

HR Forum Meeting Minutes

4/5/06

Present: M. Aguilar, J. Barnes, N. Green for J. Dorsey, L. Hughes for J. Heath, E. Luera, D. McDaniel, M. Motomochi, K. Yaklin for M. Nielsen, S. Nusbaum, A. Mendez for G. O'Neill, J. Phillips, C. Schafer, M. Sanchez for C. Conn, J. White

Absent: J. Ahlberg, M. Bird, D. Christian, S. Estaville, L. Garcia, P. Gulley, L. Hanson, J. Major, J. Mosley, P. Naylor, S. Pivonka, P. Prado, T. Ryan, G. Thyberg, T. Trip, L. Tunnell, D. Volz, Y. Volz, C. Waggoner

Agenda:

1. Topics from the Membership
2. Functional Title versus Position Reclassification
3. Reminder of Performance Appraisal Due Dates
4. Salary Review Memo
5. Background Checks
6. Diversity Tracking Report
7. Mid Year Salary Review Update
8. FY07 Holiday Calendar Proposal Forwarded
9. Holiday Rule Calculation in SAP
10. SAP Time Administrator Class Update
11. Summer Insurance Payment Process for 9 Month Employees

Mr. John McBride welcomed everyone to the meeting and encouraged everyone to have a two way dialogue during the forum. The following information was presented to the membership.

Topics of Interest from the Membership

Q. Can you explain the “eligible for merit if they receive a score over 300” information we just received?

A. There has been much discussion over this issue and at a recent BSC meeting we discussed this and the history. Last year’s memo stated that you had to have a 300 or more in order to qualify for a performance increase and you were also eligible for a merit increase. It was pointed out to us when we prepared the notification for this year, that merit means exceeds standards. In UPPS 04.04.11, *University Classification and Compensation Policy*, merit means “documented outstanding performance” which is interpreted to mean a score in excess of 300, thus we inserted this language in the memo. PC made the decision to base the increase solely on merit without an across the board increase or an increase in the pay plan. This resulted in some people saying that if they had known that the criteria was over 300 then they would have done their evaluations differently. This leads to the question whether the evaluation was done strictly as an

evaluation or was it done to get someone a pay increase. Some supervisors did not want to take the time to write down the justifications for scores above a 3 and thought it was easier to just put a 3 down which results in a management challenge. We in HR are not policing what people use as justification in their performance evaluations. This year we had to justify in writing a score above or below a 3. This change was done because of an audit by the Texas Commission on Human Rights in February, 2004 which would not certify Human Resources practices at Texas State if we did not make their recommended changes. Changes were made to the UPPS in August 04 but the use of the new forms did not start until CY05 - which caused some confusion. We are sorry for the confusion. If you want to know what can be done now, you can send in an amended evaluation providing your VP is in agreement.

There was further discussion about the confusion surrounding the evaluation methods and lack of supervisor's knowledge about performance evaluations. HR is looking into the timing of the evaluation training course to be more frequent and earlier to remind supervisors of their responsibilities during the year. The recent HR survey regarding supervisor's training needs will be used to address these issues. Another problem is that supervisor training has not been mandatory.

Mr. McBride provided a brief history of the evaluation methods used by Texas State since 1980 and discussed the positive and negative aspects.

Q. Don't you think that all of this commotion is because there was no performance award and that it was all based on merit?

A. PC made the decision that there would be no performance increase this time and that it would all be based on merit. Merit is documented outstanding performance. HR has addressed the issues that you have identified, but the institution makes the decisions based on what it thinks is in its best interests.

Performance evaluations can be a good or a bad tool and it depends on how they are implemented. I think that we had a good discussion and that you have a better understanding of how things have happened and where we are trying to go. We are here to make recommendations to management based on your suggestions and concerns.

Salary Review Memo – Floyd Quinn

I have provided you a hard copy of the salary review memo for your review. Please feel free to ask questions.

Brown Bag Lunch - I would like to remind you that the FSS Diversity Committee is having a brown bag lunch on April 11th from 12-1 in JCK 460. You do not have to be in the FSS division to attend but the discussion will center on the book "If I Die in a Combat Zone." Please attend if you are interested.

Functional Title versus Position Reclassification

There are functional titles available to you that do not require a position reclassification or a change in the pay plan to accommodate a new title for an employee. If you would like to see a different title for a position you do not need to make a change in the pay plan. You can change the title and state that it is a functional title and place it on business cards, etc. A functional title is a more specific title than the general line of work for that position. An example would be if the University title is “Grant Specialist,” but you deal with several community groups, you might use the title “Director of Community Relations.” That would be a functional title, but it would not appear in the pay plan.

Reminder of Performance Appraisal Due Dates

Performance appraisals are due from VPs to HR by April 17th.

Background Checks

We are in the process of looking at background checks provided by a third party vendor for faculty and staff and are reviewing three proposals from three companies. We should come to a decision on the vendor we want to use by next week. On March 27th PC approved background checks on faculty and staff new hires and for selected students.

Q. Is the university going to pay for these background checks?

A. The cost is about \$30-50, and it is only for the person selected. Their hire depends on successfully passing the background check. The hiring department pays for the background check.

Diversity Tracking Report

You were provided a copy of the Diversity Tracking Report which is a metric that HR uses that supports our diversity initiatives and strategic plans. You can see the job title, the date the position was open, the numbers of days the position was posted and the number of applications received. In addition, there are EEO categories and the diversity breakouts of the applicants. We want to see how the applicants were made aware of the vacant position. This will eventually help you in assessing your recruiting methods as to where you want to spend your resources.

Q. So we could come to you and see this information?

A. Yes, this is a great tool in helping you in your recruitment efforts.

Q. Can you break it down even further such as specific individual newspapers?

A. No. This is being tracked through the EASY system in broad categories and it does not track individual newspapers. In the future we may be able to track the use of individual newspapers in recruiting.

Mid Year Salary Review Update

It appears that there will be no adjustments to the minimums in the pay plan. We have used SAP to help us in our salary survey analyses, and it has gone very well. PC has asked that the information be broken down by division. In addition, CUPA salary data for 05-06 is now being incorporated into the salary review. CUPA data is going to be used for the university market instead of the big 10 public Texas universities. Based on the salary survey information, and only with limited funding available division VPs will be looking at individuals who are below market for consideration for an adjustment.

Q. Are we going to be able to look at this breakdown?

A. All salary data is open records. If you want to see a list of those individuals who received an adjustment then you can. This information is provided to the VPs then it goes to PC. This should be completed within the next 2 weeks. In addition, BRP is part of your salary and is now being considered as part of the salary information provided.

FY07 Holiday Calendar Proposal Forwarded

The FY07 Holiday Calendar has been drafted and will be part of the May Board of Regents Meeting. The calendar follows what we proposed in the past two years and consists of 14 holidays and eight energy conservation days. The Christmas time off will consist of 11 days off with us returning to work on Tuesday, January 2nd. The VPs are reviewing the proposal before it is submitted to the May Board of Regents meeting for final approval. In addition, we have been notified that the list of essential offices that are to remain open during energy conservation days may be expanded.

Holiday Rule Calculation in SAP

Employees get holiday time based on their FTE. For example, if you are full-time you receive 8 hours and if 50% part-time you receive 4 hours. Holiday hours are defaulted into SAP. If you work on a holiday you must enter the time that you worked. For a half day holiday, if you are full-time the system assumes you are working 4 hours and you received 4 hours of holiday time. If you work or do something different then you must enter that time as an exception.

SAP Time Administrator Class Update

We have split the Time Administrator classes into 2 sessions with a 2 hour session on one day followed with another 2 hour session the next day in order for the participants to be able to absorb all of the information. These changes have been made to the web for those who want to sign up.

Summer Insurance Payment Process for 9 Month Employees

Faculty and graduate students who may or may not work during the summer are covered for their insurance providing they are coming back in the fall. We have compiled a list of employees that are less than 12 months and have sent this information out last week and the information is due 4/7/06. This information is needed to tell us who is eligible for

summer insurance. Based on this information we send out a memo to each employee notifying them of their payment options. The memo should be out to the employees within 2 weeks.

Salary Review Memo - John McBride

Just a quick note - the salary review memo that you just received is the first one. There will be another memo distributed announcing training labs and screen shots to help you along in the process.

I want to thank you for your input and encourage your continued discussions. We value your input.