The meeting was called to order at 2:30 pm by Staff Council President, Marie Mize.

Roll Call

*Members in attendance:* Christine Ahern, Ian Armit, Charlie Bauder, Brittany Barnes, Debi Chandler, Kelly Cona, Melanie Crawford, Anjali Dougherty, Tamala Foreman, Macie Fouche, Jami Gilstrap, Elmer Gray, Michele Griffin, Matt Hammons, Andrew Hanneman, Savannah Hembree, Angie Heusser, Pattie Holly, Stuart Ivy, Kevin James, Laura Kelley, Heather Macon, Brittney Minor, Liz Phillips, Jackie Mitchell, Marie Mize, Mary Moore, Matt Mundy, Jacob Schindler, Ken Schroder, Amanda Shaw, Alec Shepherd, Gabrielle Saupe, Kyla Sterling, Joy Strickland, Matt Weeks, Beth Woods, Scott Woodward (present via sub Lesley Coffey)

*Members absent:* Shirley Burgess, Hayley Cox, Danielle Free, Stefani Hilley, Emma Mattox, Kassie Suggs, Scott Woodward

A quorum was present.

November meeting minutes were approved.

Marie Mize began the meeting and said she sent an email about the staff mentorship council, that's accepting applicants now so people should share that with their unit. Applications are open until Jan. 21.

**Staff Salary Administration Plan Review – Michael Lewis**

Michael explained that President Morehead requested the review of the Staff Salary Administration Plan about a year ago because the current plan had several major flaws: new hires in competitive positions could only be offered base salary +15% without having to go through the complicated process to get the Board of Regents to approve. Often, the best candidate took another job at a higher salary during that time.
Current employees were not able to get a salary increase beyond the annual merit pool unless they left their job for a new position (on campus or elsewhere) which resulted in excessive job turnover.

There was also a lack of equity between departments for similar positions.

President Morehead formed a working group from around campus and Korn Ferry (a consulting company) was hired to assist the working group.

Korn Ferry was hired to assist the working group and a set of recommendations were agreed upon. Michael provided a breakdown of those recommendations in a PowerPoint presentation (the slides appear at the bottom of the minutes.)

- A market analysis hadn’t been conducted in about seven years-- that’s currently in progress by HR.
- Evaluate the current job classification structure to allow for more flexibility utilize the established salary ranges more broadly utilize the established salary ranges more broadly- in progress by HR.
- Make broader use of the existing salary ranges assigned to staff positions/classifications, allowing managers to approve salaries up to the 50th percentile of the salary range without seeking approval from Human Resources. This will be in effect on December 16th.
- Implement a compensation philosophy that better enables the attraction, retention, and promotion of talent in all staff functions while also working to eliminate pay inequity. This has been completed.
- Evaluate central HR compensation staffing needs and budget impact centrally locally; implement changes that support the long-term strategy. This has been completed.
- Eliminate the exception process for geographical differentials. This is in progress.
- Fully analyze high turnover functions where salaries are low relative to market and jobs where loss of institutional knowledge and other critical functions would negatively impact campus. Some units are 15%+ turnover, whereas industry standard is between 8-9%. Part of the reason is because staff need to change positions to get a raise.
- Use a broader range of communication vehicles to disseminate information to the workforce. This is progress.
- Consider reviewing the current staff recognition programs and the opportunity to consistently apply such programs across the University. This has been in progress. There will now be a holiday staff appreciation event on December 18.
- Implement a formal HR training program for field HR professionals. This is in progress.

The president has fully endorsed all of the recommendations.

Michael also had slides on the new Compensation Philosophy referenced above. He explained that the university recognized this importance of having effective human capital management. There will be changes to annual reviews to better reflect the competitive landscape and facilitate equitable compensation. See slides below for more detailed information. Michael invited the group to ask questions but added that Lindsey Van Note (speaking next) would address a lot of these issues in more detail.
Marie invited Lindsey to the floor.

**USG Job Codes and Compensations - Lindsey Van Note, Parker Thomas, Russ Ramsey**

Lindsey mentioned that a video version on the slide presentation had been emailed to representatives ([https://onesource.uga.edu/videos/special_topics/](https://onesource.uga.edu/videos/special_topics/)).

The two main points of the presentation were the move to OneUSG Job codes and the opportunity to tie that to a compensation plan for increased flexibility.

**OneUSG Job Code**

UGA job codes (Administrative Specialist, Business Manager II, Academic Advisor I) will be replaced by USG job codes (known as B-cat or Board category codes). All USG system schools have adopted the b-cat. UGA added it as a modifier to existing job codes, but on December 16th UGA will be using the b-cat in the OneUSG HCM system and the UGA job code will no longer exist. Working titles will remain the same. B-cats are already used for UGA employees on the openga.gov website (and in various other places such as your official employment records)—but now they will be used in place of the old UGA codes. Working titles will be emphasized more and will still appear in the directory and units will have the ability to rename working titles as needed. This change will not affect employees FLSA exemption status, their duties/responsibilities, reporting structure, or pay rates.

UGA currently uses 1571 job codes and this change will collapse those codes into just 300 broad-based categories—which comes with several advantages for employees.

To illustrate her point, Lindsey shared an example of a student affairs professional which currently has six non-exempt classifications (Student Affairs Professional I – Student Affairs Specialist III) and two exempt classification (Student Affairs Professional IV and Student Affairs Specialist IV). Once collapsed there would only be Student Services Paraprofessional and Student Services Professional.

One of the benefits of collapsing the job codes is that it creates consistency and transparency across positions, allows supervisors to hire across the spectrum, and helps eliminate failed searches. There’s greater flexibility to respond to changes in the environment, to redefine the compensation structure, and to develop a competency framework.

Of UGA’s 1571 current job classifications, 67% have one or no people in them. Only 10% have ten or more incumbents.

Lindsey paused for questions from the group.

Kelly Cona asked how raises will work in the new system because reclassification has been linked to new job duties.

Lindsey explained that we currently focus on a vertical structure (move from I to II to III) but that will be flipped into a horizontal structure that will allow greater flexibility for compensation without changing classifications.
Kyla Sterling asked about jobs that don’t have a clear vertical structure (there isn’t “I to II to III”) and how a horizontal flip would impact those jobs.

Lindsey asked Russ to take that question. Russ agreed that there are a lot of non-tiered jobs on campus and that has led to frustration from employees not knowing how to advance. The horizontal structure will provide better flexibility for those employees because they can move through a broader salary range.

Kyla asked if they could also change their title with those salary increases.

Lindsey said that the working title could be changed but there was no longer a need for a series of different job codes.

Tamala Foreman asked how a person would move up in salary if there wasn’t a clear vertical- how would the range be defined? Lindsey said she’d cover that in detail a little later on.

Gail Andrews from the College of Education asked if employees will lose their rank if there isn’t a tiered system any longer.

Lindsey explained that employees will rely more heavily on their working titles. She explained that there would need to be a cultural shift that encouraged use of working titles.

The transition into OneUSG HCM system allows for a classification structure with broader compensation bands. The ability to hire up to the mid-point of the salary range was already adopted for competitive searches. Ultimately, this will allow the University to focus on opportunity for growth, promotion, rewarding talent, and allowing for promotion within units.

A guest asked if that means people can get promoted at any time of year.

Russ confirmed that promotion can already happen at any time of the year, but that this will give units more flexibility for raises.

Andrew Hanneman asked how many people would end up on the high end of the pay spectrum after the bands flatten.

Russ said that there would probably be fewer people at the high end than the low end.

Lindsey explained that the pay bands actually benefit employees, especially once salary is compared to market data. Using the student affairs example again the range now includes the salary levels for all positions in the job family.

Russ explained that HR uses market data to help determine starting salaries and salary advancement. Lindsey explained that now compensation will be more closely aligned with qualifications and years of experience. HR will be designing a competency framework to assist with compensation evaluations.

A guest, Byron Kitchen, asked about new hires getting a higher salary than current employees and how those current employees would get a promotion.
Russ said that employees would want to pursue certifications, take classes, and perform at a high level in order to see an increased pay raise, although the University will also look at salary compression and inversion.

Byron expressed concern about outside hires getting a higher salary than internal candidates who might not have the same certification and was worried that HR wouldn’t provide clear guidance.

Lindsey explained that HR is developing guidelines that will help supervisors make decisions about compensation by linking that to clearly defined competencies. No employee will experience a pay decrease because of these changes, it just gives supervisors more flexibility to compensate employees. Likewise, this change won’t mean employees will automatically/arbitrarily receive a raise—raises will be tied to competencies. Russ also added that the department’s budget will come into play as well.

Byron said that he was worried that these changes were actually going to hold staff back instead of helping them.

Laura Kelley said that many staff members are over qualified for their positions, but they aren’t compensated more just because their department’s budget is smaller. She asked if President Morehead had any plans for addressing the inequity between units that had more money and those with less.

Lindsey agreed that inequity between department budget is a reality and that these changes won’t fix those problems. They will allow units to reward employees for professional development, which is an improvement over the current system, but the larger problem still remains.

Laura asked if employees would be rewarded for completing degrees.

Lindsey said yes, but that it also depends on what the department values and how that professional development adds value to the role the employee currently has.

Byron asked if raises would only happen once a year.

Russ and Lindsey explained that raises could happen at any time—even more than once a year—but supervisors still had to abide by USG’s policy on a 10% raise cap per fiscal year.

Matt Mundy asked about units recruiting in specialized fields where the market value is much higher than what a department can afford to pay.

Lindsey agreed that units shouldn't advertise for positions or salary ranges than their budget can’t support and that job candidates still have to understand that higher education usually has a smaller budget than private industry.

Matt explained that he was worried that current employees who are underpaid according to market standards would feel discontent when they see the salary range open up, but the unit doesn’t have the budget to support a raise.

Russ clarified that the data he pulled is from higher education, including other R1 institutions. Other market research can be done as needed for specific circumstances.
Ian Armit about the market research HR was doing and wanted to confirm it was within higher ed.

Russ said it was, unless there was a specific position that wasn’t common in higher ed—then the might turn to the Department of Labor or the private sector for research.

Laura Kelley asked how this would affect employees FLSA status, especially if they were close to the $47,000 salary mark.

Russ clarified that the salary mark for exempt employees was not moved to $47,000 (that change was never implemented by the federal government) and that employees moving from non-exempt to exempt status would go through the reclassification process.

Byron Kitchen asked how long it takes to go through the reclassification process.

Lindsey said there was a whole classification team now and that it doesn’t take that long.

Mary Moore asked if they could give more information about the competency evaluations.

Juan Jarrett, VP of Human Resources, said that when Staff Council presented President Morehead with the problem that departments were having difficulty retaining employees who were doing a good job. These changes help solve this problem. However, departments are still responsible for their budgets and making sure that staying within those budgets when hiring and promoting. These changes do allow more conversations about equity to happen at the department level. Equity requires that the department consider how a change within the organizations affects the entire organization/unit. This solves this problem. This is a fund blind analysis. The department is responsibilities to budget for the types of jobs that they need. Reclassifications take a long time because they require the consideration of equity. The old structure didn’t account for equity, but the new structure takes that inflexibility away. UGA still has to be in compliance with three different government agencies, so this provides flexibility at the local level. But units still have to consider their individual budgets. HR is providing the framework to provide employees with the agency advocate for themselves. Longevity, in and of itself is not considered a competency, but employees will now have the tools to advocate for themselves. HR will provide strategies for managers to look at issues like compression, inversion, and budget limitations. HR is also working on finding institutional funds to help with compression and inversion as they go through the budget development process.

Juan said he would be happy to come back to discuss this at more depth with the council.

Lindsey provided a quick recap that on December 16th the OneUSG (b-cat) job codes would go live, the compensation bands will be expanded, UGA salary guidelines will be updated, pay ranges within pay bands defined by market research would begin to be loaded, and minimum qualifications and will be loaded into the system. This foundation allows for UGA to develop a competency model for compensation.

**Competency Model**

Liz Phillips asked if this was connected to the Comprehensive Administrative Review being conducted by Heron Consulting.
Parker Thomas explained that the competency model was being completed in-house with the help of the Industrial Psychology department in Franklin College.

Competency models gages employee performance based on defined characteristics. Competencies are defined as demonstrable characteristics of a person, including knowledge, skills and behaviors, that enable their performance.

An example of this would be an accountant having the competencies of financial acumen and attention to detail. These are crucial to succeed in that role.

Lindsey explained that there already is a working group to help develop competencies and that they would be looking at more involvement from areas of the university.

HR has been performing job analysis by using the O-Net databases and current job descriptions that help them identify tasks common to a specific position.

HR will be working with focus groups of subject matter experts (defined as high performing staff members who have been in their current role for some time and understand the nuance of the job) to help refine the job analyses. A qualitative and quantitative approach will help complete the picture.

Lindsey said that there would be over 90 different focus groups with 12 people each. HR will facilitate the process, but they are looking for campus feedback and involvement.

Mary Moore asked about employees who are in unique positions (only one on campus). Would they still be invited to participate in the focus group?

Parker said that there would be several criteria to determine who will be in the focus group and that job positions with just a small number of people wouldn’t be excluded.

The next step would be developing of behavioral anchors (examples of behavior) that can be used during evaluation of performance, so employees know why they were ranked a three instead of a five. These definitions will help employees understand what competencies they need to advance. These behavioral anchors will be determined through qualitative and quantitative research and will be reviewed periodically.

The development of the competency model will take several months to complete, but at least some of it should be ready for next year’s budget development.

Marie thanked everyone for coming and reminded them that the video presentation could be distributed to units.  https://onesource.uga.edu/videos/special_topics/

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm.
Staff Salary Administration Plan Advisory Group
Presentation of Results to Staff Council

Michael Lewis
December 5, 2018, 2:30 PM
Miller Learning Center 348
Why review the plan?

- Over 10 years old
- Required exceptions and approvals for nearly every new hire
- Difficulty hiring the most desirable candidate
- Salary increases beyond annual merit pool not possible
- Excessive job turnover rates
- Lack of equity between departments for similar positions
UGA Staff Salary Plan Advisory Group

» Dr. Svein Øie, Advisory Group Chair, Former Dean of the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Science Professor
» Brett Jackson, Advisory Group Vice Chair, Assistant to the Vice President, Finance & Administration and Director, Auxiliary Services
» Dr. Timothy Chester, Vice President for Enterprise Technology and Chief Information Officer
» Michael Lewis, Information Technology Professional, Department of Geology, Immediate Past President, University Staff Council
» Chris Jarvis Miller, Associate Provost for Academic Fiscal Affairs
» Gwen Moss, Assistant Vice President for Fiscal Affairs, Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach
» Lee Motsinger, Human Resources Senior Manager, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences
» James Russell Ramsey, Interim Human Resources Director for Compensation, Human Resources, Finance & Administration
» Dr. Denise A. Spangler, Dean & Professor of Mathematics Education, College of Education
» Arthur Tripp, Assistant to the President
» Reginald Woods, Human Resources Senior Manager, Facilities Management Division, Finance & Administration
On January 5, 2018, the University announced its engagement with Korn Ferry Hay Group to complete a review of the current staff salary administration plan. This review was not intended to be a comprehensive salary classification review, instead it was initiated to lay the foundation for more effective administration of staff salaries. The following is a complete list of the recommendations resulting from this review. More specific details will be provided as each of these recommendations are implemented.

Summary of recommendations:

» Update the University’s existing salary structure based on relevant analysis of markets in which UGA competes for talent. Ex. Use the BOR approved peer/aspirant Universities as a benchmark for salary and complete an annual review of the classification salary ranges. – In Progress

» Evaluate existing job classifications and collapse as appropriate. This will result in the implementation of a salary structure that allows for increased flexibility to utilize the established salary ranges more broadly. (For more information on how this structure will work, please review the recorded version of the OneUG Job Codes/Classification & UGA Pay Structure presentation.) – In Progress

» Make broader use of the existing salary ranges assigned to staff positions/classifications, allowing managers to approve salaries up to the 50th percentile of the salary range without seeking approval from Human Resources. – In Progress

» Implement a compensation philosophy that better enables the attraction, retention, and promotion of talent in all staff functions, while also working to eliminate pay inequity. (See New Compensation Philosophy) - Completed

» Undertake a broad-based staff compensation study across the University to validate current pay positioning relative to market. – Under Review

» Evaluate central HR compensation staffing needs and budget impact centrally and locally; implement changes that support the long term strategy. - Completed

» Eliminate the exception process for geographical differentials. – In Progress

» Fully analyze high turnover functions where salaries are low relative to market and jobs where loss of institutional knowledge and other critical functions would negatively impact campus; assess specific strategies to address and reduce such turnover. – In Progress

» Use a broader range of communication vehicles to disseminate information to the workforce – In Progress

» Consider reviewing the current staff recognition programs and the opportunity to consistently apply such programs across the University. – Under Review

» Implement a formal HR training program for field HR professionals. – Under Review
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Recommendations

• Update the University’s existing salary structure based on relevant analysis of markets in which UGA competes for talent.

• Ex. Use the BOR approved peer/aspirant Universities as a benchmark for salary and complete an annual review of the classification salary ranges.

• – In Progress
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Recommendations

• Evaluate existing job classifications and collapse as appropriate.
• This will result in the implementation of a salary structure that allows for increased flexibility to utilize the established salary ranges more broadly.
• (For more information on how this structure will work, please review the recorded version of the OneUSG Job Codes/Classification & UGA Pay Structure presentation.)
• – In Progress
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Recommendations

• Make broader use of the existing salary ranges assigned to staff positions/classifications, allowing managers to approve salaries up to the 50th percentile of the salary range without seeking approval from Human Resources.
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Recommendations

• Implement a compensation philosophy that better enables the attraction, retention, and promotion of talent in all staff functions, while also working to eliminate pay inequity.

• - Completed
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• – Under Review
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Recommendations

• Fully analyze high turnover functions where salaries are low relative to market and jobs where loss of institutional knowledge and other critical functions would negatively impact campus

• Assess specific strategies to address and reduce such turnover.
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Recommendations

• Use a broader range of communication vehicles to disseminate information to the workforce
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Recommendations

• Consider reviewing the current staff recognition programs and the opportunity to consistently apply such programs across the University.

• – Under Review
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Recommendations

• Consider reviewing the current staff recognition programs and the opportunity to consistently apply such programs across the University.
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UGA Staff Salary Administration Plan

Recommendations

• Implement a formal HR training program for field HR professionals.
• – Under Review
I wanted to take just a minute to again convey my deepest appreciation for all of the time and effort you invested in successfully completing the review of our Staff Salary Administration Guidelines. It is this work that I believe will indeed provide the foundation for more effective administration of staff salaries and I am very grateful for your commitment to this process.

As I hope you all know by now, the recommendations resulting from this review have been fully endorsed by President Morehead.

The timing of this endorsement couldn’t be better as the OneUSG Connect implementation creates significant opportunities to initiate several actions that will move these recommendations forward.

I truly can’t say enough about how appreciative the President and I are of the time you invested in helping us complete this very important review. Thanks again,

Ryan Nesbit
Vice President for Finance and Administration
University of Georgia
The Administration Building
Athens, GA 30602-1671
University of Georgia (UGA) Compensation Philosophy

The University of Georgia is the birthplace of public higher education in America. Its threefold teaching, research, and service mission spans the globe and improves the quality of life for all. University faculty, staff, and students are the life force of this University, and they are the reason we are soaring to new heights. They are making a difference in the lives of students and in the futures of our communities. The University of Georgia is committed to providing a competitive staff compensation program that attracts, retains, and promotes the very best staff members and recognizes the competence and dedication they possess. The compensation principles that follow will lay the foundation for more effective administration of staff salaries.

Objectives and Values

UGA’s Compensation Philosophy is designed to:

» Be competitive and enable UGA to attract, retain and promote staff in the markets in which UGA competes for talent.

» Build and sustain an engaged workforce to support the achievement of UGA’s business strategies.

» Achieve balance between operational excellence and longer-term innovation.

» Build a sense of community across the organization.

» Be internally equitable.

» Comply with all relevant regulations, policies and procedures.

» Ensure sound governance.

Strategy

UGA’s offers staff compensation that is reflective of its competitive landscape:

Target Market:

» UGA competes for staff talent from a variety of industries. Depending on the role, UGA will utilize applicable survey data to determine competitive pay. Higher education survey data is often the most applicable data set; however, the University will continuously review data to ensure the most relevant survey data is applied.

Internal Equity:

» UGA reward programs will be internally equitable.

» Compensation will be consistently administered based on job content and complexity, individual experience, competencies and performance.

External Competitiveness:

» UGA’s pay programs are positioned to be competitive within the market for which we compete for talent.

» Through participation in compensation and benefits surveys, we ensure we are keeping current with market trends, while acknowledging the significant relationship between performance and compensation.

Architecture

UGA’s approach to managing staff compensation includes:

» Utilize a single base salary structure in which job classifications reflect the type and content of work. The salary grades for these job classifications are tied to salary market data.

» Provide the ability to hire up to the midpoint of the range, with consideration for internal equity and external competitiveness; salaries may vary above or below the midpoint based on a variety of factors, including unique market demands, experience, business needs and individual performance.

» Apply a geographic differential to the salary structure that is representative of the local markets in which UGA hires talent.

Governance & Administration

Sound Governance:

» Responsibility for consistent administration of the campus’ salary administration policy and guidelines for staff is shared between UGA’s Division of Human Resources and hiring authorities within the academic schools and colleges and major administrative units.

» UGA’s Division of Human Resources is responsible for the administration, oversight, and maintenance of the framework and alignment of the staff salary administration plan to meet the needs of the institution.

» Stakeholders include UGA staff, faculty and the University System of Georgia.

» Compensation practices will be administered in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, as well as regulations and USG policies.

» UGA will employ consistent guidelines for administering all rewards plans and programs.
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**Target Market:**
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