HR Focus group meeting – 1/9/17

Present: Krista Walker, Linda von Bargen, Pat Mason, Tammy Flowers, Kevin Long, Maria Adams, Clevette Ridguard, Milton Nash, Melissa Gregory, Tammy Peery

Standard VI

- Question 1: Assessing staffing needs is a collaboration between HR, hiring unit, and budget. We start with an online requisition form that goes through several approval processes. This process includes hiring group, budget, classification to verify number and position description are accurate; HR verifies all of the other checks and balances. An online requisition form is used for all hires to get the process going. Staffing needs can also happen through the reclassification process – a unit or department can work with the budget unit to reclassify existing positions rather than hiring a new position. Planning originates at the top level with budget and SVP. There is a collaborative process among deans for faculty processes. The other divisions don't have as formal a process for determining priorities – used to have one, but now it's backed off – more of a first come first serve process (get your paperwork in and it goes into the process, but there are many checks on approving that the positions need to be justified and filled – explaining why the position is critical). Now there is a lot more repurposing of positions when there is a vacancy, rather than new hiring.
- Succession planning: This largely happens informally. There was a more formal process with the SVP and executive level positions; this is a gap that we're not taking a more strategic organizational approach to talent management and succession planning.
    - it's a challenge when we have position vacancies but no position numbers – some positions were being recruited for and weren't actual vacancies – they'd been repurposed but without communication between areas. We need to get back to a more formal process. We are more reactive than proactive with succession planning at this time
    - we can do a better job – it all comes back to how the classification system is designed – it's broken – we don't have a clearly mapped out competency framework that really shows the tiering of positions. To do this right, we have to have a clearly defined competency framework. We have classifications, but we don't see how they are matrixed together. We don't have the infrastructure to do this.
- How does HR STEM assess itself? Way back when, we did some satisfaction surveys. I haven't seen that happen in some time. We've been dependent upon the employee engagement survey for data. Planning: we come up with annual plans (sometimes these are called "operational plans"; Nadine Porter called hers the "roadmap"). Our challenge has been that the amount of sr. leadership turnover that we've had recently has taken a major toll – this is also mentioned in our recent CAR.
    - Are there industry standard assessments that you use for benchmarking? We're just starting to get into the metrics piece on the talent side – we've been tracking with a new vendor for the past year. For example, one of our improvements with our partnership with Wilson – our time to fill a position has gone from 5 months to 1.5 months. There

are also examples in the CAR. The challenge for us is that we do a lot of information sharing among the MAAC HR group, but there's no repository. We don't have an assessment plan for our operations, and we're not working that plan. We have opportunities to map those things out, but the constant turnover affects that.

- We do collect stats for each workgroup. In ERDI, the cases that we manage (our workload) we track the number of serious cases, minor cases, consultations, the number of trainings that we conduct. Where do these live? We feed the information to Yanira Ruiz, so the VP should have it. Some gets funneled to Janet Wormack, but I'm not sure what exactly goes to Janet. HRSTM does not have a centralized or strongly designed reporting system. If I want to see all of the fiscal updates we've published over the last 5 years, I need to go to different individuals to see if they have them. Even the roadmaps don't live in one systematic place. We are hanging on by legacy people and have some folders in the I drive, but it's a little disjointed. In the benefits area, we analyze data each year & do evaluations for compliance issues for retiring health benefits costs, annual reports we compile for that. It provides insight into how well we're doing. It engages unions and staff members with what they want and provides guidance for how we can move forward. Regulatory processes are sort of an imposed assessment process. Standard VI asks that if you have access to or know where they live, please get them to Kevin Long – we need to link to evidence. We also have an Affirmative Action plan to gather and track data. Used for recruitment and succession planning. Kevin Long summarizes that it's being done, but not integrated, still siloed. HR notes that there is a diversity hiring trend report that Krista Walker and Pat Mason compiled. Helps us to be more strategic with driving conversations with units.
- How are you further looking to meet the diversity needs of your team? In Sue Redding's area, we looked at EAP usage; we're concerned about it and are looking at how EAP has been used over the years. They haven't thought through the business implications of increasing thee credit limits, and that has had a significant impact. A lot of organizations totally separate tuition from other types of professional. development, etc, and we've recommended considering that. We've recommended working in a consortium for tuition remission vs. reimbursement.
- The CAR report is going to be a key piece of documentation for MSCHE – can we get a copy of it? It has been submitted to Bob Roop, but has not yet been approved. Krista Walker will follow up with Roop on its status.

Standard VII:

- How do changes within HR promote effectiveness in inclusivity and communication? How assessed? HRSTM is right in the middle of another restructuring. We will be moving towards a business partner model – for example, our HR contact list is convoluted for the general person on the campus – people are lost. Instead, there will be a central point of contact for each division with a matrix team. Then, the behind the scenes subject matter expert will weigh in. We're excited about that. We're also pushing – we don't have a formal communications plan or strategy; we're going to start an HR public relations and outreach function. Standard VII asks what documentation do you have that this is in the works? Formal communication – there is a big staff meeting on Wednesday, we'll have a better idea after that. It's one of the recommendations in our CAR report. The proposal includes a website and online resources. We can use the CAR to speak to these things. One of our greatest strengths is the commitment, flexibility and drive of the HR staff. These people get kicked around a lot, and they love the college. Working 6am, 11pm. The adoption of reaching out to hiring managers more rather than sending e-mail to get concerns addressed has been an improvement in customer service. Doing campus hours on multiple campuses has helped us to meet the needs on the campuses. We've been doing that for 4 years. We're looking at really solidifying that- we want an HR space on every campus and have people hotel in and out. We are also putting together a hiring managers' toolkit for talent acquisition, including recruiting strategy and communications plan. We are really revamping our website. Each month the 5 SVPs get a position vacancy report so that they can plan. Hiring managers are always in a forecasting and planning mode. I'd like to see that report trickle down to the hiring managers so that they can help SVPs with planning needs. The framework for the org structure has taken into consideration the skill sets of employees and where they can be better utilized – this is taking a bigger role now so we can better take advantage of individuals. We need to send the survey for Wilson of the hiring managers.

Standard III

- How do we evaluate whether hiring of faculty aligns with institutional values? Pat when we're recruiting, we're looking to get the most talented and knowledgeable faculty that we can find. We try to target critical places – *Chronicle of Higher Ed*, other journals and associations to find faculty. Faculty evaluation is a structured and detailed process to make sure faculty are meeting the needs of the college. HR's key role is process, compliance, and resource support. We are dependent upon the departments to define the strategy, interview questions, etc. They better know what they are looking for. We look at affirmative action goals; we ask which journals and websites we should be recruiting for of the department. What does the ideal faculty look like? What are key skills, programs and courses they should have? The departments are subject matter experts; they are our partners. Faculty is a recruitment area that has a detailed interview process. We review questions for legality, but departments have latitude for questions. The one college model helps faculty to embrace and interact with unique cultures of students at other campuses.
    - Part time faculty: we've been trying to make more standardized. John Hamman and Dorothy Umans are coming to the table to talk with us about this. Academic Affairs and WD&CE are very different. We have a meeting next week and can provide more information after that. The hiring units make a decision, check references, send info to

HR and we send the letter – that's the extent of HR's involvement. It's getting better now that Tango Thomas is on board. With John Hamman and Dorothy Umans we hope to have that more standardized.

- Mandatory training is now done – improves our culture – FERPA training, diversity, title 9, active shooter. We need to check on memo that was sent out – are these no longer required of faculty – we need to look into that? (follow up during the meeting indicated that these trainings are "strongly recommended" for faculty rather than required, and no one is sure when or who made that decision – needs to be followed up on). Is this a question of communication? We've had these discussions in the LMCs. Not having the required trainings creates a liability issue.
- There are several academic units with real internship opportunities – partnering with Eric Myren. Should HR have a role in working with these units? We have student workers – why aren't we bringing them together as an employee group – HR should be more involved. How can we better support their learning. How can we leverage employment at the college to support student and internship needs? HR is currently working to become more involved in this area (this is a point that best relates to Standard IV, rather than III).

Standard VII

- What are future plans for succession planning? On the CAR report – in addition to outreach, we recognize that with the way we approach succession planning, it was just looking at executives. We've identified that designing a collegewide plan for this is one of our recommendations. Melissa Gregory notes that this ties into Standard II, question 4. HRSTM met with the SALT team and made recommendations for a decision making framework for whether to appoint someone – what are the factors that go into that decision so that we have some justification for that. Krista Walker believes can share with Standard II –need to check with SALT to see what they've done with it and make sure Janet Wormack and Dr. Pollard are ok with including it. Maria Adams Davidson asks what is in writing: Nadine Porter has done some work with SALT, & there is documentation of it, but we'd need to follow up on where it is. We can ask Bob Roop for this. It's important for setting goals and we are moving into creating a strategic plan. We've been gathering data for the last 5 years, but it has been lower priority. We have documented the need for succession planning; we might have some documentation that gets to what we did when we were looking at Taleo. Jan 2010 is when we got TALEO. Part of the challenge is that anything that we have is not necessarily describing where we're going. Look in the CAR for timelines, recommendations, and documents.

Standard III – question II

- We have a satisfaction survey of hiring managers; we have a faculty evaluation process. This might be an opportunity for us to think about this – is that process meeting their needs? We did that survey last July and will do it at the end of this year. That is driving some feedback. We are tracking different metrics now – including hiring in a timely manner. Turnover might be another measure to look at. How many faculty don't make it to the 3 year evaluation? However, we don't know why people might leave, so we'd need to establish some benchmarks. Is labor relations involved when someone isn't rehired? (you could correlate people who left before 3 years with negative evaluation). For part time faculty HR isn't involved, and we don't do exit interviews with them. Milton Nash asks – do you have these metrics available, where do they live? HR STM records team. Evals are in employee records. Time for hire is in employee records as well.

- Is there a dismissal process for Part-Time Faculty that is used? If they're simply not asked back, and it's that simple, HR is not involved; however, if there is a problem, we need to get involved and investigate, and we may remove the instructor from the classroom depending on how egregious a situation is. We follow the steps in the contract to proceed to severance. They are working on a formal "do not rehire" process. One possibility is to have all new hires on a 6 month probationary period, with extended probation or more training. We do have evaluation systems, but we might be able to improve them. HR does not get involved in PTF separation unless there is a documented problem.

Standard I –

- Do you have any concerns or challenges with our current mission and vision? I think it's the same issue for any administrative or operational support unit – we're number 5 – it's the only place we really fit. The mission/vision doesn't connect as directly for support units. The challenge is that making sure staff understand that it's only one thing, but it's important. We're the circulatory system. Another person notes that she doesn't feel that we have as much because we are more indirectly involved with students. A third response is- I think we do – we are the heartbeat of staffing and supporting all of those who actually touch the students. The more effective we are in supporting staff and faculty, the better able they are to impact student lives. I think we do a good job of hiring faculty members and responding to their needs to make MC an employer of choice. That's what helps us to fulfill and meet our mission and vision.
    - How are we coming with the destination employer designation? We have to work with Ray Gilmer and his team to build a stronger faculty and staff focus. How do we measure that? What about awards we've won? The real measure is how many applications you get and your reputation in the marketplace, which is hard to measure. We're the largest community college in MD – we should highlight this – and the % of high school students who come here speaks to our reputation. Initiatives with Holy Cross and Biotechnology has helped us to become a destination employer.

Standard II – question II –

- The progressive discipline process is in P&P 34002 and on top of that we –(see written response from Tammy Flowers provided in earlier e-mail) – covers faculty, staff, full, part time and temporary

Standard VII – question 3

- One thing that works is that HR attempts to have an HR liaison within governance meetings. This promotes inclusivity and open communications because it allows us to take questions back to the leadership team and report back to the governance group. There is a sense of security from individuals participating – they know we're working on a process and we can help them to understand it; we partner with governance groups to work through changes or recommendations. It helps them to feel part of the process. We've also been involved with staff council – when there is a governance group to respond to, the data is recorded and maintained, which prevents it from coming up again and again. The robustness of the system design gives us a great pathway for communicating with employees and sharing information, particularly around new initiatives. It's a great partnership tool for HR. It helps us to ensure that the organization is healthy and running right with governance issues.

Standard III

- Who has oversight over reviewing the part time faculty evaluation form and making changes to it? Tango Thomas is involved in that. They acknowledge that they don't know who handles that piece. Part time faculty evaluations only come to HR if there is a rank advancement request. Tammy Flowers will follow up and will get back to us on that. We really need to get faculty evaluations online.

Standard I

- Is there a place where we list the awards MC has received? Probably advancement or Ray Gilmer

Standard II –

- Asks about changes to EEP process. In terms of our process, we have a new vendor that we're partnering with, but the process of investigating an EEO complaint is the same. Will follow up with Bob Roop – may need to have Standard II co-chair clarify the question and memo referenced.

Notes compiled by Tammy Peery