

**CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES COUNCIL
MINUTES
September 11, 2018**

Library – Room 256

Present: Jayne Angle, Nancy Cowherd (Alternate), Tammy Gill, Melody Gillespie (Alternate), Karen James, Ramona Kissel, Johanna Lind, Cecelia Mason, Rachel Meads, Diane Shewbridge, Theresa Smith (Alternate), Sarah Speck, Patrick Weber (Alternate)

Absent: Paula Scott, Marian Willauer

Guests: Alan Perdue, General Counsel; Marie DeWalt, Director of Human Resources; Brian Hammond, Ken Harbaugh, Sharika Abdul-Muhaimin

In the Chair's absence for the opening of the meeting, Co-Chair, Tammy Gill, called the meeting to order. She introduced guests, Alan Perdue and Marie DeWalt, who presented a draft document and information about proposed changes to the Shepherd University performance evaluation process.

Mr. Perdue explained that the draft document was the result of a direction of the BOG, the Executive Leadership Team and the President to review and change the performance evaluation processes for both Classified and Non Classified employees. The impetus for this resulted from comments by both Classified Employees and President Hendrix that there exists a lack of communication between supervisors and employees about the nature and goals of jobs and performance. How can the quality of this effort be improved? There is an especially strong concern about the way salary increases have been awarded. This year's raises resulted in concerns from the BOG that they were flat, per capita raises that didn't take into account merit or quality of employee performance, resulting in the rewarding of staff who have not performed well and under rewarding stellar employees. The proposal presented today tries to address how to fairly approach raises.

Mr. Perdue expressed concern about the need to have a performance instrument that dozens of supervisors can use that allows "apple to apple" comparisons. We need a more objective model that will use numbers in the process. To that end, goals will be formally identified by everyone within each hierarchy of levels of jobs. The current evaluation structure will be retained, but will be modified to make it more effective. Before the first of the year (2019), a consensus of at least some goals for every staff employee will be reached so that employees and supervisors will be ready for spring 2019 evaluations. The evaluation will assess how the employee has done on reaching the goals set and how he/she performed on the aggregate assessment. It is important that employees have notice of their established goals in advance of the evaluation process.

We currently do not know how this will affect compensation, but are exploring the creation of a non-monetary reward system that would compensate the best employees when the University doesn't have the monetary compensation available.

Dr. DeWalt presented a document that will be the start of a User's manual for supervisors detailing how the evaluation process will work. This document will be presented to various campus constituencies for comment. She pointed out the following information: The evaluation cycle will be changed to run from May 14, 2019 to May 15, 2020 in order to give time to award raises. Currently, supervisors are advised

to let employees do self-evaluations, but that doesn't always happen. The new process will *require* an employee to self-evaluate and will also require that a second supervisor review the evaluation in order to create more standardization. Quantification of the evaluation will be achieved through a points system which will assign a range of numbers to standard evaluation competencies. An overall rating on a scale of 0 – 16 will be calculated. Employee training for this system will be done in fall and spring. Employees and supervisors will set goals this fall. Goals for each hierarchy should cascade down from top leadership to bottom hierarchy. PIQ's will have to be updated, if they are not currently, so that they accurately reflect what you're doing. Marie DeWalt and Tammy Gill will take the lead in doing much of the campus training in order that everyone understands the nature and purpose of this process. Goals must be realistic for the resources available and only include those things that the employee can control. An example of an unrealistic goal would be for a painter to have the goal of making sure that there is no rust showing on the campus, because it would be impossible for only one person to achieve. Marie drew attention to **SMART goals**: goals that are **Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time bound**. Evaluations will be finished by June 20. The ultimate goal is to enhance the University experience for students.

Marie and Alan took questions and comments:

- Concern was expressed about making sure that each Supervisor is actually doing evaluations for their supervisees.
- Concern that an employee who has taken on the goals of someone who is no longer here not be given even extra work via the goal settings. Marie said that the goals will probably not be covering duties you aren't already doing.
- Marie asked for thoughts on the new wording of "**reliability and accountability**" which replace "**Attendance and punctuality.**" The Council members liked the new wording better because it gets at the *performance* of the employee better than the old wording.
- Melody Gillespie: My peers often have a difficult time sitting at a computer doing work and they need help navigating the computer system or software. Without a monetary reward, she felt that it will not be worth doing. Marie asked what, other than money, would be valuable to them. Comp time was discussed as a possible reward.
- Need to meet with Administrative Council and Deans.
- A dialogue with council members can continue through email.

The Chair thanked Alan and Marie for their presentation.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Chair asked for the discussion on the Consent Agenda; there being none, the Consent Agenda was M (Meads), S (Gill) and PASSED:

- Approval of August Minutes
- Classified Employees' Children's Scholarship Fund: Approval of a scholarship to late applicant, Charles William Ransom.
- Board of Governors, Mona Kissel : No Report
- Staff Development, Marian Willauer: as of September 10, 2018:
Seminar/Conference fee: \$140
Textbooks: \$607.45
Total Reimbursements: \$747.45
Remaining Balance: \$852.55

- Legislative Affairs, Jayne Angle: No Report
- Budget Committee, Jayne Angle: No Report

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Safety, Building & Grounds

Melody Gillespie

The next meeting will be in September.

Special Events

Jayne Angle

There was a discussion about the feasibility of having a fall employees lunch on Wednesday, November 14, before the holidays, so that more people might be available to attend. There will be a raffle. Both vegan and vegetarian food options will be offered. The food will be catered and employees will pay to attend. The Ballroom is available that day. After discussion, it was agreed that November would be a good time to hold the luncheon.

ACCE (Advisory Council of Classified Employees)

Jayne Angle

ACCE met on August 29, 2018. Jayne gave the following report:

- Chancellor Carolyn Long met with ACCE to discuss expectations in her new role, newly appointed Blue Ribbon Commission, HEPC, restructuring higher education, funding models, and employee concerns.
- Update on Funding Model. Recent revision, see Chris Treadwell, Senior Director of Research and Policy report on HEPC website (September 17, 2018 Legislative Interim Presentation) [HEPC Reports and Publications](http://www.wvhepc.edu/Reports_and_Publications). Public comments on the funding model also updated: http://www.wvhepc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/HEPC_FundingModelComments_23Aug2018.pdf
- Patricia “Trish” Humphries, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, and Bruce Cottrill, Director of Classification and Compensation, WV Higher Education Policy Commission (HEPC) and the Community & Technical College System (CTCS) of WV - Currently in the process of requesting institutions to provide data on employee turnover rates, the time of vacancies/hiring process, time to fill-in, Reduction in Force (RIF) policies, etc. to evaluate institutions on their HR processes and outcomes; a kind of HR report card based on a 5 year cycle. wvOASIS contains data on only half of employees in higher education in the state of WV. Marshall and WVU have their own employee management systems; they do not use wvOASIS for personnel functions.

Committee Reports/Discussion

Benefits: PEIA Task force website

Legislative: ACCE Mission statement update. Advocate for staff; be an active advocate for our institutions.

Web/Communications: updating and maintaining website

Student Advocacy: discussed the HEPC financial aid advisory board and EFC

- Discussion of employee burnout - In particular, there has been an increase of questions regarding work hours. Some employees regularly work 12-14 hour days because of no funding, institutions are not filling open positions because of budget issues. All employees committed to 2-3 different jobs. Is this because institutions have their own policies? Employees are worried about being 100% effective and are afraid to speak up. Employees quitting for other jobs and/or leave the state.

Accountability of Institutions not in compliance of WV code 18b of HEPC. There currently isn't a process in place to keep institutions on task and to follow code.

Unfinished Business

None

New Business:

None

The next regularly scheduled Classified Employees Council meeting is Tuesday, October 9, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. in LB 256.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectively Submitted,

Nancy Cowherd, CEC Secretary