



15

DEPLOYMENT PROJECT

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

INCEPTION DATE: 09/25/09
SPAC UPDATE: 11/09/09

THIS PROJECT SUPPORTS THE FOLLOWING DISTRICT FOCUS AREAS OUTLINED IN THE GCS STRATEGIC PLAN 2012:

- I. Improving Academic Achievement
- II. Supportive Family & Community Involvement
- III. Strategic Human Resource Management
- IV. Respectful & Responsive Service
- V. Safe Schools & Character Development
- VI. Optimal Operations
- VII. Transformational Technology
- VIII. Clear Baseline & Equitable Standards

THIS PROJECT SUPPORTS THE FOLLOWING GCS STRATEGIC PLAN 2012 MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES:

Goal #	Goal description
III.A	Reduce the number of teacher resignations from the start of school to December by 50 percent.
III.B	Increase the retention rate of high-performing teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools by 5 percent.
III.C	One-hundred percent of teaching positions will be filled on the first day of school for students.

THIS PROJECT SUPPORTS THE FOLLOWING GCS STRATEGIC PLAN 2012 STRATEGIES:
(PLEASE NOTE WHEN A STRATEGY IS SHARED WITH ANOTHER DEPLOYMENT PROJECT)

Strategies are aligned with those located in the
[GCS Strategic Plan 2012: Achieving Education Excellence](#).

Goal #	Strategy #	Strategy description	Shared with another project (Y/N)
III	5	Explore the feasibility of developing an Office of Human Resource Development as recommended by the 2006 (sic) Council of Great City Schools audit.	Yes

Project Overview

Project Introduction and Context		
<p>In 2007, the Council of Great City Schools audit of the Human Resources Department recommended “that the school district adopt a management philosophy that supports the reengineering of human resources and realigns its functions with the district’s strategic objectives. “ Strategic functions of a district that support the recruitment, development and retention of human capital may include: pre-employment preparation, recruitment, hiring, induction, professional development for classified and certified personnel, compensation and incentives, working conditions, and performance appraisals. A critical component of the alignment of these should include determining the organizational structure that will best support the integration of these functions.</p>		
Desired Results		
<p>A minimum of two Human Resources Development Office models illustrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rationale for the model ○ Pros/Cons for the model ○ Organization structure for the model ○ Possible budget implications for the model 		
Project Oversight		
Role	Description	Person Responsible
Sponsor	Ultimate authority. Responsible for the project, its desired results and specific outcomes.	Dr. Shirley Morrison
Project Manager (Champion)	Assists in developing the Deployment Project and project plans, performs project reviews and disposes of issues and change requests. Develops and maintains Deployment Project and plans, performs reviews, tracks issues and change requests, manages budget and is responsible for technical quality of solution.	Dr. Amy Holcombe
Project Deployment Team (PDT)		
<p>Tina Johnson, representing the preparation function of an HRD model Cheryl Lowe, representing the hiring function of an HRD model Tracey Dungee, representing the recruitment function of an HRD model Tammy Taylor, representing the induction function of an HRD model Randy Shiflett, representing the professional development function of an HRD model Steve Foster, representing the compensation function of an HRD model Mark Jewell, representing the working conditions function of an HRD model Amy Holcombe, representing the performance evaluation function of an HRD model</p>		

Advisory Team
Patrice Faison, Principals' Advisory Committee Erica Bower, Teachers' Advisory Committee Tijuana Hayes, GCAE Margaret Arbuckle, Guilford Education Alliance Martha Snavelly, Induction and Professional Development Barbara Zwadyk, Curriculum and Instruction Bill Passmore, Center for Creative Leadership, expert on organizational development Jeanine Falcon, Replacements, Ltd., Vice President, expert on human resources
Clients
All GCS Employees

Major Project Scope and Deliverables

Deliverables	Person Responsible	Start Date	Completion Date
Human Resources Development Office Feasibility Report offering a minimum of two proposed models of implementation	Amy Holcombe	10/20/09	1/29/10

Project Impacts

Projects Impact	Description of Impact	Degree of Impact	Impact Resolution Date
I.30: Provide a high quality new teacher induction program.	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010
I.31: Provide high-quality, research-based professional development activities for both licensed and classified staff to support district programs.	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010

Projects Impact	Description of Impact	Degree of Impact	Impact Resolution Date
III.2: Implement a teacher and administrator screening process	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010
III.4: Evaluate and refine a pay structure that recognizes the need to differentiate compensation for hard-to-fill positions.	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010
III.6: Develop a selection and appointment process for school-based administrators	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010
III.7: Develop an employee selection and appointment process designed to grow current and future leaders	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010
III.9: Strengthen orientation for new employees	This project deployment plan will need to be aligned to all components of an HRD model if one is implemented.	Medium	February 2010

Project Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Person Responsible	Budgeted Amount	Budgeted (Y/N/Pending)	Budget Code
None				
TOTAL:		\$0.00		
Notes:	As this is a feasibility study, there should be no expenses incurred.			

New Positions Required

Staffing Summary Resource Type	# of FTE	Duration	Hours	Budgeted (Y/N/Pending)
None				

Project Assumptions

Document any assumptions that could significantly affect the project (e.g. facilities usage, budget approval, etc.).

Project Assumptions	Description
None	

Project Approval

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Approved	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved as Noted	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rejected (See Note)	
Additional Comments:		
Last Revised:		

Project Status Reports

Complete attached Project Status Report for updates to SPAC.