



2011-12

Talent Analytics
Workgroup Report

JP Eres, UC Davis Medical Center
Kenneth Feer, UC Office of the President
Anna Gandolfi, UC San Diego
Jason Valdry, UC Irvine
Tim Willette, UC Riverside
Tanya Williams, UC Los Angeles

The [2010-11 CUCSA Demographics Working Group](#) examined the available employee statistical and summary data collected by UC. The information gathered was compared to similar data reflected by other large employers. The comparison yielded several recommendations regarding the collection and presentation of employee data that would enhance UC employee relations' strategic planning by exploring new axes of analysis and augmenting current efforts. Of particular note was the recommendation of the working group to focus on normative demographic (or pipeline) data with a greater emphasis on framing and explanatory text to enhance UC reports. The working group also suggested that data on total remuneration should be analyzed across many metrics, rather than as a single aggregate, and that transactional data regarding internal personnel changes be tracked and reported differently. Finally, the working group encouraged greater study of employee workplace and work/life satisfaction in order to drive recruitment and retention strategies.

This year, the CUCSA Smarter Data Systems Working Group continued on the same trajectory, seeking to provide specific, concrete examples of models to UC employee relations and to provide strategic justifications for the development and implementation of those tools across all UC locations. A critical step in that process was to conduct informational interviews with system-wide human resources officers. We are grateful to Joe Epperson, Dennis Larsen, and Jennifer D'Amico-Murphy for their time and cooperation with this project. Another recurring effort was to investigate best practices and determine where UC could make the greatest strides in positioning itself to be an "employer of choice" as demonstrated through successful employee recruitment and retention. Indeed, the theme of successful staff recruitment and retention frames this report.

Becoming a national "employer of choice" in the current environment requires careful study and strategic planning. Having a more robust and standardized set of demographic data elements for analytical use will greatly assist each of the UC campuses in developing and implementing strategies for succession planning and employee development and growth. Thus, these analytical tools will allow UC to better recruit and retain workers and empower UC to be California's "employer of choice" for today and into the future.

It is within this framework that the CUCSA Smarter Data Systems Working Group identified three broad topics for investigation: 1) having a better understanding of our comparators and the market; 2) defining the "retirement bubble" and its impacts; and 3) adding a robust and flexible system-wide data system. Our exploration of these topics yielded the following information, which is presented in narrative order expanded in the discussion below.

The following actions would assist UC in developing and implementing effective strategies:

1. fully consider previous UC efforts with similar goals and use its internal resources, such as faculty experts, as often as possible
2. complete the in-progress title code cleaning and streamlining process being undertaken as the payroll component of [UCPath](#)

3. specify the competitors against which the rewritten descriptions are to be compared, and the rationale for each included competitor
4. utilize comparative data more robustly
5. report payroll and HR transactional data in a manner conducive to career arc tracking
6. gain a better understanding of the approaching retirement bubble
7. require greater localized strategic planning, including succession planning and plans for retaining institutional memory
8. conduct systematic and standardized engagement surveys
9. encourage non-monetary rewards and recognition, such as flexible schedules and other individualized work-life balance enhancement options
10. systematize and standardize the use of exit interviews
11. develop and use systemized and standardized “on-boarding” and transition interviews/surveys
12. systematize and standardize performance reviews, preferably following the 360-degree model
13. matrix and integrate both the quantitative and qualitative data
 - a. create and track over time several “straw men”, or employee archetypes
 - b. analyze UC’s competitive place and UC’s employee satisfaction with multivariate analyses

Discussion:

Successful staff recruitment and retention requires a clear understanding of UC's competitors. A first step is to enable UC to make accurate comparisons with similar institutions. A second step requires communicating those findings in dynamic and informative reports.

As a general rule, UC should **fully consider previous UC efforts with similar goals.**¹ For example, UC is working to **complete the in-progress title code cleaning and streamlining process being undertaken as the payroll component of [UCPath](#)**, a project in the *UC Working Smarter Initiative*. Completing the title code streamlining and market alignment project will enable UC to better analyze its competitive position by allowing accurate comparisons. As part of that process, UC should consider the findings of a [1997 UCOP working group](#). That particular group conducted a comprehensive review of the Title Code System and issued nearly 20 specific recommendations and elements to be included in the next generation payroll system. (See Appendix 1 for a complete analysis of the 1997 report.)

Next, UC should **specify the competitors against which the rewritten descriptions are to be compared, along with a rationale for each.** During informational interviews, HR personnel were unable to clarify why specific comparators were chosen for inclusion in the most recent total remuneration study ([2009](#)), even after indicating that the outcomes will depend on how the market is defined and who is included. For example, there are several possible markets, including but not limited to: statewide California industry; California or national higher education; and regional employment zones. For staff comparisons, the 2009 study includes only one other institute of higher education (CSU), and no rationale for the inclusion of the other comparators. One concern stemming from an unclear definition of the market could be the artificial deflation of wages or other forms of compensation. For instance, if *Google* frequently successfully poaches from UC, but is not considered a comparator, the UC employment position will remain uncompetitive. Similarly, if the staff comparator market also consists of other elite institutions of higher education, the inclusion of only CSU but not other universities with national recruiting further inhibits the employment competitiveness of UC.

Finally, with more strategic data in hand, UC should **utilize comparative data more robustly.** For staff, the 2009 Total Remuneration study reported only UC versus everyone, without disaggregating public and private employers or higher education and general industry employers. Some UC jobs have clear industry parallels (e.g., desktop technical support, programmer analysts, electricians) and some do not (e.g., student affairs analysts and admissions officers). The comparators currently used do not afford UC the ability to make such sub-level analyses – or at least the reporting does not include these analyses. Furthermore, it is unclear from institutional reporting how non-represented UC employees compare to union-represented industry

¹ UC should also use its internal resources, such as faculty experts, as often as possible.

counterparts. For jobs that do not have a clear industry parallel, the reasons underlying the selection of the proxy match should be communicated.

Successful staff recruitment and retention also requires a greater knowledge of staff. UC should endeavor to know why employees choose to work at UC, what will keep them retained and highly engaged, and why they choose to leave the University.

The “h” in UCPATH stands for human resources information system, for which the software architecture is currently being developed. Last year’s working group recommended tracking time to years-of-service in order to indicate, perhaps, if women were disadvantaged upon retirement. This year, we highlight the benefit of **reporting payroll and HR transactional data in a manner conducive to career arc tracking**. Specifically, by reporting promotions, reclassifications, and job movement, or as in the case of [CSU](#), changes in status and the reasons for separation (see Table 1). The inclusion of these aspects will allow UC to track employee career arcs and enable UC to frame HR actions accordingly in public reports.

A better understanding of career arcs will also help UC **gain a better understanding of the approaching retirement bubble**. When the accumulation of retirement-eligible staff begins retiring, UC ought to be ready to fill the vacant positions with eligible staff. However, one challenge in determining the dimensions of such a retirement bubble lies in the way the data is currently available (see Table 2). Without the ability to go further into the data and interpret which positions might have an excess of retirement-eligible incumbent employees, UC cannot plan ahead effectively. Alternatively, new recruitments in long-staffed areas may require fresher recruitment techniques or types of offers.

For example, consider the MSO position in relation to the advent of the HR Service Center in Riverside. This will change some of the duties included in the hiring and training of Academic Personnel officers. The local MSO position will require updated training regarding personnel files. Thus, the requirements for this position will change, possibly resulting in a reduction of necessary skills. While the condensed workload may be welcome in some cases, the re-filling of positions may warrant downgrading them in others.

From this example, one sees a need for UC to **require greater localized strategic planning, including succession planning and plans for retaining institutional memory**. These procedures would serve to help the institution understand the types of training and mentoring necessary for employees to better create and enact individual development, as well as long-term growth plans.

To further inform this strategic planning process, UC should conduct **systematic and standardized engagement surveys**. Engagement surveys collect valuable information, suggestions, and insights from staff. With these surveys, the UC can identify where to focus

training and development resources and initiatives while making better, more informed decisions based on both quantitative and qualitative data. Consistent engagement surveys will allow the UC to measure and monitor change longitudinally and across locations. They will indicate strategic gaps and opportunities the UC can choose to fill or exploit to better prepare itself and its workforce for the future. Also, such institutional responsiveness sends the more important message to staff that their opinions are valued. (We note that the UC has already embarked upon the process of gathering this type of information, and we encourage our colleagues to be as cooperative and collaborative as possible with the process.)

Elsewhere, previous similar surveys have indicated that work-life balance is increasingly important to today's workforce. Surveys suggest workers may be willing to trade salary for flexibility in the workplace: According to a work-life survey of 1,071 nationwide workers conducted by [Mom Corps](#) and reported by the National Association of College and University Business Officers ([NACUBO](#)), "flexible workplace options are of the utmost importance in the minds of professionals and can be a determining factor when deciding to take a position."² This same survey also found that:

- "Forty-two percent of working adults would be willing to trade pay for more flexible working arrangements, and they would forgo on average up to 6 percent of their salary.
- "Men are twice as likely as women to give up more than 10 percent of their pay for more flexibility.
- "Adults in the 18-to-34 age group are three times as likely as workers ages 35 and older to forfeit up to 10 percent of their salary."³

Each UC location has programs for work-life balance, as do universities like Princeton and Georgetown, as well as large corporations, such as IBM. The UC is obligated to **encourage non-monetary rewards and recognition, such as flexible schedules and other individualized work-life balance enhancement options**. This type of engagement in and support for worker-wellness adds to employee satisfaction by empowering and validating employees. Continued employee satisfaction will enhance successful recruitments from within the UC, as well as to increase the likelihood of the successful retention amongst long-term employees.

The UC would be well-served by **systematizing and standardizing the use of exit interviews**, which provide vital information as to how training and development could be improved, or what might be lacking in terms of communication, and finally, which methods were viewed as valuable and successful. They give the employee the opportunity to express his/her views as well as giving positive and constructive feedback. Businesses use exit interviews as a tool for diagnostic and strategic purposes to determine the reason(s) for turnover, to help identify training and

² <http://hrhorizons.nacubo.org/x380.xml>

³ *ibid.*

development needs, to develop strategic planning goals, and to identify those areas in which organizational and procedural changes should be made.

Exit interviews should be done consistently to ensure that a target participation/response rate of 65% is achieved.⁴ Moreover, data reports should be evaluated by individual campuses, not just on a system-wide basis. Once the reports are reviewed, action plans could be implemented at the campus level, and subsequently at the UC system-wide level. Again, we note that some units within the UC system have already embarked upon gathering this type of data, but it is not consistent across locations. Nonetheless, we encourage our colleagues to cooperate, collaborate, and facilitate the collection of such data.

As a logical extension to exit interview surveys, UC also should consider **developing and using systemized and standardized “on-boarding” and transition interviews/surveys**. Just as the UC would like to find correlations as to why employees leave, it would be equally as important to understand why employees choose to work at the UC, and their reasons for changing jobs once at the UC. As a new generation is entering the workforce, it will be essential to understand what the motivating factors are for employment, and long-term employment with the UC.

Similarly, UC should consider **systematizing and standardizing performance reviews, preferably following the 360-degree model**. As exit interviews and engagement surveys illuminate and inform strategic goals, so too could performance reviews be used as diagnostic tools by the institution. Furthermore, the annualized nature of performance reviews will enable UC to get “real-time” feedback. The 360-degree model is particularly useful since it provides multi-directional feedback, encouraging employees at all levels to improve continuously.

Finally, UC should strive to **matrix and integrate both the quantitative and qualitative data** to be the most beneficial. For illustrative purposes, imagine that UC were to **create and track (over time) several “straw men”, or employee archetypes**. Possible archetypes include information technology troubleshooter, Medical Office Services Coordinator – Supervisors (MOSC-S), business and finance analysts, and student affairs/admissions officers. These straw men could then be used to illustrate and **analyze the UC’s competitive place and the UC’s employee satisfaction with multivariate analyses** that include family status and size, life cycle stage, career mobility, salary escalation and rapidity, inflation, increasing mandatory deductions, completion of training and development courses, and performance review ratings of self and supervisor, as well as the usual standard demographic variables.

Having the ability to cross-reference data sets and integrate wide-spread indicators would greatly enhance the UC’s ability to become a highly competitive employer, even during these difficult fiscal times. In addition, as the market and industry changes, the UC must be positioned to act

⁴ More suggested exit interview best practices are available in Appendix 2.

nimbly in order to meet its institutional needs, which in turn equates to meeting its employees' needs.

Table 2:

Description	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Active Members (all groups)	118,885	114,242	115,745	114,928	115,568
Inactive Vested (all groups)	26,776	29,436	31,215	31,623	32,159
Avg. Age of Active Member	44.3	44.2	44.5	44.8	44.9
Avg. Active Service Credit	9.2	8.9	9.2	9.4	9.6
Avg. Service Credit at Retirement	20.9	20.9	21.0	20.9	21.0
Total Employees (Headcount)	180,707	184,982	183,668	185,835	187,201
UCRP Active Vested Faculty	22,090	22,311	22,518	22,936	22,991
UCRP Active Vested MSP	7,631	7,967	8,536	8,627	8,842
UCRP Active Vested PSS	89,164	83,964	84,691	83,365	83,735
Avg. Age Faculty	50	50	50	50	50
Avg. Age Faculty-Non-Senate	44	44	44	44	44
Avg. Age MSP	49	49	49	50	50
Avg. Age PSS	43	43	43	43	43
Avg. Retirement Age - Faculty	63	63	63	63	64
Avg. Retirement Age - MSP	60	60	60	60	60
Avg. Retirement Age - PSS	59	59	59	59	59
Avg. Service Credit at Retirement - Faculty	26	26	26	26	26
Avg. Service Credit at Retirement - MSP	22	22	22	22	22
Avg. Service Credit at Retirement - Staff	20	20	20	20	20

(Sources: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/finreports/index.php?file=ucrp/ar11ucrp.pdf>
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/finreports/index.php?file=ucrp/ar11ucrp.pdf>
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/finreports/index.php?file=ucrp/ar10ucrp.pdf>
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/finreports/index.php?file=ucrp/ar09ucrp.pdf>
http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/ar08ucrp.pdf
http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/ar07ucrp.pdf)

Appendix 1:

In reviewing the UC Title Code System and each campus's Title Code Table, considerable information was gleaned from a 1997 UCOP report that conducted a comprehensive review of the Title Code System. Salient elements of that report are highlighted.

Background

A Title Code System Workgroup (hereinafter the Workgroup) was formed in the summer of 1996 to review future corporate and campus title code data needs for non-academic titles. The Workgroup was comprised of representatives from each campus who were familiar with existing title code data and with new data needs of the campus in the context of the Human Resources Management Initiatives (HRMI).

The Workgroup was specifically charged with:

- 1. Identifying the information needed to be captured and maintained in local campus title code tables to cover the proper payment of employees and to support local management and reporting requirements and external reporting requirements.**
- 2. Identifying the information needed to be captured and maintained in the corporate title table and in the Corporate Personnel System to allow UCOP and campuses to report internally and externally according to common data definitions established on a system-wide basis.**
3. Reviewing processes for recording and maintaining title code data and recommending an approach that streamlines these activities and maximizes the ability of staff at, both UCOP, and each of the campuses to effectively carry out their responsibilities.

The UC Title Code System (TCS) exists as the central repository of information on appointment titles. The system is used to record title attributes and pay rates for academic and staff titles and to generate range adjustments. In the past, it has been the source of a hardcopy system-wide title and pay plan report. Transactions are entered online into the system by staff in UCOP Compensation and Data Analysis based on information received from each campus and from UCOP Labor Relations. Existing rates are downloaded for range adjustment processing and modeling. New rates are uploaded back to the TCS database. Periodically, transactions are generated by TCS and made available to each campus so that each local Title Code Table (TCT) can be updated. The TCT on each campus is integral to the Payroll Personnel System (PPS), serving as the source for local title and pay plans. **Each campus TCT reflects a true history of all titles and their attributes, while the TCS reflects a history of only shift differential rates, as well as base rates not residing in the standard grade table.**

In reviewing TCS and TCT, the Workgroup identified unmet needs and made recommendations in three broad areas: 1) needs related to the [process](#) by which information is sent to UCOP and to each of the campuses and by which the systems are updated, 2) needs related to [information](#) about appointment titles which is not currently captured, and 3) **needs related to [access](#) to title code data.**

The workgroup focused on needs of campus and UCOP compensation units. Particular emphasis was given to bringing existing systems in line with new delegations of authority under the HRMI as these delegations are currently being exercised at the campuses. **To date, no one compensation/classification model has arisen. Models being tested include pay for performance, incentive programs, market based pay, and an on-going response to unionization. As divergent compensation models are put in place throughout the organization, additional systems needs may arise. As UC moves away from a strictly title-driven compensation model, fundamental systems changes may be necessary in the next few years.**

Process Needs

The process for updating the central TCS and then the local TCT simply takes too long. When campuses need to make a large number of changes, UCOP is unable to prepare the information and update the system in a timely manner. This happened this last year with health care titles and when the Patient Care Technical Unit moved staff titles from step-based rates to open ranges.

The Workgroup discussed the possible decentralization of the work to the campuses as a way of addressing this problem and determined that it was not desirable to do so. Several campuses indicated that they could not absorb the increased workload. The most significant factor, however, is that decentralization would remove a critical control point for UCOP Labor Relations and Academic Personnel. Changes for represented titles and for academic titles are determined centrally and a central update ensures that appropriate steps have been taken in the bargaining process. Approximately 56% of the staff and academic titles are centrally bargained or administered.

The consensus of the Workgroup was that **the TCS database should continue to be updated centrally and data be transmitted to each of the campuses** and that steps should be taken to improve the timeliness of the process.

Recommendations:

- 1. Provide a web-based mechanism for each of the campuses to request single title add, change, and delete transactions to the TCS.** This would expand upon the current process for submitting changes via the TCS Web forms.

2. Improve the ability of UCOP to process "mass changes" in TCS in situations where a large volume of like transactions need to be processed. To the extent that it is possible to predetermine mass changes which may be required in the future and to the extent that it is technically feasible to do so yet still maintain the integrity of the central and local database data, an automated mass change facility should be developed. The current online updating of the TCS database does not meet Human Resources' basic update requirements, where, for example, updates for all titles in a bargaining unit are common. **There is no facility to update a logical group or set of titles.** For example, when the on-call rate for the titles in a particular bargaining unit change, the on-call rate must be changed manually, title by title. This creates an unnecessary clerical workload while multiplying the chances of error. At a minimum it should be possible to perform predetermined types of updates against a set of titles based on one or more of the following attributes: Bargaining unit, personnel program, campus, or link code. Such a set update facility should significantly reduce turnaround time on maintenance.
3. Increase the frequency by which transactions are sent from TCS to TCT. There is currently no system limitation to the frequency by which transactions can be sent to each of the campuses. Transactions should be sent as soon as they represent a completed logical set and as often as campuses have the ability to process them. Procedures for maintenance and range adjustment processing will need to be reviewed and modified in order to accomplish this.
4. Provide a mechanism for capturing and updating TCS with campus-initiated TCT transaction updates Skilled Craft range adjustments.

Information Needs

The current TCS and TCT do not capture and reflect all the information about appointment titles that is needed today for salary administration and reporting. As campuses have moved to implement new compensation models as delegated to them under HRMI, a number of shortcomings in current systems have been identified. The Workgroup had several specific recommendations in this area.

1. FLSA Status

The ability to differentiate exempt from nonexempt titles is accommodated in the current title code systems. However, several campuses intend to exercise their delegated authority to collapse titles and differentiate the FLSA status at the position/employee level.

Recommendation: Establish a new data element at the appointment level in the Payroll System to record the status for any position that has a status different from the standard one for the title (with a default to the standard one for the title). New edits in the Payroll System using this data element could provide enhanced functionality.

2. **Organization/Location within a Campus**

Two campuses expressed the need to record varying pay rates and title attributes for the same title (the same body of work) between two organizations /locations (the medical center and the general campus). Similarly, UCOP, since it uses the Berkeley campus payroll/personnel system, expressed the need to record pay rates and title attributes that differ from those in use by the Berkeley campus. Creating separate title codes where needed for each organization was discussed; however, it was felt that, since a title code defines a body of work, the same title should be used for the same work in both organizations. If the body of work is re-defined, then a new title code would be established.

Recommendation: Enhance TCS and TCT to permit the recording of varying pay rates and title attributes for multiple organizations within a payroll location.

3. **Six Month Eligibility Flag**

The current systems do not accommodate a Six Month Eligibility Flag which differs for covered and uncovered rates. As each of the campuses is moving from step-based titles to open salary ranges for uncovered rates, they are eliminating eligibility for a six month increase for uncovered rates, yet still maintaining steps and six month increase procedures for covered rates. The recording of one Six Month Eligibility flag for each title is insufficient.

Recommendation: The systems need to allow for recording of Six Month Eligibility flag at the Pay Representation level so that covered rates can have a different eligibility than uncovered rates.

4. **Salary Grade Assignment**

Most campuses anticipate assigning multiple grades to a single Professional/ Support Staff (PSS) or Manager/Sr. Professional (MSP) title. While the Payroll System currently allows assigning of differing grades to employees within a single PSS, MSP, or SMG title, TCS and each campus TCT currently cannot accommodate recording of multiple grades per title and their salary ranges. For this reason, the old MAP and Executive salary ranges were never stored in central TCS.

Recommendation: While modifying TCS and each campus TCT to record multiple grades and their ranges per title would add another complex layer to an already complex structure, UCOP Compensation recommended that TCS and TCT be enhanced to permit the recording of salary ranges at the campus level for MSP and SMG titles and to permit the recording of multiple grades and their salary ranges for each location for PSS, MSP, and SMG titles.

5. Salary Structure

The Workgroup confirmed that TCS and TCT sufficiently capture the scope and diversity of pay structures for recording step rates; minimum, midpoint and maximum for open ranges; no rates for by agreement titles; and the standard grade table for look-up of covered and uncovered rates. Per Diem rates are currently recorded inconsistently and, as a result, may resemble either step-based or merit-based rates in reports. Each of the campuses expressed the need to identify per diem titles and more effectively and accurately record and display their unique rates. UCOP Labor Relations described per diem employees as at-will employees who must be kept in separate titles.

Recommendation: Establish a new data element in TCS and TCT to identify per diem titles and establish consistency on how the rates should be stored and displayed. Workgroup members agreed that the recording of quartiles and additional salary rate reference points should be handled locally.

6. Series and Level Identifiers

Campuses have a need to identify a related series of title codes for survey, compensation, and classification purposes. As new job series are developed, a series identifier would be useful for comparing salaries across UC and in linking to job families. From a system-wide perspective, it would also be valuable to identify the journey level title within each series.

Recommendation: Add Series and Level identifiers to TCS and TCT as new title attributes.

7. Uniform Allowance and Perquisite Rates

Each of the campuses has been delegated the authority to establish, change and/or delete uniform allowance and perquisite rates. The Workgroup discussed the merits of recording the actual rates for these in TCS and TCT and determined that they would have limited use. UCOP Compensation and UCOP Labor Relations favor a title attribute which would identify titles eligible for uniform allowances. This is not a high priority for the campuses.

Recommendation: None

8. Salary Survey Administration

UCOP and each of the campuses have a common need to identify the benchmark titles used in various internal and external salary surveys and map those titles to the appropriate survey and benchmark survey job code. Currently, this information is maintained manually or in local campus systems.

Recommendation: The consensus of the Workgroup was that, while there might be a need for central support in this area, it is not core to TCS or TCT. No action needed.

9. Occupational Groupings

There was agreement on the need for meaningful occupational groupings to provide a common profile of the UC work force in internal and external reporting.

The Workgroup reviewed the groupings in use today: Federal Occupation Code (FOC), Sub FOC, Standard Occupation Code (SOC), Class Title Outline (CTO), Occupation Subcategory Code (OSC), Linkage Code, and Job Group Identifier. For Federal affirmative action reporting there is a continuing need for FOC, SOC, and Job Group, which is currently locally defined and maintained. Class Title Outline continues to be needed for academic titles as is Linkage Code for staff titles. Both code structures are satisfactory in their current form.

Recommendation: The Workgroup recommended that Job Group Code be added to TCS and TCT as a locally defined data element, and that Sub FOC, which is actually a UC-defined element, be combined with Occupational Subcategory Code to form a revamped code structure. The Workgroup also recommended that a small group with participation from Affirmative Action staff refine this proposal.

10. Title Code Sub-Specialties

The Workgroup discussed the need to identify sub-specialties within the title code systems as campuses move to collapse multiple titles into generic schemes. Specialty detail is needed to match to market data. Adding a sub-specialty level of detail was considered not a viable option in that it adds another layer to an already complex system. The goal of simplifying the University's pay practices is not accomplished if, by reducing the number of title codes, another level of complexity must be added.

Recommendation: The Workgroup recommended that existing distinct title codes be retained for each sub-specialty that has a unique benchmark. It was also identified that "broad banding" does not necessarily mean losing specialty detail currently reflected in title names.

The Workgroup also recommended that the conflict between the goal of simplifying pay practices by reducing the number of titles and the need for specialty in a market-driven structure be brought to the attention of UCOP and campus management.

11. Supervisory Titles

Central TCS and each of the campus's TCT currently capture rates for supervisory, confidential, and out-of-state and student employees within uncovered segments of represented titles. Labor Relations is moving towards establishing separate titles for supervisors since the work they perform is a different body of work than that performed by the non-supervisory employees in the same title. Separate titles are not needed for confidential and out-of-state employees since these employees perform the same body of work as the covered employees.

Recommendation: The Workgroup concluded that there are no system issues with regard to establishing separate new titles for supervisors, and that the issue should be referred to the Human Resource Directors for discussion as the proliferation of new titles conflicts with the mandate to reduce the number of existing titles.

Access Needs

Access to accurate, current, and complete data in the TCS and at each campus's TCT is viewed as a major unmet need in the current environment. Information is needed by central administrators, as well as by departmental staff and individual employees. TCS has been the source of data for the voluminous hardcopy system-wide Title and Pay Plan and, since the implementation of HRMI, this report has not been produced. Several campuses produce local versions of the report and, in order to reduce costs, several have eliminated the paper versions in favor of Web-based versions.

Recommendations:

The Workgroup recommended that the following be undertaken to improve access to the data recorded in the systems:

1. Provide Web-based access to the title data stored in TCS. This would replace the system-wide Title and Pay Plan. At a minimum, this facility should allow search and selection by location, title, title name, title unit code, and type of pay (by agreement, step-based, etc.), provide a number of display options, and clearly and accurately indicate effective dates for all rates and which salary adjustments have been included. Each of the campuses felt that a system-wide version of the Plan was useful even though greater divergence in pay practices is anticipated and that having such a facility would eliminate the duplicative effort in developing local Web-based applications.
2. Development of TCT history reporting. Each local campus TCT contain a history of changes made to title attributes and rates but there is no mechanism to display or report this history. Staff in Compensation and Affirmative Action offices would find this information useful.

Next Steps

This report has been reviewed by Workgroup members and updated with their comments. Approval of the recommendations will be solicited from the Human Resources Directors.

The Employee Systems Task Force (ESTF) was formed in Fall 1996 by Senior Vice President Kennedy to guide the future direction of human resource and benefits information systems. The Task Force **has undertaken** its work over the past several months **to re-assess current systems, identify potential projects, and prioritize future needs. The enhancements recommended**

by the Workgroup in this report are provided with the goal to improve timeliness of data in both central and local title code systems, expand systems to capture data required for current salary administration practices, and provide improved access to data in the systems. The ESTF is scheduled to complete its work by June 30, 1997 and forward a plan, including recommendations, schedules for implementation, benefits to be obtained, and resources required to Senior Vice President Kennedy.

Additionally, information was gleaned from the ESTF report. Highlights of that document that speak to the specific concerns of the TCS and TCT are provided below.

ESTF Summary of Needs

Specific Global Application Needs

- **Demographic Database:** Enable people-centric processing to eliminate redundant processing, and better integrate common, centralized demographic data between applications to include UC authentication objectives.
- **Employee Access:** Improve access to employee data and improve the ability of an employee to maintain her/his own data.
- **Modeling and Projection Applications:** Provide people-centric applications to facilitate the ability of an individual to make a decision and second, to allow decision forecasting.
- **Salary Administration - Merits:** Provide salary modeling of merits, as well as automating the merit adjustment process itself and facilitating online merit changes. Given market-based pay trends, modeling would facilitate ascertaining the UC position at any given time in the market for all benchmark positions at a minimum. It would also allow departments to compute various scenarios to ensure meeting budget requirements. Merit processing provides online entry panels for processing non-academic merits. It also provides alternative reporting forms with collapsed distribution lines.
- **Salary Administration - Range Adjustments:** Provide salary modeling of range adjustments as well as automating the range adjustment process itself. Given market-based pay trends, modeling would facilitate ascertaining the UC position at any given time in the market for all benchmark positions at a minimum. For academic and staff positions, it provides a means for campus to define the titles and original salary rates to be adjusted. It establishes a mechanism to define, by title or rate, if the range adjustment figure is a percent of the rate or a flat amount. It allows for automated adjustments of by agreement, off-scale rates, and special compensation distributions using established methodologies.

- **Title Code Systems Enhancements:** Improve the timeliness of data in, both, TCS and each campus TCT and improved access to data in systems.
- **Leadership Continuity System:** **This would** be used for succession planning and career development.
- **Employee Campus Transfers:** This will provide for electronic transfer of data captured on employees who move from one campus to another or who separate and return, and a means of tracking such movements.
- **Employee Development Data:** Record employee training and support enrollment in internal training courses.

Appendix 2:

Based on studies, by Human Resources.com⁵ and Washington State University Human Resources⁶ the best format for exit interviews is by written survey/on-line survey. When someone is given a form to complete either written or on-line, they are more likely to be open and honest. If face-to-face exit interviews are introduced, they ought to be handled in unification with human resources personnel and not alone with an employee's manager, which diminishes the employee's ability to be forthcoming, especially if the manager is the reason for the exodus.

For written interviews:

- If using rated questions, 35-60 questions are suggested as survey length
- Questions should be simple, and not too complicated
- The survey instructions should be easily understood
- Avoid questions that ask for employees' emotions; it is easier for an employer to rate the effectiveness of a process rather than how someone feels about a process
- Stress that honest feedback will not result in negative consequences. Similar to whistleblowing, statements made on an exit interview would never be used to prevent future eligibility for re-hire
- Ideally, an employee should be notified of the exit interview by human resources within 2 weeks of separation; the notification would come in the same medium as the interview
- The employee should be encouraged to complete the exit interview by a scheduled series of reminders, and, if an employee wanted to complete/conduct the interview at work, a private space and unidentified computer should be made available to them

Finally, when improvements are implemented based on suggestions from an exit interview, inform the employee responsible for the source of the idea.

⁵ <http://humanresources.about.com/od/employeesurveys/a/exitinterview.htm>

⁶ <http://www.dop.wa.gov/WorkforceDataAndPlanning/ResearchAndResources/HRManagementIdeaBank/Pages/DesigningExitInterviews.aspx>