

Human Resources Advisory Committee

October 21, 2009

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Shannon Templet, Dee Everett, Frederick Skinner, Dona Pilcher, Frankie Grant, Shelia Metoyer, Genie Silva, Gwen Jones, June Gillis, Ranzy Montet, Ann Coulon, Katie Hodgin, Ashley Moreland, Kevin Brady, Sandi Ellis, Mary Gloston, Lynette Mack, Judy McGimsey, Ranzy Montet, Marianne Covington, Corliss Dupuy, Mary Ginn

1. Ranzy Montet from the DSCS Accountability Division spoke to the group about the new post HR evaluation survey that they will begin receiving. This is an effort by Civil Service to get feedback on the audit process. These will only be sent following full audits, not drop-in reviews. The survey will be in electronic format and contain 10 questions. It will be sent via email to the HR Director or other key staff member who was present for the close out meeting at the end of the audit.

Also, Ranzy asked the members to review the updated Accountability section of the Civil Service web site. A list of commonly cited areas has been added as well as other tips and assistance for agencies. The group asked about the process for auditing LA Careers postings. This will be transitioning from the Staffing division to Accountability in January 2010. The process has not been finalized. Agencies would like guidance on the audit process for job postings once it is outlined.

2. Judy McGimsey from the DSCS Program Assistance division let the group know that we will discuss a draft of proposed changes to Chapter 10 – Performance Planning and Review at the November committee meeting. Some of the changes being considered at this time relate to the focused rating date and the performance adjustment language changes. Agencies expressed an interest in considering something other than a 5 point rating scale (possibly 3). Also, another idea would be to consider permitting the designated reviewer to be someone outside of the agency. Employees have also expressed to their HR office the idea of a PPR panel review instead of a single reviewer. Agencies are also seeking examples and guidance on what constitutes exceptional or outstanding performance. It is possible the Advisory Committee may form work groups to consider how this can be accomplished.

The possibility of additional training requirements such as a PPR refresher or PPR for employees was discussed. Civil Service is also in the process of developing an online training module to comply with the requirements of Act 377

of the 2009 session of the legislature. This act requires unclassified employees to attend PPR training and to administer the PPR program for their classified subordinates.

3. Shannon Templet, DSCS Director, asked the group for additional feedback on the proposed changes to Chapter 6 – Pay Rules. The Department has provided The Advocate with copies of all employee comments per their request and the reporter also asked if we had considered having a night-time meeting. The Louisiana Purchase room has a capacity of 300 which is limited by the Fire Marshall and there are concerns about large numbers of employees coming out and being turned away. Also, there is no building security after 5 PM. Some conversations that we have had with legislators illustrate that they are attempting to address short term issues while we are looking at a longer term view. Agencies are concerned about the disparity in payments that will occur among agencies due to the “up to” language in the performance adjustment rule.

Other agencies are concerned that managers will manipulate the PPR score to maximize the pay of employees approaching retirement. Agencies would like to consider making the PPR Alternative form the default form since changing the form will require managers to take a second look at expectations and may make it more difficult to “fudge the numbers.” Many agency members expressed the importance of a second level review to attempt to establish equity. Requiring a second level review should be considered in the rule change and ratings of outstanding could require an agency head review. Civil Service data indicates that 10-14% of all state employees on average were rated outstanding in the last 10 years. We will continue to monitor that trend and agency HR may have to do more trend analysis on PPR ratings.

Another concern is a misunderstanding of the proposed rules related to the percent increase for the performance adjustments. Some agencies are thinking that their policy can read “up to X%” then each supervisor can render a % increase within that limit. That is not the intent of the proposal. Civil Service intends that each appointing authority establish a finite % increase for each level of rating. Civil Service will look at the wording of that rule to see if it can be clarified.

4. **Next Meeting:** Wed., Nov. 18th at 1:30 PM in the Marbois Room #1-137