Memorandum

To: Tracy Bigney and Tom Hopkins
Fr: Scott Harrison, HECCP Project Leader
Re: HECCP Project Update
Dt: March 10, 2009
Cc: Steering Committee
Joint Labor-Management Team
Working Group

As we approach the one year mark since launching the HECCP project, I have summarized the team’s accomplishments and our next steps. I have also included summary results from a project opinion survey that was recently administered to all Design Team participants.

It has been a productive year. Our first few months focused on developing a governance structure and defining our path forward. We selected an outside consultant; assembled a project team; gathered information on past practices and best practices; elicited employee opinions; defined our project goal; and developed a work plan. Work plan phases and timeline are depicted below.

Since August our focus has been on the Classification Study. We selected the job evaluation method and completed design of the Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ) to collect information about jobs. We field tested the PDQ and conducted Employee Information Sessions (EIS) across the state. The PDQ has been completed by 73% of all hourly employees, with at least 65% at each university. This strong response can be attributed to cooperation of employees and supervisors, support of employee organization leadership and agents, and work by HR.

Work Accomplished. Phase 1 was completed in August, 2008. Phase 2 is in process and on track. The status of all tasks, by phase follows.

- **Phase 1: Project Initiation & Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Develop project governance structure</td>
<td>To specify Design Team roles, responsibilities and relationships of internal and external groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Select compensation consultant</td>
<td>To engage external expertise. We defined selection criteria; developed interview and reference checking protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Assemble design team [See Appendix A]</td>
<td>To bring together a team of employees who are interested, available, engaged, and represent key roles and/or functional areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Develop job aids for each team [See Appendix B]</td>
<td>To ensure clear and consistent understanding of team roles, rules, and expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Develop communication plan</td>
<td>To develop a multi-media approach that ensures stakeholders stay informed throughout project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create logo and tagline</td>
<td>To establish program identity and intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create standardized meeting protocols</td>
<td>To foster preparedness among team members and productive meetings. HECCP binders; meeting agendas and materials in advance; documented actions and accountabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop HECCP website [See Appendix C]</td>
<td>To provide a clearinghouse of information on project status and a mechanism for continual sharing and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create HECCP newsletter [See Appendix D]</td>
<td>To provide regular, frequent project communications, easily accessible by all employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Research past practices, best practices</td>
<td>To understand compensation and classification issues and opportunities. Reviewed archived records and interviewed employees across the UMS to gather information on current compensation practices, strengths and weaknesses. Researched contemporary approaches to job evaluation, including e.g., competency based systems at Penn State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Administer employee opinion survey</td>
<td>To gather opinions on current classification and compensation program and elicit ideas for HECCP. Response: 600+ surveys (33%), 2,000+ comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Develop project goal [See Appendix E for entire goal statement]</td>
<td>To develop a statement of intent that gives a sense of shared purpose to all members of the Design Team. A goal that is specific, measureable, and achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To: Create a classification and compensation system (“UMS Model”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For: All hourly employees at UMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By: Teaming together to plan, design, develop, test, and implement the system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So That: We achieve extraordinary results that benefit our stakeholders inclusively.</td>
<td>♦ Employees experience a fair and sensible pay system and greater clarity on job expectations, progressions and career paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Employee organizations experience a fair and sensible pay system for their membership that is valid and reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Leadership experiences a system that helps them attract, retain and motivate high performing employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ UMS experiences a system that reflects its mission and compensation philosophy, and that values desired behavior and business results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2: Classification Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✓      | Research job evaluation options | To gather information on contemporary job evaluation options. Narrows search to Flex | 2 | Page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Select job evaluation model and methodology</td>
<td>To identify best fit model for UMS. Selected DBM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Develop Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ)</td>
<td>To tailor PDQ to data needs of DBM job evaluation method. Facilitated statewide focus groups to test, refine, and finalize PDQ. [See Appendix F]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Deliver Employee Information Sessions (EIS)</td>
<td>To provide a variety of EIS delivery options that would meet campus needs (i.e., on-site, polycom, and/or online). 1,100+ employees participated [See Appendix G]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Complete PDQ’s</td>
<td>To capture PDQ’s from a representative sample of all current UMS positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMA</td>
<td>70%  (88/126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMF</td>
<td>84%  (108/128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMFK</td>
<td>90%  (43/48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMM</td>
<td>88%  (28/32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>71%  (692/968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USM</td>
<td>65%  (251/386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMPI</td>
<td>100% (59/59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWS</td>
<td>100% (26/26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On target, perform interviews and/or administer occupational panel discussions</td>
<td>To clarify and validate information on PDQ’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On target, develop classification structure</td>
<td>To develop a new classification structure that combines similar jobs based on the nature and level of work performed. To indicate career ladders within each job family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On target, develop new job descriptions</td>
<td>To ensure all requirements regarding essential functions and minimal qualifications are included on job descriptions. To determine appropriate FLSA status of each job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On target, develop classification guidelines</td>
<td>To provide guidelines for administering the new classification system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Design Team recognizes the importance of high involvement and regular, frequent, and open communication. We conducted statewide focus groups to fine-tune the PDQ and prepare for the EIS. Our EIS’s were attended by over 1,100 employees and were made available online. We created an HECCP website and have provided monthly updates. We installed a mechanism for employees to ask questions, share ideas, and learn about all aspects of the project. Similarly, we published the first in a series of newsletters, HECCP News in an effort to keep employees updated and informed.
Project Management - Annual Check-in. Members of the Steering Committee (SC), Project Team (PT), and Joint Labor-Management Team (JLMT) were recently surveyed to gauge their satisfaction with the progress and direction of the HECCP project.\(^1\) As shown below, survey results were generally positive. Overall, participants view meetings as productive and a good use of their time. Participants feel valued and free to voice their opinions. Project communications have been effective and need to be ramped up now that employees are engaged. Most importantly, participants feel that the team is on track and headed in the right direction.\(^2\) [See Appendix H for an aggregated list of responses to what we should keep doing, start doing, and stop doing to ensure a successful project.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>“Top 2” Box(^3)</th>
<th>Average Rating(^4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) HECCP meetings are productive.</td>
<td>100% 100% 100%</td>
<td>4.40 5.00 4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Participants have equal opportunity to express their points of view.</td>
<td>100% 100% 100%</td>
<td>4.60 5.00 4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Differences of opinion among participants are elicited and explored.</td>
<td>100% 100% 100%</td>
<td>4.80 4.67 4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Project communications (i.e., website, newsletter, emails, information sessions) have been effective at keeping people informed.</td>
<td>100% 100% 100%</td>
<td>4.80 4.67 4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I am satisfied with the progress we have made with HECCP this year.</td>
<td>100% 100% 62%</td>
<td>4.80 4.67 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I am satisfied with the overall direction of HECCP.</td>
<td>100% 100% 62%</td>
<td>4.80 4.67 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Survey response: Total (16) = SC (5) + PT (3) + JLMT (8)
\(^2\)The JLMT average rating of 62% reflects the following distribution of responses: 3 “neutral,” 2 “agree,” and 3 “strongly agree.”
\(^3\)Reflects sum of “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” responses.
\(^4\)1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree.

Path Forward. Following completion of all tasks in Phase 2: Classification Study, we will begin work on Phases’ 3-5.

- **Phase 3: Job Evaluation Study by October 2009**
  Customize DBM job evaluation criteria. Evaluate jobs. Establish the internal worth of all job classes.

- **Phase 4: Market Study by April 2010**
  Define labor market, select benchmark jobs, conduct job matches, verify data, determine competitiveness, develop pay structure, develop compensation recommendations and guidelines.

- **Phase 5: Final Report and Recommendations by June 2010**
  Summarize all aspect of Study including processes, recommendations, budget implications, implementation and transition methods and administrative guidelines.
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**HECCP Design Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Joint Labor-Management Team</th>
<th>Steering Committee</th>
<th>Project Support Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hopkins</td>
<td>Jim Bradley</td>
<td>Tracy Bigney</td>
<td>Natalie Worden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lane</td>
<td>Gail Wartell</td>
<td>Steven Weinberger</td>
<td>Amanda Dunham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Mitchell</td>
<td>Dina Goodwin-Short</td>
<td>Laurie Gardner</td>
<td>April Strowbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rabata</td>
<td>John Bracciodieta</td>
<td>Tom Potter</td>
<td>Ann Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Watson</td>
<td>Matthew Troxel</td>
<td>Joan Getchell</td>
<td>Kitty Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Wood</td>
<td>Richard Pramis</td>
<td>Carolyn Cheney</td>
<td>Rachel Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Pile</td>
<td>Chris Gardner</td>
<td>Judy Ryan</td>
<td>Dwayne Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gerry</td>
<td>Chris LeClair</td>
<td>Sheri Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna O’Connell</td>
<td>Murillo Stevens</td>
<td>Sally Dobres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Harrison</td>
<td>Michelle Beaulieu</td>
<td>Tracy Elliott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcia Mower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stew Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **HECCP Design Team** includes representation from all campuses and employee organizations. The **Working Group** is made up of Human Resource, Compensation, and Labor Relations specialists. The **Joint Labor-Management Team** includes both represented and non-represented hourly employees and management. The **Steering Committee** is comprised of all ERL’s and representation from Finance.
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Sample Job Aid Material – JLMT Roles and Responsibilities

Team Member Responsibilities and Operating Guidelines

♦ Provide input to consultant and Project Team
♦ Help shape project goals and directions
♦ Participate in discussion about all major aspects of the project: market analysis, factors, PDQ, how to collect data, statistical analysis, communications, etc.
♦ Review and comment on all major project materials: PFI, PDQ, market data, generic classification descriptions
♦ No collective bargaining occurs in this group; bargaining will occur prior to implementation
♦ Group operates as much as possible through consensus, in an advisory capacity to the project staff and consultant
♦ Convened and facilitated by Sponsor, Project Leader and Consultant

Team Norms

♦ Members of the JLMT are encouraged to express their personal views and to actively participate. Individuals will not be assumed to be speaking for the group that nominated them to the Team.
♦ Discussions will be conducted as an exploration of ideas that will evolve with our work. Members should feel free to express ideas in a brainstorming mode without worrying that an idea may sound “dumb” or that they may not even support the idea in the long run.
♦ When members have different viewpoints we will be “hard on ideas” and “easy on people.”
♦ The convener will recognize people in order to avoid individuals from dominating the discussion or not getting a chance to talk.
♦ While collective bargaining may be required to implement some JLMT recommendations, no negotiation will take place in the JLMT.
♦ Meetings will be attended by JLMT members, staff, consultant and invited guests.
♦ Classification and compensation are issues of great importance to employees and UMS. We can best deliberate and reach recommendations if the discussion is held within the group during our work. We recognize that the administration and bargaining agents must keep constituents informed about the progress of the project. Joint communications from the JLMT will be used to communicate with employees whenever possible.

Collective Bargaining

♦ Negotiate impact of new program
♦ Negotiate any change in unit members’ wage rates
♦ Negotiate appeals process for assigning classification
♦ Negotiate policies for promotion, demotion, reclassification

Time Commitment

♦ Anticipated meeting frequency: monthly for first few months during design and start up phases; then every 2 – 3 months during data collection, analysis, and development of classifications and policies and procedures
♦ Meeting preparation material to be distributed 1+ week in advance if possible
Welcome to the HECCP website. A space dedicated to sharing information, gathering ideas and keeping you in the loop throughout the HECCP project. The process may take a couple years to complete and we want you to be informed and involved at every step.

We have assembled a high caliber team of inside and outside talent to guide our success. Though no system is perfect, our hope is that a trained approach will result in a model and methodology that achieves our goal and satisfies your expectations.

Our charge is clear – to develop a classification and compensation system that is fair, sensible, and aligned with our HR Mission and Compensation Philosophy. A system that is rooted in sound theory, backed by best
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Sample Newsletter

HECCP PROJECT LAUNCHED

The HECCP project was launched in Fall 2006. It is a 3-year, $2 million project supported by the National Science Foundation. The project is focused on improving the preparation and training of teachers in the areas of mathematics and science. The project will involve partnerships with universities, schools, and other organizations to develop and implement innovative programs for teacher education.

HECCP to Win:

- the development of a new curriculum for teacher education programs
- the creation of a new professional development program for teachers
- the establishment of a new research institute for mathematics and science education

The goal of the HECCP project is to improve the quality of teacher education and to increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the areas of mathematics and science.

EMPLOYEE INFORMATION SESSIONS

Several employee information sessions were held in Fall 2006. These sessions were attended by faculty and staff from various departments. The sessions included an overview of the project, an introduction to the curriculum, and a discussion of the benefits of participating in the project.

For more information about the HECCP project, please visit the project website or contact the project director.

Program Design Team

- William E. Mooney
- John L. McDonald
- David A. Green
- John E. Johnson
- Susan M. Nelson
- Elizabeth A. Smith
- Linda A. Thompson
- Michael A. Tipton
- Patricia A. Wood

HECCP SURVEY RESULTS

The HECCP project conducted a survey of participants to collect feedback on the program. The survey included questions about the curriculum, the pedagogy, and the overall experience. The results of the survey will be used to improve the program and to make it more effective.

Partnering with Experts

- Patricia A. Wood
- John E. Johnson
- David A. Green
- William E. Mooney

Future Newsletter Topics

- "Reflections on the Project"
- "Evaluation of the Curriculum"
- "Teacher Feedback on the Program"
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HECCP Project Goal

To: Create a classification and compensation system ("UMS Model")

For: All hourly employees at UMS

By: Teaming together to plan, design, develop, test, and implement the system

So That: We achieve extraordinary results that benefit our stakeholders inclusively.
- Employees experience a fair and sensible pay system and greater clarity on job expectations, progressions and career paths
- Employee organizations experience a fair and sensible pay system for their membership that is valid and reliable
- Leadership experiences a system that helps them attract, retain and motivate high performing employees
- UMS experiences a system that reflects its mission and compensation philosophy, and that values desired behavior and business results

Conditions: Do's
- Employ a governance structure with the following components: executive sponsor, project sponsor, steering committee, joint labor-management team, project leader, project staff and project team
- Align the system with the UMS HR mission and compensation philosophy
- Integrate the system where possible and practical with other HR programs and practices
- Engage outside expertise in higher education
- Incorporate best practices into a tailored design
- Invite all employees to be involved in the design
- Involve representatives from labor and management
- Communicate continually and fully with all stakeholders using multiple media (e.g., web, email, newsletters, face-to-face)
- Deal ethically with all involved – employees, employee organizations, and leadership

Don’ts
- Do not violate any collective bargaining agreements entered into by the University

Success Criteria: A classification and compensation system that draws on best practice principles and is:
- Culturally compatible
- Internally equitable
- Externally competitive
- Easy to administer and maintain
- Fiscally responsible
- Legally defensible
- Easy to understand and communicate
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PDQ Focus Group

Employee focus groups were held statewide and facilitated by members of the Project Team. We recorded over 100 comments and suggestions from hourly employees and supervisors who participated. Many of these ideas were incorporated into the final PDQ and Employee Information Sessions (EIS). Among those who shared their time and feedback included:

- Elinor Hague
- Jenni Hebert
- Sarah Mosley
- Paul Baresel
- Kevin Monteith
- Bill Griffiths
- Gretchen Brissette
- Murillo Stevens
- Joshua Belanger
- Kristin Hickey
- Kimberly Trider-Grant
- Rebecca Houle
- Alison Dwyer
- Arthur Drolet
- Peggy Loveless
- Paul Philbrick
- Tom Fields
- Lisa Feldman
- Christopher LeClair
- Brad Jenkins
- Chris Gardner
- Allan Smallwood
- Constance Laughlin
- Amy Goodie
- Angela Hildreth
- Lois Farris
- Nancy Smith
- Mary Fernandez
- Cheryl Spencer
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Employee Information Sessions

December 1-12
JLMT/PT/SC representation at each session where possible and practical
Campus Visits and/or PolyCon
- All Hourly Employees and Supervisors Invited
- 1 - 1.25 Hours
Primary Intent: HECCP Overview; Distribute PQ’s, review instructions, answer questions

Welcome by ERL (9min)
HECCP Overview (15min)
PQ (30min)
Q&A (15min)

Employee
- Completes pp. 1-17.
- If completing PQ electronically, then print paper copy of entire PQ. [Employees are encouraged to confer with Supervisor for help with unclear questions, etc.]
- Signs ‘employee certification’ on p. 17.
- Forwards original paper PQ to supervisor by January 5, 2009.

Supervisor and Department Head
- Reviews PQ for accuracy and completeness.
- Addresses any perceived errors and/or omissions with the employee
- Notes any additional comments, duties, etc. on p. 18.
- Places checkmark in the appropriate box on p. 19.
- Employee, Supervisor and Department Head sign on p. 19
- Distributes completed and signed PQ to Campus HR by January 19, 2009.

Campus HR
- Enters EMPID and POSSO on p.3.
- Reviews PQ for accuracy and completeness.
- Works through Supervisor and Employee to make any needed changes.
- Tracks PQ response and communicates response rate to Project Leader weekly.
- Retains original copy of final PQ for campus records.
- Distributes copies to Project Leader, SWS by January 30, 2009.

Campus Visits
- UMM 12/11: 10am, 1
- UMF 12/12: 10am, 12:30, 2
- PLA Polycon
  Wed. 12/13:
  8:30am, 10:30am, 1pm, 3pm
- UMFK 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- UMP 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- UMM 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- SYS 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- UMA 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Bath/Brunswick 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Ellsworth 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Rockland 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Rumford/Mexico 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Sac/Middlefield 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- South Paris 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Univ College - Bangor 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Calais 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Houlton 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Lewiston/Auburn 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- UMF 12/13: 10:30, 1, 3
- Musk/Augusta 12/13

Electronic EIS
- HECCP Website Available 12/12
- DVD and VHS Available 12/12

ERL Responsibilities
- by 10/31: Confirm schedule of EIS times/locations
- by 11/5: Distribute EIS invitation packet (President’s letter, HECCP flyer, etc.) inviting all hourly employees and supervisors
- by 11/19: Follow-up, sign-up & confirm attendance
- by 12/1-12: Confirm and set up EIS meeting room(s)
- by 12/1-12: Track attendance and follow-up / distribute PQ to those who do not attend
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HECCP Project Survey – Unedited Comments

Keep Doing?

- Communications to all involved.
- Lots of communication in lots of different media with the various stakeholders.
- Keep moving forward.
- I think the meetings are important in keeping everyone informed.
- Only meeting when there is something to discuss.
- Making sure that participants feel things are clear and take the process seriously. Handholding?
- Keep the web fresh and advertise regularly.
- Push forward even if money is scant.
- Communicating where the process is and keeping on schedule.
- Communication has been terrific...
- Communicating with the different participants. Keeping people informed.
- Information is good.

Start Doing?

- Perhaps let everyone know what the response rate has been with the PDQs.
- I think a "thank you" email for those who filled out the PDQs across the system should go out. We’ve done it on our campus, but maybe another sign of appreciation for their participation.
- Will need to provide brief (one paragraph) monthly updates to employees now that became actively engaged by completing PDQ's.
- Share information about the progress (how many turned in on which campuses, etc.) as well as problems encountered with both participants and supervisors.
- Communicate every couple of months on where we are with the PDQ’s.
- Begin to develop job groupings.
- Slow down.

Stop Doing?

- Nothing. Personally I believe the process has been open, informative, and progressing. Thank you.