Vision
Administrative services in an institution of higher education support the core missions of teaching, research and public service. The goal of shared administrative services in a public system is to protect the core of each institution, improve services to students, faculty and staff, and free up resources for re-investment in institutional quality.

Principles
In order to maximize quality and minimize costs in the University of Maine System, administrative services -- including information technology, student administrative services, human resources, and financial services -- should be structured along the following principles to the extent possible.

- Shared administrative services must support and be designed in the context of differentiated institutional missions.
- Common policies should be established where idiosyncratic policies are not tied to mission.
- Transaction processing should be centralized, when economically beneficial, to take advantage of technology and economies of scale and to allow university staff to focus on value-added functions.
- When centralization is not cost effective, de-centralized processes should employ common standards and policies.
- Services should be designed to collaborate with the State, K – 12 education, and other higher education institutions to facilitate seamless education Pre-K – 20.
- Individual university strengths should be utilized for the benefit of the System.

Shared services do not mean that there will be a cookie-cutter approach to providing services. The differences in campus missions, sizes and locations require that the service model be flexible. However, the service model will emphasize consolidation, integration, collaboration, and standardization in order to provide a single management structure wherever possible. Together we will strive to find the best balance of centralization and decentralization to meet the needs of students, faculty and staff in the most efficient manner possible.

Delivery Model
To insure that the goals of shared services are achieved, the delivery model must be characterized by

- A focus on students and other constituents;
- A high technology, learning environment;
- Continuous improvement;
• Avoidance of unnecessary duplication;
• Decision making at the lowest level of the organization that is consistent with other goals;
• Adequate training to meet high standards for customer service;
• Assessment to assure that services are not compromised and that savings and cost avoidance are realized; and
• Accountability to the public.

Tools
There are many obstacles to implementation of shared services in the UMS. Effective leadership and perseverance are needed to effect a change in the service delivery paradigm. Change of this magnitude requires tools such as
• an enterprise-wide planning system (ERP),
• back office service centers,
• many people working collaboratively toward a shared vision,
• organizational change and transformation,
• alignment of all functions with the UMS mission and strategic plan,
• development of an appropriate method of assessing and sharing costs of shared services, and
• standardization of practices, which will often require change from custom and habit.

Partnership
UMS leaders in finance, technology, student services, academic affairs, and human resources are committed to working in partnership to fulfill our vision of shared services within UMS. Each Strategic Direction 7 Implementation Committee is charged with addressing the shared vision in its work on the centralization of services.
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Strategic Direction 7 - Centralize the System’s business/administrative functions, where appropriate, in order to leverage resources and increase effectiveness of service throughout the System.

Executive Summary

For this period of work, the SD 7 Human Resources Committee focused on seven of the thirteen integration opportunities that were identified in our first report. The two IO’s on compensation and classification programs were combined, resulting in six areas for further development. In order to make substantial progress toward implementation we found it necessary to narrow our focus to the selected opportunities. However, we are committed to moving forward on all thirteen integration opportunities over the next several years to meet our goals of improved service, efficiency and use of technology.

The Integrations Opportunities (IO’s) that were the basis for the work during Fall 2005 are:

- Employee Development
- Compensation and Classification Program Management
- Violence on Campus
- Pre-Employment Screening
- Employee Wellness Programming
- Approval of salaries over $65,000

Background

A sub-group of the SD 7 Implementation Committee met in August 2005 to recommend how the committee could best work toward our second report. This group recommended to the full committee that we focus on seven integration opportunities and operate through six sub-committees that would include members of the Implementation Committee and others with special knowledge of each area under review. A list of all sub-committee members may be found in Appendix 1. In September the full Implementation Committee met and endorsed the recommendations about areas for further work at this time. The six sub-committees met throughout the fall and submitted reports in early December. The full committee reviewed and discussed the reports, asked questions and suggested minor revisions. The revised sub-committee reports form the foundation of this report and are appended so that the full sub-committee work is available to readers. See Appendices 2 through 7.

Recommendations

Integration Opportunity: Employee Development
**Charge:** The Staff Development Task Force was created and charged by RARAC (the UMS Risk Assessment and Review Advisory Committee) to develop and recommend a plan for sharing system-wide resources to expand employee development programs across the University of Maine System in order to avoid and reduce risks and improve employee productivity. The Task Force served as a subcommittee of Strategic Direction 7 – Human Resources.

**Background:** The Employee Development Subcommittee surveyed System Office departments to identify areas of high risk and the universities and SWS to inventory current employee development programs. We have concluded that:

- Most universities conduct new employee orientation, legally required safety training, mandated sexual harassment training, and information technology classes.
- There is no sharing of best practices, programs, or resources across the System.
- There is little to no formal leadership development at all levels of UMS.

Each university operates autonomously to identify needs, secure resources if available or “make do” with few resources, and deliver programs. Only USM and UM have staffed an employee development unit within their HR departments, but both report needs that far outstrip available resources.

**Recommendations:** UMS should adopt an integrated model for delivering employee development programs to optimize organizational effectiveness by minimizing risks and maximizing employee growth, contributions, and career satisfaction. Integration would enable universities to deliver more and better employee development opportunities by sharing the programs, resources, and expertise of the other universities. A Steering Committee led by the System Office of Human Resources should be established to plan a flexible approach to expanding employee development opportunities across UMS that augment campus initiatives. The Steering Committee should include representatives from each university and the System Office, selected representatives from large departments, and representatives from Risk Assessment and Review Advisory Committee. The Steering Committee, which could begin work in spring 2006, would:

- Identify and prioritize shared employee development needs
- Establish a clearinghouse of current UMS programs and resources
- Share curricula, workshop leaders, and materials
- Sponsor train-the-trainer programs
- Advocate support of employee development at the university and System levels
- Explore potential partnerships with other organizations
- Identify costs and recommend a cost-sharing model

Some progress can be accomplished with existing resources, but it is likely that additional staffing will be needed.

An integrated approach is highly recommended in the following areas:
• Leadership development (including supervisor development, academic management development for chairs, and programs for aspiring supervisors)
• Technical skills development
• Career planning to promote employee satisfaction and retention and to meet future staffing needs
• Orientation programs to help new employees transition to a new organization

Delivery of shared programs to different audiences would be accomplished by campus-based, centralized, outsourced (to consultants, vendors, and UMS non-credit courses), train-the-trainer, online, and asynchronous models.

The first and highest priority should be to implement a Supervisor Development Institute (SDI) patterned on the highly successful Institute created at USM. This is the focus of a feasibility study that will be completed by March 2006. The report of the study will identify costs of program implementation.

Non-budget barriers: The members of the Employee Development Task Force (which served as the sub-committee for this report) are enthused about the opportunities for sharing resources to improve employee development. However, it is possible that other university employees and administrators may be reluctant to share their resources and to adopt programs developed elsewhere within the System. Strong support for this initiative by presidents and other senior managers will be essential to its success.

Integration Opportunity: Compensation Programs

Charge: Review the way in which compensation programs are managed and consider whether greater centralization/integration of the function would result in improved service, increased efficiency and better use of technology.

Background: The sub-committee reviewed the current state of compensation program administration, solicited information from other higher education systems, and developed the pros and cons of three models of program delivery varying in the level of centralization. The sub-committee recommends adoption of the moderately centralized model subject to further review of the staffing impact on the University of Maine and the University of Southern Maine.

Recommendation: The committee recommends that UMS create a compensation/classification team. The team will report to the System Office but will be located at USM, UM and the System Office. We believe that this model can result in improved service and efficiency with the current staffing level or with the addition of one half-time or full-time staff position. This proposal will result in greater consistency and quality of compensation work and create a team to play a lead role in development, implementation and maintenance of compensation programs. All recommendations of the compensation/classification team will be reviewed by the university HR director, so that we will not lose critical local knowledge.
Current staff time devoted to classification and compensation work is estimated as 4.5 to 5.0 full-time equivalent staff System-wide. We estimate that for the future on-going state (following the current high level of activity related to a new program) there is a need for 4.3 to 5.0 FTEs system-wide dedicated to compensation/classification work. To move to the recommended model the following changes would occur:

USM: One full-time position would be re-designated to report to the System.
UM: By reallocating work within the UM HR department, 2 – 2.5 FTE could be reassigned to report to the System.
System Office: One full-time professional position would be assigned to the team. An additional position of .5 – 1.0 FTE would be created.

Responsibilities of the compensation and classification staff would include assisting with developing position descriptions, reclassification reviews, reviewing vacancies for classification, assistance with and scoring of Position Description Questionnaires, collecting market data, participating in design and maintenance of compensation programs, completing salary surveys and Fair Labor Standards Act determinations.

The committee recognizes the need for a major revision of the UMS Job Classification Program. This classification and compensation program for hourly paid positions was implemented in the late 1980’s and has no explicit tie to the labor market. Many position descriptions do not reflect changes in work that have occurred due to new technology and to the changing nature of higher education. Difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff in certain positions make it clear that the program must be revamped to provide an effective compensation structure for UMS.

Non-budget barriers: The sub-committee noted that university employees and administrators may be reluctant to accept the work of classification and compensation staff who report to the System Office, perceiving a loss of autonomy and of local university knowledge. Strong support for this initiative by presidents and other senior managers will be essential to its success.

Integration Opportunity: Violence on Campus

Charge: Address three related issues, Violence in the Workplace, Domestic Violence in the Workplace and Weapons on Campus to determine whether System-wide policies should be adopted and if so, draft proposed policies.

Background: The committee concluded that each issue was distinct and posed its own challenges; therefore three policies were developed rather than attempting to draft one comprehensive policy that spoke to all three issues. Internet searches were conducted to identify similar policies at other universities which served as models for the committee’s work. The committee concluded that the UMS Board of Trustees should adopt policies on these three important topics. The System policies should be broad and allow for university-specific procedures to carry out the policy goals.
The committee reviewed drafts of the three policies and recommended changes. After editorial work, changes were agreed and incorporated into the text of each policy, and the work group gave their approval to the attached documents. (See Appendix 4.)

**Recommendations:** The committee recommends that the draft policies be thoroughly reviewed at the campus and System level. Suggestions for changes should come back to the sub-committee for consideration. The sub-committee will then recommend policies to be presented for adoption by the UMS Board of Trustees.

**Non-budget barriers:** No barriers were identified.

Integration Opportunity: Pre Employment Screening

**Charge:** Review current UMS Background Check process/policy and consider whether checks should be mandatory and whether the process for conducting background checks should be centralized.

**Background:** Pre-employment screenings, or background checks, have been recommended by the UMS insurance carrier to help minimize the potential liability around negligent hiring actions. No current UMS policy exists and the current practice at the different campuses lacks consistency. The committee believes this is an important piece of the hiring process and warrants the investment of resources to ensure a comprehensive and consistent hiring practice.

**Recommendations:** The committee recommends that a system-wide policy be developed and that all new regular employees be required to undergo a conviction background check. Other types of pre-employment screening such as credit checks should be required for designated positions. Oversight by HR, whether at the campus or at the system level, should be required for the positions selected for checks, and the policy should include some general criteria and a process for reviewing the information received. It would be helpful in working to achieve system-wide consistency for this policy to include other pre-employment screenings such as credential verification and pre-employment physicals. There would be some potential value to consolidating these checks to one or two sites within the UMS. Because of the complexities of actually conducting the checks, we recommend that a vendor be selected to gather the background check data.

We recommend that advice be sought from a topic expert or other employers that have built a successful program for pre-employment screenings to help determine what checks are appropriate and add value to the hiring process.

To increase the acceptance by hiring officials, we recommend that the campus community receive information and background during the policy development.

**Non-budget barriers:** Conducting pre-employment screening will add workload to staff in hiring departments and to human resources and equal opportunity offices. It is
important that the benefits of this policy be well communicated and that there be strong administrative support to encourage that the screenings be consistently conducted.
Integration Opportunity: Employee Wellness

**Charge:** Review the current state and direction of wellness programming across the University of Maine System with the following goals in mind: improve efficiency – cost and return on investment (ROI); improve customer service – providing effective programs which are perceived as ‘high value’ to the customers and the UMS administration to engage employees, dependents and retirees to improve health status; and increase the use and effectiveness of technology to achieve UMS wellness goals.

**Background:** Our process was to develop three different models of wellness delivery ranging from highly centralized to highly decentralized. We then analyzed the pros and cons of each and reached consensus on a model that best achieves the above stated goals.

**Recommendation:** The UMS Health Improvement Committee’s (HIC) conclusion/recommendation strongly supports the continued expansion of the moderately centralized model currently deployed. Under this model, significant support in the form of communications, reporting, program development, funding and coordination are provided by a system-wide resource. This coordination includes benchmarking best practices and providing templates under which all of the universities are able to move forward toward common goals.

This model allows for significant collaboration across the system and provides for the most efficient use of resources. The local HIC members can leverage system-wide templates and take advantage of successes achieved at other university sites. In addition, the System-wide Director provides support and guidance as well as access to resources system-wide, state-wide and nationally. At the same time this organizational structure allows each university to move forward at its own pace, allowing for cultural differences as well as different starting points and levels of resource available.

While this recommendation will not result in any significant structural change, the committee did determine a number of valuable next steps in the use of technology that should significantly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the total program. Some specific examples are:

1. Design/maintain centralized wellness intranet for wellness coordinators.
2. Provide boilerplate ready-to-use programs designed to support specific events or program themes (nutrition, smoking, exercise etc.).
3. Provide access to state and national sites where best practices can be easily accessed
4. Provide simple reporting and data analysis tools that will allow each university to look at their own results as well as allow the system to easily assemble system-wide reporting
5. Maintain information to be shared by the system in moving forward in our goal of becoming a Wellness Council of America (WELCOA) designated Well Institution

6. Implement Blackboard chat-room to allow committee members to easily seek others’ input and share ideas.

**Non-budget barriers:** The primary barrier to success would be the reduction of support for wellness initiatives at the System or any individual university level. Since many of the people driving the wellness work are not hired primarily to do this work, reassignment of other duties could significantly impact success.

**Integration Opportunity: Approval of Salaries over $65,000**

**Charge:** Review the process, the information required and the criteria that trigger Chancellor’s salary approval.

**Background:** The committee reviewed the Board of Trustees’ policy 404.3, and gathered insight and input from colleagues at campuses not represented by subcommittee members. All of the committee’s deliberations were conducted in the context of recognizing the fiduciary responsibility the System as well as each individual campus, as a publicly funded entity, has to the citizens of the State of Maine to make prudent and justifiable salary decisions.

**Recommendations:** The subcommittee recommends that the salary level requiring Chancellor approval be increased from $65,000 to $75,000.

The subcommittee recommends that a process and timeline for regular adjustment of the level requiring Chancellor approval be established. We recommend the specified level be adjusted annually, indexed to the average of the across-the-board increases for faculty and professionals, both represented and non-represented.

The subcommittee recommends that the following statements be added to the exceptions list of those instances in which Chancellor approval is not required, as cited in guidelines for Board of Trustees Policy 404.3, in the section titled Salary Adjustments. We recommend campus-level oversight for salary adjustments or stipends for employees already at the specified level, within the parameters recommended below, with periodic reporting to the System Office. The committee had discussed exempting certain named positions, but decided that the following recommendations are stronger; they reach the same goal, but are more broad-based and would not need revision as new positions were developed in the future. They can be applied at each campus, no matter what titling structure is used.

**Additional exceptions not requiring Chancellor’s approval:**
A. Changes to job responsibilities or promotions that result in an increase to the salary base, if the current base is at the specified level or more, and the amount of the increase is 10% or less of the current salary base.

B. Payment of a stipend lasting at least one academic year which is added to the salary base, if the current base is at the specified level or more, and the amount of the stipend is 10% or less of the current base salary or the amount is within the stipend ranges established for certain titles.

The subcommittee recommends that a process be developed for System Office salary range pre-approval for hiring in certain high level, high salary positions. The campus could then hire within the range, and would forward documentation on the specific hire to the Chancellor’s Office for information purposes. This would allow for a more expedient process for making the final salary offer to the chosen candidate.

The committee appreciates careful review and consideration of its recommendations and assures that if the parameters for salary increases requiring Chancellor’s approval are modified as recommended, the campus HR offices will apply the same rigorous review and analysis currently exercised at the Chancellor’s office.

Non-Budgetary Barriers: Adoption of recommendations requires a consensus of Chancellor and Presidents about how best to balance our fiduciary responsibility for highly paid appointments with the administrative burden.

Budget

Costs to implement each of the six sets of recommendations follow:

Employee Development

For optimal implementation of the employee development model of shared resources, there will need to be a position at the System level to provide leadership, coordination and assistance in developing and delivering programs. Responsibilities and costs of this position will be further developed in the next phase of the committee’s work. Current estimates are an annual salary of $50,000 plus benefits and funding for frequent travel to universities. Expansion of employee development opportunities will also have costs for outsourced programs and contracted presenters. These costs have not been assessed. The feasibility study for the Supervisor Development Institute will provide valuable information about the resources available at each university.

Compensation Program Management

This model will have added costs for staff travel, investments in technology (for desktop computer conferencing), and additional 0.5 – 1.0 FTE. The added FTE will be needed because classification work has expanded with the implementation of the Salaried Employees Classification and Compensation Program. As we develop a new program for hourly paid
employees there will also be a temporary increase in workload related to that program. The cost of the added FTE is estimated at an annual full-time salary of $40,000 - $45,000 plus benefits. This estimate will be refined as we review the staffing impact and the potential responsibilities of the position. Implementation of these recommendations will also take advantage of other planned technology improvements including document management and PeopleSoft enhancements.

In the current model each university pays the salary, benefits and other related costs for the services provided at the university. In the proposed model the larger universities would lose FTE staff for positions reassigned to the System. The smaller universities would receive services from the System team. The issue of funding shared services crosses various service areas (finance, HR, IT, student services) and should be addressed on a larger cross functional basis.

**Violence in the Workplace**

There are no costs associated with adoption of the proposed policies by the Board of Trustees. Universities may have modest costs of communicating and educating employees and others about the policies. Adoption of policies will assist in better management of these issues, resulting in long-term savings.

**Pre-employment screening**

Initial costs will include retaining an outside expert to consult on appropriate parameters of the policy. If we identify a human resources practitioner in higher education with this expertise, consulting costs will be modest, perhaps $15,000. Ongoing costs will be fees charged by an outside vendor to conduct the pre-employment screening checks required. This is not a new cost for the larger campuses and System-wide contracting may reduce the cost per transaction. The smaller campuses do not currently conduct screening of this sort, so the fees will be an added cost. The sub-committee recommends that this cost be passed onto the hiring department. A positive return on investment is expected as screening results in better hiring decisions.

**Wellness**

No additional funding will be required if the current sources of funding continue, including current staffing levels at the universities, wellness funding from Anthem and the availability of small wellness grants within the UMS. Return on investment in terms of employee health and morale exceeds the investment.

**Salaries over $65,000**

There is no cost associated with adoption of the recommendations. There will be minor savings in staff time for processing the approvals and time savings in the hiring process.
Budget Summary:

Ongoing costs:
1.5 – 2.0 FTE – Salaries up to $95,000 plus benefits

Note: Further work is needed to determine whether additional support staff will also be necessary due to the high volume of scheduling, logistics, and preparation of materials related to both employee development and compensation/classification work.

Instate travel $20,000 per year –to be minimized as much as possible by use of technology. This estimate assumes an average 200 miles per week for each of 5 staff (3 in compensation, 1 in wellness and 1 in employee development).

Fees for pre-employment screenings –to be estimated as work proceeds

One-time costs
Consultant to assist with pre-employment screening policy development, up to $15,000

Decision Making Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (urgency, benefits)</th>
<th>Cost (financial and effort)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Violence in the workplace policies; • Wellness program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Salaries over $65,000 process revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Timeline
Employee Development

Spring 2006
• Complete feasibility study for Supervisor Development Institute
• Further review staffing needs for coordination and development of integrated model
• Recommend first steps in implementation of Supervisor Development Institute
• Recommend charge and composition for Steering Committee
• Further explore intersections with Strategic Direction 2 regarding faculty development

Fall 2006
• Appoint and charge ongoing Steering Committee
• Begin implementation of Supervisor Development Institute at universities

Compensation Program Management

Spring 2006
• Move forward with planning for Hourly Employee Classification and Compensation Program (HECCP)
• Further review impact of recommendations on staffing at UM and USM
• Further review needed FTE for System-wide team
• Further explore intersections with Strategic Direction 2 regarding compensation targets

Fall 2006
• Collect information about hourly paid positions through an instrument similar to Position Descriptions Questionnaire and continue development of HECCP
• Subject to approval, create System-wide classification and compensation team by reassigning existing staff to report to the System Office

Violence on Campus

Spring 2006
• Conduct broad review of proposed policies and consider input received
• Make final recommendation regarding proposed policies

Fall 2006
• Submit proposed policies for Board of Trustee adoption

Pre-Employment Screenings

Spring 2006
• Identify and contract with an outside resource to assist in developing parameters of pre-employment screening policy
• Draft a Request for Proposals for outside vendor to conduct pre-employment screenings
• Estimate initial one-time costs and ongoing costs

Fall 2006
• Make final recommendation for Board of Trustees policy and administrative practices related to pre-employment screening
• Subject to approval, distribute RFP and select vendor
Calendar year 2007
• Begin conducting pre-employment screenings in accordance with policy and administrative procedures

Wellness

Spring 2006 and ongoing
• Work through the Health Improvement Committee and with the Wellness Coordinator and Director of Compensation and Benefits to fully implement committee recommendations, taking advantage of new technology as it is available.

Approval of Salaries over $65,000

Spring 2006
• Present recommendations to Chancellor and Presidents for consideration and immediately implement any changes approved
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Report of Sub-Committee on Employee Development

December 9, 2005

Background

The Employee Development Task Force was created and charged by RARAC (the UMS Risk Assessment and Review Advisory Committee) to develop and recommend a plan for sharing system-wide resources to expand employee development programs across the University of Maine System in order to avoid and reduce risks and improve employee productivity. The Task Force has since also become a subcommittee of Strategic Direction 7 – Human Resources Integration, which is responsible for recommending areas where greater centralization of employee development functions is appropriate. During the recent Strategic Plan Implementation Planning period, the Task Force met three times (9/21, 11/8, 11/29), including a joint meeting with members of the Strategic Direction 2 Committee on faculty support and development to explore areas of mutual interest. This report describes the analysis conducted to date by the Task Force and preliminary recommendations.

Needs assessment and current state

The Task Force collected and reviewed data from System Office departments (data are for FY04 unless otherwise noted) that indicate UMS risk exposure in the following areas:

- Workers’ compensation and environmental accidents/injuries
  191 total cases
  669 employee days out of work
  2916 employee restricted duty days
  $511,374 in expenses
- Insurance claims ($14,000 paid, $76,000 held in reserve)
- Grievances (70)
- Discrimination complaints
  13 complaints filed externally
  13 formal complaints filed internally
  Numerous informal complaints (data not available)
- Employee misconduct investigations (data not available)
- Cases litigated (5)
- Performance evaluations completed (FY03 audit showed completion rates ranging as low as 30% at some universities, excluding faculty evaluations)

The Task Force also gathered and analyzed information from SWS departments and each university regarding in-house employee development programs that are conducted to limit risk exposure and improve productivity. A review of current programs reveals that:
- New employee orientation, legally required safety training, mandated sexual harassment training, and information technology classes are the areas in which most of the universities currently conduct employee development programs.
- The necessary legally mandated training programs appear to be in place at each university.
- Best practices and resources are not shared across the System. As a result, universities “reinvent the wheel” to implement programs and have significant gaps in areas where other campuses have already implemented programs.
- There is little to no formal leadership development all levels of UMS (with one notable exception at USM, discussed further below).

Each university operates autonomously to identify employee development needs, secure resources if available, and deliver employee development programs. USM and UM have established and professionally staffed an employee education and development unit within their human resource departments, but both report needs that far outstrip available resources. Other campuses have no staff for whom employee development is a significant assigned responsibility. Specialized and technical training is normally provided by sending employees to external programs.

Coordination of campus employee development programming would allow for better use of existing resources and expansion of effective programs throughout UMS.

**Vision**

Employee development programs can be one effective solution to reducing the number and level of risks. Studies have shown that organizations that invest proactively in effective employee development reap return-on-investment from improved employee performance, reduced liabilities associated with poor performance, and improved employee career development, morale, and retention.

UMS should adopt an integrated model for investing in expanded employee development programs to optimize organizational effectiveness by minimizing risks and maximizing employee growth, contributions, and career satisfaction. Integration would enable campuses to deliver more and better employee development opportunities, share resources and expertise, yet maintain local autonomy.

**Recommended priority areas and target populations**

The Task Force has identified categories of employee development programs for which UMS should explore an integrated approach.

- Leadership development for employees at varied stages in their career, including:
  - Supervisor development
  - Academic management development for chairs
Programs for aspiring supervisors and managers
- Technical skills development (to take advantage of new technology, meet licensing requirements)
- Career planning to promote employee satisfaction and retention and to meet the University’s future staffing needs (comparable to faculty career development opportunities that enable faculty advance within their institution)
- Orientation programs to help new employees transition to a new organization

The most urgent priority need recommended by the Task Force is to provide a broad program of supervisor development so that supervisors throughout UMS are able to:

- Manage employee performance for improved productivity
- Assess employee performance to recognize contributions, identify and correct problems at an early stage, and encourage employees to attain goals that benefit the organization and the individual
- Comply with collective bargaining agreements, employee handbooks, and legal requirements
- Communicate effectively
- Identify and use available resources
- Develop networks with other supervisors that provide mutual growth and support

USM created a supervisor development program five years ago that delivers classroom instruction and practice in a series of modules (40+ hours total) that are critical to supervisor success. University staff drawn from across the campus, who have expertise in one or more areas, serve as volunteer presenters, and the program has visible support from senior USM management. Sixty-two USM supervisors have completed this program, with another cohort currently enrolled. Originally designed for new supervisors, the program has also attracted veteran supervisors seeking pointers or a refresher course. The program has received excellent evaluations from participants and their managers. Some large departments consider the program so successful in building needed supervisor skills that they have had many supervisors participate.

The Task Force strongly recommends that the USM program be adapted for delivery at each university. This recommendation will also be made to RARAC and Presidents Council. Local resources – seasoned managers, faculty with relevant expertise, human resources and equal opportunity staff – and System Office staff offer a ready pool of skilled workshop leaders. Use of internal talent to deliver an existing, successful program adapted to meet other universities’ needs would result in cost-effective, timely employee development for large numbers of supervisors throughout UMS. The System Office of Human Resources has engaged USM’s co-manager of staff development programs, who designed and implemented the supervisor development program, to conduct a feasibility study to determine whether and how it could be tailored to other universities and whether there is leadership support for the program. The report from the feasibility study will be completed by March 1, 2006 and will include estimated costs of implementing the program at the universities.
**Integrated approach**

A system-wide Employee Development Steering Committee led by the System Office of Human Resources should be established to plan a flexible, integrated approach to expanding employee development opportunities across UMS that augments individual campus staff development initiatives. The Steering Committee would include representatives from each university and the System Office whose responsibilities include employee development or who are knowledgeable about campus needs, selected representatives from departments that are large potential consumers of employee development programs, and representatives from RARAC. The Steering Committee (which would meet regularly) would be the structure for a formal partnership among the Universities and the System Office to:

- Identify and prioritize shared employee development needs
- Establish a clearinghouse of current UMS employee development programs and resources
- Share curricula, workshop leaders, and materials
- Sponsor train-the-trainer programs
- Advocate for support for employee development at the university and System level

All campuses, particularly smaller campuses with no current employee development resources, would benefit from the increased opportunities for and coordination of employee development programs under the Steering Committee’s umbrella.

The Task Force considered and rejected decentralized and centralized alternatives to an integrated model for developing and conducting an enhanced program of employee development. The decentralized model is the current state. It fails to take advantage of synergies among the universities and would continue to leave smaller campuses without the capacity to offer programs for their employees. A centralized model, such as the approach used in State Government, is not politically or financially feasible for UMS for the foreseeable future.

**Delivery models**

Various models are available for delivering more coordinated employee development programs:

- Campus-based model (campus conducts programs for its employees)
- Centralized model (employees from multiple campuses attend programs at a central location)
- Outsourcing (use consultants/vendors to provide customized employee development programs or send employees to commercially available programs, including university CED courses)
- Train-the-trainer model (use current UMS or external resources to train campus staff, who then conduct programs at their own campus)
- Hybrid model
Different models will work for different types of program based on such variables as:

- Effectiveness for and size of the specific target audience
- Quality and consistency of programs
- Costs of programs vs. risks to be managed
- Potential use of technology (e.g., PolyCom, online courses, asynchronous courses)

A Steering Committee could be formed and begin work by spring, 2006.

**Resources required**

Some coordination and sharing of existing programs can be done with current staffing. It is anticipated, however, that additional staffing will be needed to expand the range of programs and deliver them to wider target groups.
Appendix 3
Strategic Direction 7 – Human Resources
Report of Sub-Committee on Compensation and Classification Programs

December 12, 2005

Charge and Process

The charge of this sub-committee is to review the way in which compensation programs are managed and to consider whether greater centralization/integration of the function would result in improved service, increased efficiency and better use of technology.

To approach this task the committee reviewed current UMS compensation programs and how they are administered at each university, collected information from several other higher education institutions about management of compensation programs, and developed three archetypes for compensation program management within UMS. The archetypes ranged from the current system (centralized for program design and largely de-centralized for program operation) to a moderately centralized program (regional delivery of service housed at universities and reporting to the System) to a highly centralized model (staff housed at and reporting to the System). We determined the pros and cons of each archetype and assessed the impact of moving from the status quo to a more centralized/integrated model.

Recommendation

The committee recommends that UMS adopt the moderately centralized model. Under this model, a UMS compensation/classification team will be created. The team will report to the System Office but will be located at USM, UM and the System Office. The centralized reporting is important so that each university will be confident it is receiving the appropriate attention of the team, that time and resources are not given disproportionately to the campuses where the staff are located. The team will regularly consult and work together through use of technology such as web cams, phone and video conferencing. Team members will also travel to the other campuses to conduct work and to build their knowledge to campus operations, structure and culture. However, to the extent possible work will be carried out by technology to avoid travel costs.

We believe that this model can result in improved service and efficiency with the current staffing level or with the addition of one half-time staff position. In addition it will free up time of university HR staff at UMA, UMF, UMM, UMPI, and UMFK to improve HR services. Because the staff FTE devoted to classification and compensation at each of those campuses is a fraction of an FTE, ranging from about .1 to .5, it is not likely that any positions can be eliminated. However, the greater expertise and efficiencies of scale from positions dedicated to compensation and classification work combined with reporting to the System will result in greater consistency and quality of compensation work and create a team that can play a lead role in development, implementation and maintenance of compensation programs.
An important aspect of this proposal is that all recommendations of the compensation/classification team will be reviewed by the university HR director. The director at the university level has important knowledge of the campus structure and culture and of the employees that is essential to quality decisions regarding classification and compensation of individual positions. With this review feature we will not lose the critical local knowledge that is a major positive feature of the current model. This university involvement is also critical to maintaining employee and manager trust in the process that is built on their confidence in the local HR staff.

Current staff time devoted to classification and compensation work is estimated as follows:

- UMPI: 0.2 – .25 FTE
- UMFK: 0.1 FTE
- UM: 2.0
- UMA: 0.2
- USM: 1.0 – 1.33
- SWS: 0.5
- UMM: 0.1
- UMF: 0.2

These estimates include time spent on the following activities:
- Position reviews (classified and professional)
- Completing salary surveys
- Writing job descriptions
- PDQ ratings
- Reviewing classified and professional vacancies for classification
- FLSA determinations

At the smaller universities this work is one of many hats that a staff member wears. Only UM, USM and UMS have employees whose major assignment is as a compensation analyst. We estimate that for the future on-going state (following the current high level of activity related to a new program) there is a need for 4.3 - 5.0 FTEs system-wide dedicated to compensation/classification work. To move to the recommended model the following changes would need to occur:

USM: One full-time position would be re-designated to report to the System. The employee in this position currently spends about 80% of time on compensation and classification work. In the revised model this position plus an added half-time position would provide compensation and classification services to USM, UMF, and UMA.

UM: Classification and compensation work is now spread among six employees and totals 2 – 2.5 FTE. One employee has a full-time assignment to this function. By reallocating work within the UM HR department, 2 – 2.5 FTE could be reassigned to report to the System and provide compensation and classification work for UM, SWS, UMM, UMFK, UMPI and UCB.
One professional position and one support position at the System Office currently provide compensation and classification services, totaling approximately .5 FTE. The professional position would be assigned full-time to this work and would be a part of the team providing service to UM, SWS, UMPI, UMM, UMFK, and UCB. The System Office would also provide limited administrative support staff time.

Responsibilities of the compensation and classification staff would include:

- Assisting with developing position descriptions
- Reclassification reviews for professional and classified positions – perhaps phased in first for professional positions
- Reviewing classified and professional vacancies for classification
- Assistance with and scoring of PDQ’s
- Collecting market data
- Participating in design and maintenance of compensation programs
- Completing salary surveys
- FLSA (Fair Labor Standards Act) determinations

The work for this team could be assigned on a regional basis or with specialization for specified employee groups or job families. Benefits of having a team include the ability to consult with each other, the ability to provide back up for leaves or vacancies, and the ability to smooth the peaks and valleys of workflow by picking up work from each other as needed.

The committee recognizes that the need for a major revision of the UMS Job Classification Program. This classification and compensation program for hourly paid positions was implemented in the late 1980’s and has no explicit tie to the labor market. Positions descriptions do not reflect changes in work that have occurred due to new technology and to the changing nature of higher education. Difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff in certain positions make it clear that the program must be revamped to provide an effective compensation structure for UMS.

**Impacts of proposed model**

**Added Costs**

- Travel for staff to periodically conduct business at campus locations
- Investments in technology to facilitate team work
- Additional 0.5 FTE
- Cost allocation issues for reassigned positions

The committee recognizes the issues raised regarding the costs of compensation/classification service. In the current model each university pays the salary, benefits and other related costs for the services provided at the university. In the proposed model the larger universities would lose FTE staff for positions reassigned to the System. The smaller universities would receive services from the System team. Would the salaries of the reassigned staff stay with the university or be re-allocated to the System? Would the costs of the System team be charged out to the universities? Any system of charging would
add costs to the smaller universities which will not be able to eliminate positions because only a fraction of a position performs compensation and classification work. The committee believes that this issue crosses various service areas (finance, HR, IT, student services) and should be addressed on a larger cross functional basis.

**Technology Needs**

- Document management to facilitate sharing of documents such as position description questionnaires
- Web cam and/or video conferencing to enable team work
- Better integration of compensation programs with People Soft to ensure accurate employee and position information
- Better use of technology for employee self service (e.g. computer-based communications on how to fill out PDQ's with pop-up screens, etc.).

**Measures of success**

- Improved turn-around-time
- Greater efficiency
- Greater employee and manager confidence in the Classification and Compensation and Position Review processes
- Fewer appeals overall and of those appeals actually processed, fewer that result in overturning initial determinations
- Need baseline and post implementation data

**Future Committee Work**

Following receipt of feedback about our work to date, the committee will continue to explore and develop the recommendation. We plan to ask managers and employees to review and comment on our recommendation in a focus group session. This will provide some baseline information about how compensation/classification services are currently perceived, what improvements can be made and perceived advantages or disadvantages of the recommended model.

In order to move further toward implementation of the recommendation we need to:

1. Collect more detailed information about the volume of work at each university. This will allow us to test our assumptions about staffing needed and allow us to better assess the impact of the recommendations on staffing at UM and USM;

2. Assess the availability and cost of the technology improvements needed to put the proposed model in place;

3. Get more detailed information about how compensation/classification work is carried out at each university by involving more employees who directly provide these services;

4. Get more information about the changes being implemented by the State of Maine which is moving to a regionalized model.
Attachments

1. Practices from other employers
   A. Maine Community College System
   B. State of Maine
   C. University System of New Hampshire
   D. University of Georgia System
   E. Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education

2. Three archetypes for managing compensation and classification programs with pros and cons.
A. Maine Community College System:
- Very centralized
- Only 750 employees system-wide
- 5 CBA's plus non-reps
- Each campus has an HR liaison that reports to campus CFO
- Have ability to hire up to mid-point of range. If want to go higher have to go to HR director at central office. Follow State classification system but have different pay scales (Hay-like system)
- Classification and re-class including unit determinations and FLSA determinations done centrally
- Will be re-doing their classification system within next two years
- Two tracks for faculty: Technical and “academic.” Ranges are the same but they progress differently.
- Do not have academic ranks. Do not have tenure.
- Very centralized.
- Work closely with unions.

B. State of Maine

The State of Maine was highly centralized; then went to decentralized; now going to three regional centers (DHS, DOT, & Correctional Facilities). Goals are to reduce expenses, increase efficiency and consistency, improve service, and strengthen resources for smaller agencies.

C. University System of New Hampshire

Very similar to system we are moving in to. Interesting: want to add ‘pay for competency.’ Faculty unionized. Professional non-supervisory positions – new category. Moderately centralized.

D. University of Georgia System

Very decentralized system. Have no classification system, but “regional” market information is very important. Non-academic positions are “area” regional and academic positions were checked with CUPA. Presidents have final decision on all positions. Only Benefits highly centralized - FLSA.

E. Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education

Some ways highly centralized and some ways like our current decentralized model.
Attachment 2
Compensation Programs
Three Archetypes with Pros and Cons

Current model:

**Classification and Compensation staff** – some campuses have specialized staff, some campuses have generalists perform this responsibility, limited staff at System level

**Program design and maintenance** – collaborative between System and universities; System plays lead role

**Classification decisions** – at campus level with some System oversight

**Position reviews** – at campus level with some System oversight

**Develop and deliver training, procedures and implementation tools** – System provides assistance in providing procedures and tools, campus conducts training; historically there has been limited training and development of tools

**Market data** – Collected at System level for SECCP; at campus level for other positions and market impacted positions; surveys completed primarily at campus level

**Individual salary setting** – primarily at campus level by hiring department/HR/EEO

**Setting short and long term goals and priorities for compensation programs** – not done in any formal way

Current State structure Pros and Cons:

Con:

- Inconsistency
- Overwhelming workload
- Inability to be the expert
- Lack of timeliness
- “Political” pressure to make a classification decision

Pro:

- Local knowledge
- Customer service
- Provides consistency - centralized

Moderately Centralized:

**Classification and Compensation staff** – Highly qualified analysts located at two or three campus locations provide regional service, report to System OHR Compensation Manager. University HR director has review and input regarding decisions for positions at the university.

**Program design and maintenance** – Collaborative between system and universities, with labor intensive work done by classification and compensation staff

**Classification decisions** – Classification and compensation staff, with review and input of university HR
Position reviews – Classification and compensation staff, with review and input of university HR

Develop and deliver training, procedures and implementation tools – Classification and Compensation staff

Market data -- Collected at System level for SECCP; by Classification and Compensation staff for other positions and market impacted positions; surveys completed by Classification and Compensation staff

Individual salary setting --primarily at campus level by hiring department/HR/EEO, with support from classification and compensation staff

Setting short and long term goals and priorities for compensation programs – collaborative between System and campus with data analysis prepared by Compensation and Classification staff

**Moderately centralized structure Pros and Cons:**

a) Central reporting/geographically dispersed (someone on each campus playing the ‘Class and Comp’ role, at least part-time)

**Pro:**
- Local knowledge

**Con:**
- Having two hats/two bosses
- Too many jobs/hats (especially at the smaller campuses)
- Too dependent on single incumbent with competency; no coverage or back up

b) Central reporting/2 or 3 ‘Class and Comp’ people regionally dispersed

**Pro:**
- Good support and back-fill if someone were out.
- Must centralize reporting with regional workers
- No ivory tower affect; campus based
- Balances the two concepts - local knowledge and interlocked with the other person(s) and get rating/volume; located at a campus location but connected to the team
- Could have rotating team leader, team constantly interacting with each other
- Would highlight things that aren’t working well and could raise issue
- Improved employee relations and employee confidence because of deliberation within the team

**Con:**
- Duplication of effort

**Con/Pro:**
- Loss of campus decision-making

**Con:**
- Volume of work – some campuses may feel they are being left out or loss of service
Could be a greater cost because the “specialist” would need to be hired to replace the generalist

Pro:
- Employee has a campus contact
- Would relieve the generalist of wearing so many hats, especially at the smaller campuses.

Highly Centralized:

**Classification and Compensation Staff** – Highly qualified analysts located at and report to System Office

**Program design and maintenance** – Collaborative between system and universities, with labor intensive work done by classification and compensation staff

**Classification decisions** – Classification and compensation staff

**Position reviews** – Classification and compensation staff

**Develop and deliver training, procedures and implementation tools** – Classification and Compensation staff

**Market data** -- Collected at System level for SECCP; by Classification and Compensation staff for other positions and market impacted positions; surveys completed by Classification and Compensation staff

**Individual salary setting** -- primarily at campus level by hiring department/HR/EEO, with support from classification and compensation staff

**Setting short and long term goals and priorities for compensation programs** – collaborative between System and campus with data analysis prepared by Compensation and Classification staff

---

**Highly centralized structure Pros and Cons:**

Pro:
- In central location – experts “synergy,” more certain of consistency, coverage, sharing information; “expertise gained through volume.”
- Protection from pressure at a campus (insulation with central reporting)

Con:
- Someone, somewhere will have to travel to do PDQ's or have someone at campus to do it. Data collection would be lost without the face-to-face interview. Not a lot of savings (due to duplication).
- Even with great technology centralized, would need to go back to campus for more info.
- Customer service – loss of comfort/feeling if not face-to-face, especially for a small campus.
- When you’re highly centralized could lose touch with the real needs of the campuses.
Technology – All three archetypes will be improved by document management and workflow. Compensation programs must be integrated into PeopleSoft to eliminate the need for shadow systems and to reduce errors. PS will contain factors, points, and job family information and will calculate wage/salary band, etc.

11/21/05
Appendix 4
Strategic Direction #7 -- Human Resources
Report of the Sub-Committee on Violence on Campus

The group was assigned to address three related issues, Violence in the Workplace, Domestic Violence in the Workplace and Weapons on Campus.

In its initial meeting the group concluded that each issue was distinct and posed its own challenges therefore three policies were developed rather than attempt to draft on comprehensive policy that spoke to all three issues. Sub teams were formed around each issue and members were asked to develop draft policy language for review and consideration by the whole work group.

Internet searches were conducted to identify similar policies at other Universities which served as models for the committee’s work.

At its second meeting the group reviewed drafts of the three policies and recommended changes. After editorial work, changes were agreed and incorporated into the text of each policy the work group gave their approval to the attached documents.

The committee recommends that the draft policies be thoroughly reviewed at the campus and System level. Suggestions for changes should come back to the sub-committee for consideration. The sub-committee will then recommend policies to be presented for adoption by the UMS Board of Trustees.
The University of Maine System is committed to providing a safe and secure environment for all members of the University community in its operations and activities. This commitment includes the prevention of domestic violence within the University Community, working to support faculty and staff who are victims of domestic violence to prevent abuse and harassment from occurring in the workplace, and to reduce its impact on employee well-being and productivity.

The University of Maine System will not tolerate domestic violence, including harassment in any of its offices, facilities, work sites, vehicles, or while a University employee is conducting University business. This includes the display of any violent or threatening behavior (verbal or physical) that may result in physical or emotional injury or otherwise places one’s safety and productivity at risk.

Any faculty or staff member who threatens, harasses, or abuses a spouse or domestic partner at the workplace or from the workplace using any university resources may be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including, termination.

All faculty and staff need to take seriously the problem of domestic violence and its effect in the workplace. The University will take reasonable measures to foster a safe working environment for all faculty, staff and students.

II. DEFINITIONS:

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: Domestic violence is abusive behavior that is physical, sexual, and/or psychological, and serves to establish and maintain control over a spouse or domestic partner. Domestic violence affects people from all walks of life and can adversely affect the well-being and productivity of faculty and staff who are victims, as well as their co-workers. Other effects of domestic violence in the workplace may include increased absenteeism, turnover, health care costs, and reduced productivity.

B. VICTIM: A person who is subject to an act of domestic violence as defined above.

C. PERPETRATOR: A person who commits an act of domestic violence as defined above.

III. IMPLEMENTATION:

Each University of Maine System member University shall adopt procedures, consistent with this policy, to address and prevent domestic violence in the workplace, classroom, recreational and residential facilities in order to promote a safe and secure environment for all members of the campus community in its operations and activities. Each University shall provide the Chancellor, on June 1st of each year, the name of the campus designated University official charged with receiving reports of domestic violence in the workplace under this policy.
Adopted procedures should include methods to:

Provide appropriate support and assistance to faculty and staff who are victims of domestic violence. This may include confidential means for seeking help, resource and referral information, work schedule adjustments or leave, as needed, to obtain assistance, and workplace relocation, if feasible.

Ensure no faculty or staff member will be penalized or disciplined solely for being a victim of harassment in the workplace.

Require faculty and staff who are victims of domestic violence are expected to cooperate with the University in developing and instituting approaches to their assistance.

Provide information for faculty and staff who are perpetrators of domestic violence to seek assistance. This may include the provision of information regarding counseling and certified treatment resources, and where feasible facilitate assistance for employees.
Policy Statement

The University of Maine System is committed to protecting the health and safety of all members of the University community in its operations and activities. In order to ensure a safe environment, the University of Maine System prohibits, with the exception of duly sworn law enforcement personnel engaged in official duties, the wearing, transporting, storage, or presence of firearms or other dangerous weapons in our facilities or on our property.

Any employee in possession of a firearm or other dangerous weapon while in our facilities/property, or while otherwise fulfilling job responsibilities, may face disciplinary action up to and including termination. A student who violates this policy may face disciplinary action up to and including expulsion. A visitor who violates this policy may be removed from the property and reported to police authorities. Possession of a valid concealed weapons permit authorized by the State of Maine is not an exemption under this policy.

Definition

A firearm or other dangerous weapon is a firearm or other weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which is capable of producing death or serious bodily injury. This may include, but is not limited to devices from which a projectile (e.g., arrow, ball, bullet, missile, pellet, shell, or other material) may be fired, certain knives, objects used as clubs that pose reasonable risk of injury.

Implementation

Individual campuses and organizational units shall establish appropriate procedures that:

1. Prohibit the presence, wearing, transporting, storing, displaying, using, or possessing weapons in University facilities or on University property.
2. Provide for, if desired or needed, University controlled storage of weapons for residents, employees, and academic or recreational programs that may require the use of weapons.
3. Provide for, if desired, a process to grant temporary permission in writing to an individual to possess a weapon or ammunition on campus for instructional purposes and/or other special circumstances.
4. Provide for notification and disciplinary action of any employee, faculty, student, or other representative of the University who violates the weapons policy under existing applicable disciplinary processes.
5. Provide for notification of any member of the general public who violates the weapons policy. In addition, for members of the public who refuse to comply with the weapons policy, procedures shall be established to remove the individual from campus and subject the individual to all applicable legal penalties including criminal trespass provisions under Maine Law.
6. Provide exemptions for:
   a. Duly sworn law enforcement personnel engaged in official duties,
   b. Security personnel engaged in official duties, and
   c. Any person engaged in military activities sponsored by federal or state government, while engaged in official duties.
7. Provide for notification of this policy and local procedures within the University community. This may include conspicuously posted “No Firearms or other Dangerous Weapons” signs within all facilities, parking areas, and grounds. These signs must clearly indicate that firearms and other weapons are not to be carried onto University property.
property or into University facilities. Other campus provisions for notification of employees, students and visitors may be used including written handbooks, brochures, or inclusion in other training programs.
HUMAN RESOURCES AND LABOR RELATIONS
Section xxx Campus Violence Policy

Policy Statement

The University of Maine System is committed to providing a safe and secure environment of all members of the University community in its operations and activities. This commitment includes prevention of violence in the workplace, classroom, recreational and residential facilities. The University System takes pride in its tradition of maintaining a civil and non-violent learning, working and social environment. Civility and mutual respect towards all members of the University Community are essential for effective teaching, learning and work performance.

The University of Maine System has zero tolerance for acts of violence against any member of the University community (i.e. students, faculty, staff, administrators, and visitors).

Workplace violence for the purpose of this policy is defined as any physical assault, threatening behavior or verbal abuse occurring on University premises or while conducting University business. It includes, but is not limited to beatings, stabbings, shootings, sexual assaults, punching or striking another, physiological traumas, such as threats, obscene phone calls or gestures and harassment of any nature such as stalking.

The University shall strive to provide assistance and referrals to external supports for persons who are victims of violence on campus.

Reporting

Any person who experiences, witnesses or who has information about an alleged threat or violent act should immediately contact the designated University official. All supervisors and administrators must immediately contact a University or unit designated official to report violations of this policy as soon as they become aware of an act of alleged workplace violence.

Consequences

All reports of incidents of workplace violence will be fully investigated. Violation of this policy may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination, expulsion from the University, and/or civil and criminal prosecution. The University will report, as required, instances of violence on campus to appropriate law enforcement agencies and fully cooperate with local law enforcement agencies during any investigation.

Implementation
Each University shall adopt procedures, consistent with this policy, to address and prevent violence in the workplace, classroom, recreational and residential facilities in order to promote a safe and secure environment for all members of the campus community in its operation and activities. Each University shall designate one or more individual(s) to serve as the recipient of reports of violence on campus.
Appendix 5
Strategic Direction # 7 – Human Resources
Report of the Sub-Committee on Pre-Employment Screening

The charge for this committee was to review current UMS policy Background Check process/policy and consider whether to recommend that checks should be mandatory and whether the process for conducting background checks should be centralized.

Background checks are a growing trend among larger employers to limit the liability of negligent hires. Applicants with convictions in their past may be discouraged from applying for a position when they know that a background check will be conducted. A formal and consistent background check process would be a positive part of a best practices hiring process at the University of Maine System.

The background check process at the campuses has evolved at different paces since the draft policy developed in 1989. More comprehensive programs exist at the larger campuses because of the larger number of hires. Some position advertisements mention that a check will be conducted. An external vendor is used by at least two campuses to conduct the checks.

The following are the issues we considered and the consensus of the committee’s recommendations and areas for further work:

1. *Should UMS formalize a policy requiring Background Checks?* Yes.
2. *Should UMS seek the advice of an outside expert/consultant to help develop the policy, including guidelines on targeted positions, checks to be conducted, and other details?* Yes. During the short time available for our discussions, it has become apparent that this is a complex area and the need for expert and objective advice is needed to develop a well thought out policy to achieve an example of an employment best practice. External, expert advice could help add credibility to the need for a policy and facilitate the acceptance at all levels of the organization.
3. *What positions should be covered by this policy?* We recommend that finalists for all regular faculty, professional and classified positions be required to undergo a conviction background check. Other positions, based on the nature of the position’s duties and responsibilities, should be required to undergo appropriate checks (credit, driving, etc.). We are not recommending that student employees, temporary employees, graduate assistants or independent contractors be included at this time.
4. *What checks would be conducted?* Conviction, driving, credit checks, and based on recommendations from our insurance carriers and involved vendors, additional checks might be added. Insurance carriers and vendors recommend additional types of checks. The return on investment to the hiring process should be investigated further. What is the appropriate time frame to be considered? How can we reliably determine the geographic regions that should be checked? Gathering some of the information needed to conduct background checks (social security number, date of birth) may be problematic before a job offer is made.
Should employees who were required to undergo a conviction record check be required to disclose information about future convictions (felonies and/or misdemeanors)?

5. Should criteria and formal definitions exist to help the HR staff who will be assigned to conduct the checks assess the results? Yes. Guidelines would help to ensure consistency over time and over a variety of position types. Before a decision is made not to hire someone, UMS HR staff and/or University counsel should be consulted to ensure that the decision is appropriate and complies with applicable laws and regulations. We also recommend the development of examples and standards for deciding when to conduct follow-up checks or what remedial action or job modifications could or should be considered to mitigate concerns raised by a background check. It will also be important for clear distinctions to be made between traffic, civil and criminal offenses. University counsel should be consulted in the policy development process and should be asked to review the recommended policy.

6. Should the checks be conducted by the campus or UMS OHR office? We recommend oversight from HR for public safety and child care departments. We believe there could be potential economies of scale and consistency in administration by having one or two locations conduct the checks. Because of the experience and volume handled at UM and USM, those campus procedures should be considered as a potential model for systemwide administrative procedures.

7. Should the gathering of information to complete Background Checks be outsourced to a vendor? The committee has found this area to be complex with a high risk potential. We recommend that UMS solicit bids from an external consultant, experienced in this area, to assist in developing a process for conducting the checks. We further recommend that UMS consider inviting vendors to submit proposals for conducting checks for the entire system. UMS staff would have the capability to conduct conviction and driving checks within Maine. The vendor’s task would be to solicit checks for conviction records outside of Maine, when indicated, credit reports and other reports that may be necessary. Staff have already encountered situations where background information may not be available. One option might be to require those finalists to provide the requested information.

8. Should a sexual offender check be routinely conducted for all people selected for regular positions? Yes. This information is now readily accessible.

9. Should physical screenings be included as part of the policy? Yes. The procedures in use at campuses that now do these screenings (for positions requiring strength or specific physical capacities as well as those positions exposed to hazardous environmental conditions) could be adopted to achieve consistency throughout the system. These screenings are now position specific and at UM done in consultation with Safety and Environmental Management. To avoid delays in the hiring process, these screenings should be conducted at a location convenient to the selected finalist. Standards for the nature of the screenings and the type of provider/facility should be developed.
10. **Should fingerprints and/or photos be gathered as part of the screening process?**
   The earlier draft policy recommended doing fingerprints for financially sensitive positions. A file photo could be useful so we recommend a photo University ID card be required of all regular employees as an easy, inexpensive and unobtrusive method for gathering photos. A system to maintain copies of the photos would need to be developed. We suggest that the photo not be included in the background check process but as part of the actual hiring.

11. **Should the established process of credential verification be included in a Background Check policy?**
   Yes. We recommend that the current practice across the campuses of decentralizing this to the hiring department not be changed. We recommend that these guidelines be reviewed and updated as necessary. The step of verifying with the applicable licensing board that the person is in good standing might be added.

12. **Will the administration, current employees and supervisors resist the development of a background check policy?**
   The administration and campus employees should be made aware of the benefits of implementing an inclusive background check policy. We very much encourage positive and periodic communication to help increase acceptance and support as well as to minimize concerns that the process would delay the hiring new employees.

13. **What funding is available to support conducting background checks?**
   Hiring departments should be billed for the fees associated with the checks/screenings.
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Appendix 6
Strategic Direction #7 – Human Resources
Report of the Sub-Committee on Employee Wellness
12/9/05

Challenge:

Under the broad guidelines of Strategic Directive #7 review the current state and direction of Wellness programming across the University of Maine System with the following goals in mind:

1. Improve efficiency – cost and ROI

2. Improve customer service – providing effective programs to engage employees, dependents and retirees to improve health status which are perceived as ‘high value’ to the customers and the UMS administration

3. Increase the use and effectiveness of technology to achieve UMS wellness goals

Our process was defined as developing three (3) different models of wellness delivery ranging from highly centralized to highly decentralized. Analyze the pros and cons of each and reach consensus on a model that best achieves the above stated goals.

Background:

In October 2000, the UMS Chancellor and Presidents adopted a System-wide Strategic Operating Plan for a UMS Health Improvement Program. The mission of the Program as adopted is:

“The UMS Health Improvement Strategy works to create and foster an environment of health improvement within the Community of the University of Maine System. The Strategy strives to promote the improvement of health and well being of employees, retirees and members of their families as well as the students in the University of Maine System by designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs based on documented needs. The Strategy provides opportunities to improve the health of all constituents no matter what their current health status.”

Business case for an expanded wellness program:

Facts:

✓ UMS health care costs are rising faster then revenues can support (10% - 14% annually)
✓ Incidence of chronic disease caused by poor personal health management is rising exponentially
✓ UMS employee population is on average older than most others in Maine (therefore more prone to illness and chronic disease)
✓ Mainers in general have higher health risk factors than most Americans (smoking rates, obesity, lack of exercise etc.)

Many large national employers (e.g. Pepsi, General Electric) as well as local firms such as Cianbro and BIW have documented the return on investment for implementing comprehensive wellness programs.

Specifically organizations have seen:

✓ Reduced increase(s) to health insurance premiums
✓ Reduced Absenteeism, increased Presenteeism
✓ Increased Productivity
✓ Improved employer/employee relations
✓ Employer marketplace recognition

Current State:

Wellness programming exists at all primary UMS sites. Some programs are fairly highly developed with strong local management support and wellness teams providing a wide array of programs including comprehensive Health Risk Appraisals and an array of support programs. Other universities are in earlier stages of development, but are working towards building their programs.

The UMS Health Improvement Committee (HIC) (membership from all universities and SWS) has been working together for over six (6) years. The goal of this committee is to work together in collaboration, sharing best practices to move the wellness agenda forward. This commitment met with moderate success, however it lacked the focused leadership required to push/pull this important initiative forward at the required pace.

In May of 2005 UMS added a System-wide Wellness Director, reporting at the System level, whose primary purpose is to lead the organization forward in developing and sustaining a state of the art System-wide comprehensive, data driven Health and Wellness program.

Since that time, the HIC has made considerable strides in cohesiveness and in improving programs at their individual university sites. In addition, they are promoting and delivering the first ever system-wide wellness initiatives. Attachment I provides a report on system-wide and university specific programs currently underway.

SD #7 Analyses and Recommendation:
Attachment II details the three models that the team developed as well as the pros and cons of each model.

The committee’s conclusion/recommendation strongly supports Model II, the moderately centralized model. Under this model, significant support in the form of communications, reporting, program development, funding and coordination are provided by a system-wide resource. This coordination would include benchmarking best practices and providing a template under which all of the universities could move forward towards common goals.

At the same time Model II allows each university to move forward at their own pace, allowing for cultural differences as well as different starting points and levels of resource available.

This model allows for significant collaboration across the system and provides for the most efficient use of resources. The local HIC members can leverage system-wide templates and take advantage successes achieved at other university sites. In addition, the System-wide Director provides support and guidance as well as access to resources system-wide, state-wide and nationally.

While this recommendation will not result in any significant structural change, the committee did determine a number of valuable next steps in the use of technology that should significantly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the total program.

Some specific examples are:

7. Design/maintain centralized wellness intranet for wellness coordinators.

8. Boiler plate ready to use programs, particularly designed to support specific events or program themes (nutrition, smoking, exercise etc.).

9. Access to state and national sites where best practices can be easily accessed

10. Simple reporting and data analysis tools that will allow each university to look at there own results as well as allow the system to easily assemble system-wide reporting

11. Maintain information to be shared by the system in moving forward in our goal of becoming a WELCOA designated Well Institution

12. Blackboard chat-room to allow committee members to easily seek others input and share ideas.
Appendix 7
Strategic Direction 7 – Human Resources
Report of the Sub-Committee on Approval of Salaries over $65,000

Charge:
The subcommittee was asked to review the process, the information required and the criteria that trigger Chancellor’s salary approval. We met three times, reviewed the Board of Trustee’s policy 404.3, and gathered insight and input from colleagues at campuses not represented by subcommittee members.

All of the committee’s deliberations were conducted in the context of recognizing the fiduciary responsibility the System as well as each individual campus, as a publicly funded entity, has to the citizens of the State of Maine to make prudent and justifiable salary decisions.

Recommendations:
I. The subcommittee recommends that the salary level requiring Chancellor approval be increased from $65,000 to $75,000.
   • The last increase to the specified level was approved in 2000.
   • In the five years since the last increase of the specified level, the average across-the-board salary increase for faculty and professionals, both rep and non-rep, has been approximately 3%. Applying this percentage increase to the original $65,000 over the 5 year period results in approximately the $75,000 figure.
   • The University of Maine and University of Southern Maine have the largest number of requests for salary approvals over $65,000. However, colleagues from the smaller campuses supported an increase in the specified level as well, citing the fact that as the Consortium model becomes more of a reality, the need for higher level salary justifications will probably follow.

II. The subcommittee recommends that a process and timeline for regular escalation of the level requiring Chancellor approval be established. We recommend the specified level be adjusted annually, indexed to the average of the across-the-board increases for faculty and professionals, both represented and non-represented.

III. The subcommittee recommends that the following statements be added to the exceptions list of those instances in which Chancellor approval is not required, as cited in BOT Policy 404.3, in the section titled Salary Adjustments. We recommend campus-level oversight for salary adjustments or stipends for employees already at the specified level, within the parameters recommended below. The committee had discussed exempting certain named positions, but decided that the following recommendations are stronger; they reach the same goal, but are more broad-based and would not need revision as new positions were
developed in the future. They can be applied at each campus, no matter what titling structure is used.

Additional exceptions not requiring Chancellor’s approval:

A. Position reclassifications as a result of a change in job responsibilities that result in an increase to the salary base, if the current base is at the specified level or more, and the amount of the increase is 10% or less than the current salary base.

B. Payment of a long-term stipend for an academic year or more which is added to the salary base, if the current base is at the specified level or more, and the amount of the stipend is 10% or less than the current base salary.

IV. The subcommittee recommends that a process be developed for SWS salary range pre-approval for hiring in certain high level, high salary positions. The campus could then hire within the range, and would forward documentation on the specific hire to the Chancellor’s Office for information purposes. This would allow for a more expedient process for making the final salary offer to the chosen candidate.

The committee appreciates careful review and consideration of its recommendations and assures that if the parameters for salary increases requiring Chancellor’s approval are modified as recommended, the campus HR offices will apply the same rigorous review and analysis currently exercised at the Chancellor’s office.