and open communication between managers and employees in as evidenced in the developmental evaluation.
Ongoing Support

*Please list all those that have a role in ongoing support after project completion.*

- ADS or Neogov: ongoing maintenance, updates (org structure), and trouble shooting.
- Labor Relations: evaluation consultation and training with managers and employees.
- Human Resources: personnel file upload and maintenance.
- SEIU: due process oversight through the appeal and grievance procedures.

Conditions For Approval

This section should identify any conditions that are required *BEFORE* the project can go forward, assuming all approvals are obtained. Examples might be, the project is conditional upon finishing project xyz, or conditional upon obtaining 1 FTE to assist with the additional support requirements, or conditional upon obtaining the funding for the project, or conditional upon acceptance of reduction of support in other areas (areas to be identified).

1) Cabinet approval for this pilot approach using Neogov in order to ascertain defined requirements in anticipation of a follow-up charter to select a product and implement.
2) On going PERC committee time is needed.
3) Funding confirmation with HRS and Personnel Commission for the Neogov pilot costs.

Approvals

Minimally, this document should be signed by the Project Initiator, Functional Managers, and Director. It may be advisable to include providers of key resources (lead technical staff, for example) and/or key stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Classified Personnel Evaluation Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Initiator</td>
<td>Mercedes Gutierrez, Ed.D., Coordinator, HRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Sponsor</td>
<td>Darren McDuffie, Ed.D., Chief Human Resources Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mercedes Gutierrez  
Mercedes Gutierrez (Sep 29, 2017)  
Date: Sep 29, 2017

Gregory Lindner  
Gregory Lindner (Sep 29, 2017)  
Date: Sep 29, 2017

Sarah Niemann  
Sarah Niemann (Sep 29, 2017)  
Date: Sep 29, 2017

Scott Pilch  
Scott Pilch (Oct 2, 2017)  
Date: Oct 2, 2017

LACOE Executive Cabinet Approval

Sarah Niemann  
Sarah Niemann (Oct 2, 2017)  
Date: Oct 2, 2017

Discussed in Cabinet
Role Definitions

**Executive Sponsor** - manager with demonstrable interest in the outcome of the project who is ultimately responsible for securing spending authority and resources for the project. Ideally, the Executive Sponsor should be the highest-ranking manager possible, in proportion to the project size and scope. The Executive Sponsor acts as a vocal and visible champion, legitimizes the project’s goals and objectives, keeps abreast of major project activities, and is the ultimate decision-maker for the project. The Executive Sponsor provides support for the Project Director and Project Manager and has final approval of all scope changes, and signs off on approvals to proceed to each succeeding project phase. The Executive Sponsor may elect to delegate some of the above responsibilities to the Project Director.

**Project Director** - manager with demonstrable interest in the outcome of the project who is responsible for securing spending authority and resources for the project. The Project Director acts as a vocal and visible champion, legitimizes the project’s goals and objectives, keeps abreast of major project activities, and is a decision-maker for the project. The Project Director will participate in and/or lead project initiation; the development of the Project Charter. He or she will participate in project planning (high level) and the development of the Project Initiation Plan. The Project Director provides support for the Project Manager; assists with major issues, problems, and policy conflicts; removes obstacles; is active in planning the scope; approves scope changes; signs off on major deliverables; and signs off on approvals to proceed to each succeeding project phase. The Project Director generally chairs the steering committee on large projects. The Project Director may elect to delegate any of the above responsibilities to other personnel either on or outside the Project Team.

**Project Manager** - the person responsible for ensuring that the Project Team completes the project. The Project Manager develops the Project Plan with the team and manages the team’s performance of project tasks. It is also the responsibility of the Project Manager to secure acceptance and approval of deliverables from the Project Director. The Project Manager is responsible for communication, including status reporting, risk management, escalation of issues that cannot be resolved in the team, and, in general, making sure the project is delivered in budget, on schedule, and within scope.

**Project Team Members** - responsible for executing tasks and producing deliverables as outlined in the Project Plan and directed by the Project Manager, at whatever level of effort or participation has been defined for them.