

K-State Compensation Philosophy Focus Group

October 23, 2014, 3:00-4:30

Edwards Hall

This is a joint meeting along with the Alternative Service Committee

I. VP Cheryl Johnson welcomed everyone and introduced several Cindy Bontrager, Jennifer King, and Shanna Legleiter, all HR staff members that were in attendance.

II. Roll Call

Present: Amy Capoun, Carrie Fink, Janet Finney, Doris Galvan, Brittany Green, Steve Greinke, Kerry Jennings, Emily Johnson, Connie Kisse, Gary Leitnaker, Sharon Maike, Carol Marden, Cheryl Martin, Lesa Reves, Rob Reves, Terri Savage, Michael Seymour, Michael Seymour II, Janice Taggart, Pam Warren, Julie Wilburn, John Wolf, Kari Zook

Excused: Lindsay Thompson, Heather Tourney

Absent: Michael Ashcraft, Susan Erichsen, Janel Harder

III. One of the big concerns of the University has been compensation so that is one of the first focuses for Vice President Johnson now that she is here. Currently, the Compensation Department of HCS is in the process of meeting groups around campus to get a wide perspective from various leadership groups across campus.

Also, it was mentioned that the Benefits Department had a few folks that left this summer. Since the two positions had different duties, advertising for these positions has been confusing folks since there was an HRPII and HRPIII. With the changes occurring and moving towards a customer centric focus, the Benefits department will now address benefits and retirement. In hopes to clarify the confusion of recruiting these positions, they will be hiring on two HRPIII's.

IV. The first step in this process is establish a clear focus of what our Compensation Philosophy is. Much like USS employees, unclassified employees feel as though they have an unclear plan. Sometimes they don't even receive performance reviews. By establishing a clear Compensation Philosophy it gives us a foundation for how to address future compensation decisions. It gives us direction in good and bad times. The idea to grow on would be to focus on total compensation of our employees including base pay, benefits, perquisites, work life, wellness plans, and work environment.

As part of our Compensation plan, some of the things we would like to address are who are our external competitors, to reward team work, and rewarding those with seniority/years of service.

V. After reading the three philosophies we discussed what we like/dislike in each of the options

Option 1:

Like: short; wants to attract, retain and reward all employees; not only quantity but the quality of work is important; statements show the University's commitment to the policy

Dislike: short, too wide open; no road maps to say how we are going to get there; words are empty (puts power with the administration, takes the power away from those in the trenches) very generic; written too much like a state statute

DO NOT LIKE

Option 2:

Like: gives better guidelines of what is expected; short but with better guidelines; transparency; pay what the job is worth (would need to be defined); gives a lot more power to the employees if they want to do better they know what the guidelines so they can work with their department to improve (discussion was had regarding how departments are completing performance evaluations and how many supervisors rate people in the middle to avoid a conflict rather than giving folks that excel a higher rating and those that are doing below average.) Having better criteria of what “meets expectation”, etc. to better establish how to define the rankings. It needs to be an honest system; career path; statements show the University’s commitment to the policy

Dislike: needs supervisor clarity/equity for evaluations; pay what the job is worth; no mention of helping the University with various committees or offices (almost hurts the employee); explanation of team performance; no mention of quality/quantity

Option 3:

Like: more explanatory; “as funding permits”; internal equity “stay and grow with us”; salaries will be reviewed regularly; merit based pay clearly defined

Dislike: proper job titling and make adjustments as needed; proper classifications identified; no mention of quality/quantity

Carol Marden asked: Many State public systems, they are heavy in the benefits and weaker on the pay, is that still the system we are working on? Answer: we are looking to show a whole benefits package to show other benefits aside from just pay.

What are the next steps? There will be many focus groups across campus in the next month including the Deans council, Faculty senate, Professional Staff Affairs, BFSAs, and the President’s Cabinet. After those focus groups are complete, changes will be made and then there will open forums held to see if it is right.

Michael Seymour asked since it is noticeable that the performance reviews are a problem, will these be worked on? Answer: yes, but probably not till like the latter part of 2015. Right now the big concern is to hire all across campus. The way we hire is a very broken and long fragmented process so that is our main focus right now.

It was asked if longevity was going to be sticking around? It was also added that it needs to be added to base pay so when we get percentage raises we will get raises with those added in helping everyone in the long run. Also, all staff that have been here for 10 years or greater should be included with the longevity bonuses not just USS employees since we are no longer part of the state system.