

Human Resources Advisory Committee

December 16, 2009

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Mary Gloston, Judy McGimsey, Dee Everett, Burgundy Cummings, Ann Coulon, June Gillis, Byron Decoteau Jr., Dwuena Wyre, Sandi Ellis, Sheila Metoyer, Marcella Jones, John DiCarlo, Frederick Skinner, Ashley Gautreaux, Makayla Harris, Patrick Lowery, Mary Ginn

Speaker: Mary Gloston

1. Mary Gloston welcomed all of the attendees and presented the proposed changes to Chapter 10 Rules.
2. Some of the members wanted to know if the rules would address supervisors who are out on an extended period of time and can't rate timely. The members would like a differentiation between supervisors who fail to rate and plan as opposed to those who can't because of things beyond the supervisor's control. Will there be flexibility for the agencies? The group would like to have more flexibility at the agency and appointing authority level.

Proposed rule 10.2(b) was discussed if a supervisor did not rate an employee and it was out of their control. Judy stated that rule 10.17 was the catchall rule to allow for an agency to request an exception to the rules from the Director. Civil Service has already received a number of requests from agencies and will provide specific examples to the advisory group to see if they feel 10.17 is sufficient enough or not. Other group members would like the agency to have more discretion without having to go to the Director. Patrick suggested that members bring exceptions they would like included in the next meeting.

Proposed rule 10.3(a) states that employees shall be rated on one or more tasks or responsibilities and one or more work behaviors. This is addressed on the PPR-A form. A supervisor will not be eligible for a merit only if they do not follow Civil Service Rules. Agency policy denying a merit will be up to the agency to enforce.

Proposed rule 10.4(c) states that ratings of un-rated employees shall be rendered when the employee does not receive an official rating. This language was used as an attempt to get away from perceived entitlement by default.

Proposed rule 10.5(d) states that the PPR session shall be conducted no later than 30 (or 60?) calendar days after.... The HR Advisory Group prefers 60 calendar days requirement. Proposed rule 10.5(d) also states a PPR shall be conducted after the movement of an employee into a position having a different position number and/or significantly different duties. The group was asked if they prefer the “and/or” language or one or the other. The group decided the language should remain “and/or.”

Proposed rule 10.6(a) states requirements to create an official rating by the rating supervisor including providing comments to summarize supporting documentation of factor ratings. This is a move away from only requiring comments on factors of “needs improvement” and “poor.” Some members wanted to know what would happen to a supervisor if they didn’t write comments. The PPR would be treated as an unrated and would default to 3.00 or “achieves expectations.” Members would like a broad policy exception with an option of an agency preview prior to it becoming official so they could help supervisors catch these errors. A question was raised if the PPR form could have verbiage that indicates the comments for each factor are mandatory. Civil Service can also look at making the comments section of the PPR-A form a mandatory field before a supervisor can save the document.

Proposed rule 10.6(d) states that when an employee is not available, the provisions of this rule shall be satisfied by mailing the completed document to the employee on or before the employee’s anniversary date or approved agency rating date (for agencies that use focused rating dates.) Members discussed whether emailing could count as mailing. Civil Service will look at possibly changing the language to “other means of transmission” with a provision that the agency would need evidence that it was sent and that if it was an electronic transmission, the transmission was secure.

Proposed rule 10.10(a) states that a rating or re-rating of “needs improvement” or “poor” is not a disciplinary action. Civil Service is considering adding additional language that states that it is not a disciplinary action but may constitute cause for discipline.

Current rule 10.12(b) was repealed removing the requirement of agencies to send the top form of the completed PPR to Civil Service for any overall ratings of “Needs Improvement” or “Poor.”

Proposed rule 10.13 includes a change to the language to differentiate between a regular review by a supervisor and an official agency review of a completed rating. The group proposed possibly changing the language in 10.13(a) from “official rating” to “official overall rating” however this would not serve agencies with internal policies that dictate an individual rating can

cause an employee to be ineligible for a merit increase, regardless of the overall rating.

Proposed rule 10.14(c) does not specify a period of time in which an employee's file is due to Civil Service for a review of an employee's rating. Civil Service will work with agencies on a reasonable turnaround time.

Proposed rule 10.14(d) is new and allows for the Director to return the reviews within 60 calendar days as opposed to the current 30 calendar days.

No agency will get cited for not using the new PPR forms until the new rules are passed. The SF-15 is available in PDF and Word format. The PPR-A is available in PDF but requires that the ratings be split 50/50 between tasks and behaviors for automatic calculations of the ratings, however, an unlocked format is available.

A question was asked if Civil Service was doing any more training. Civil Service is considering a different model to the PPR in which different groups, such as the appointing authority, supervisor and employee would be targeted differently. The Training Division is looking at an online class for supervisors with an additional ½ classroom training on writing expectations in a workshop format. They are also planning on using LEO for the online training. Non-ISIS agencies will be able to load the training onto their LMS. They will also try to incorporate as much as possible on agencies with focused rating dates. Agency delegated training will still be utilized. There is an anticipated target date of 7/1/10 for the online course.

3. PPR planning dates 1,2 and 3 are in production in ISIS HR. Planning date 1 can be used for the initial planning session of an employee. Planning dates 2 and 3 can be used if an employee requires an additional planning session due to a significant change of duties, etc. The Department will not be mandating the use of these planning session dates.

Date specifications (IT 0041) have been added in ISIS HR for merits not granted. These are also at the agency's discretion to how they are utilized. An ISIS HR Quick Tip will be released soon regarding both of these updates.

If any members have anything else to comment on or suggest, please email Mary Gloston at mary.gloston@la.gov.

4. **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, February 17, 2010 at 1:30 PM in the Marbois Room #1-137

