

UCOP HRIS Northern California Workshops Day 1 Notes

Attendees:

UCOP: Shelley Dommer, Patrick Collins, Chris Simon, Jeanette Harroun, Kay Miller, Stan Kowalski, Patty Yamashita, Mike O'Neill, Myron Okada
UCSC: Laura Mellegers, Celena Allison, Nancy Degnan
UCD: Diane Davies-Conley, Cindy Jones, Ron Purnell, Jamie Heckman, Marion Randall, Irene Horgan-Thompson, Peggy Younglove, June Taylor, Michele Platten, Ray Reveles, Wave Armijo, Elizabeth Ehnat, Bobbie Laskey, Linda Durst, Terri McKown, Michael Sheesley
UCSF: Catherine Pedersen, Susan Wright, Russell Fitzgerald, Diane Dillon, Peggy Bagala
UCB: David Scronce, Kathy Uyeno, Dorla Cantu, Ken Robin, Carol Dudley, Patti Owen
KPMG Consulting: Phil Encinio, Debby Lu

Personnel Processes Breakout

GROUP #1

David Scronce, Ken Robin, Linda Durst, Michele Platten, Kay Miller, Michael O'Neill, Peggy Bagala

■ **Needs and Priorities**

- Clean up UC's business processes, e.g., separations. With new requirements and laws, the data might be improved if the process were streamlined..
- Implement all of PPS (e.g., rank and step)
- Periodically refresh historical data/archives onto new media
- Balance data entry/maintenance workload vs. value of information—data need to have a clear purpose or use if we're going to enter and maintain it
- Automatically populate data throughout the system
- Focus not just on data capture, but how to get data out and what we're doing with the data
- Need to add a data element to track the expiration dates for certification and licensing (1.6)

■ **General Discussion**

- Need not just to capture data, but to extract data and be able to do things with it
- It might be too sensitive to capture grievance/disciplinary information on this HRIS, or we may need more than a 30-character line about the situation.
- Tradeoff between usefulness of the information vs. level of effort necessary to maintain different types of data. Nice to be able to get at certain types of data, but it may not be worth the effort.
- Simplification is essential—people aren't putting data in because data entry is already too tedious now. We're talking about adding an awful lot more data and we're talking about adding a lot more data entry to an already burdensome job. We can develop a system and then nobody puts data into it. For instance, separation data has a system, the trouble is making people update it, or leave without pay. How can we make the job of data entry and maintenance simpler?

- We should look at parts of the PPS that aren't used today, and ask questions about why—is there no payoff, has it never been communicated and trained on?—because this will give us a glimpse of what we may face in a future system.
- Our systems end up being duplicative—e.g., we maintain both a paper and automated system for grievance tracking. Why not look at the secondary systems and see if we can use those, rather than reinventing the wheel (e.g., Greentree, Resumix)?

■ **Phil's summary:**

- Concern about sensitive data
- As we start moving toward a sense of consensus and recommendations, if a decision is made that suits me perfectly and crushes someone else under the weight of implementation, then we haven't resolved anything. Have to look at ourselves as a collective enterprise
- We may have a good solution to a flyspeck; we need to address issues, not flyspecks
- We crave and have to have simplification

GROUP #2

Dorla Cantu, Bobbie Lasky, Jamie Heckman, June Taylor, Chris Simon, Jeannette Harroun, Diane Dillon

■ **Issues and concerns:**

- Funding of the new system—if we're going to talk about salary savings to pay for HRIS, then we're perpetuating a situation of too few people doing too much work
- Maintenance of the system—who's going to maintain and how as needs change?
- Strong focus on union needs—we should also be focusing on campus-wide needs and take care of ourselves.
- 1.2, 1.4—accommodating fluid elements (background checks, org structures) that aren't needed everywhere
- Flexibility to keep up with changing regulations; e.g., 1,000 hour limit for term employees
- Ability to track history on positions and job functions—at some campuses this is tied to individuals; but we need to look at specific positions and job functions. Positions need to describe business necessities
- Would like a tool to build position descriptions with built-in job functions and skill sets, and look at levels of positions and be able to formulate a description that has meaning for people
- Need clarification on 2.8—which campuses are using smart cards?
- Historical tracking and flagging of retroactivity—critical on staff side as well
- Tracking movement and transfers among departments (primarily staff) as well as separation information. Using this data, we can see whether we're vulnerable from an employee relations perspective. If we see trends of people bailing out of a particular department, maybe there's a need to do HR intervention.

- Address retention planning—how to better retain staff. (why wouldn't we do this on a local level? Why develop this systemwide?)
- Ability for departments to customize queries and reports
- Ability to accommodate a variety of access types (across campus, systemwide)—ability to transfer employees from department to department; ability to look at title code use across the system; have a process to gain access to a secure field or data. Not just looking at how to limit people from getting access; but efforts to provide security shouldn't override efforts to provide appropriate access.
- Opportunities for improvement: should include history, reporting, user friendliness and ability to get data out of the system
- Academic: track physical location for space planning and emergency notification (staff also)
- 4.6: include tracking of submittal of sabbatical report.

GROUP #3

Kathy Uyeno, Patti Owen, Elizabeth Ehnat, Ron Purnell, Peggy Younglove, Nancy Degnan, Susan Wright

■ Needs and Priorities

- HR vs. payroll data/function vs. benefits administration—do you duplicate systems that are already in place? What's going to be the interface? Benefits administration is really robust right now, do we overlay that?
- Local vs. systemwide needs for data capture, reporting—who'll capture data?
- Transactions in a system vs. reporting—who's putting data vs. reporting needs
- Are we looking at the system as a processing system or a database?
- Accruals for time, leaves, and time in service credit—those issues cross over between HR, payroll, and defining a system of record
- #1 item is capturing salary history—if you have a good salary history, you can meet a lot of the needs that are identified now as separate elements
- Tracking performance reviews for union reporting and merit processing; on the academic side, tracking reviews and recommendations and final results
- Mass changes—how to do that in a new system? Retroactivity, automated ranges, lump sum payouts, and what's the impact on your salary history? Accurately overlay that change
- Capturing multiple components of compensation in HR: shift differentials, overtime pay, stipends,
- Security—needs to be another column on that chart
- Maximum flexibility
- Biographical data for academics—gets input 8 times by different offices for every salary action

Phil: links to other systems, local vs. systemwide needs—what are the consequences if it's local or systemwide?

GROUP #4

Carol Dudley, Irene Horgan-Thompson, Marion Randall, Michael Sheesley, Wave Armijo, Patty Yamashita, Celena Allison, Catherine Pedersen

■ Personnel Process Needs and Priorities

- 1.2 (identify critical positions and capture background check data for employees): determine whether the issue is for an employee/person vs. position control issue
- 1.4 (capture organizational structure and working relationships): include department codes, position control Ids
- 1.5 (capture appointment data): intercampus transfer HIGH, limited appointment; audit history need old/new values, date of change, preparer ID
- Need to capture lost vacation time
- 1.7 (capture union data): each appointment needs own CBUC
- 1.22 (capture grievance/disciplinary data): reporting for EEO, access issues cent vs. decent, does volume justify?
- 2.2 (capture exempt and non-exempt tracking): position by position, appt. by appt.
- 2.3 (capture vacation data): flag increase in vacation accrual
- 2.5 (capture effort reporting data): applies to staff
- Add 2.9(: need to capture lost vacation accrued due to reaching maximum
- 3.1 (accommodate the difference between appointment and payment distributions): limited # of distribution; include intercampus transfers
- 3.4 (calculate the next merit date and approve merits electronically): should be high priority
- 3.7 (capture multiple simultaneous range adjustments and show them as separate increases): should be high priority
- 3.13 (capture other salary information): add staff
- 3.14 (ability to connect personnel actions and salary action): should be high priority
- 4.2 (capture recruitment/applicant data): should be high priority
- 4.4 (workflow enabled for approvals): add academic
- 4.6 (automated close-out at end of process): should be high priority
- Add 4.11: “do not hire” (disciplinary); flagging process
- Add 4.12: need to include data required for reporting to unions (e.g., promotions, more than 1 step)
- 5.3 (ability to do succession planning): particular person vs. groups?
- 5.4 (ability to generate management reports for bargaining): should be high priority—applies to other sections

- 6.3 (ability to report movement among providers during open enrollment): eliminate “during open enrollment”
- Add 6.6: faculty on sabbatical—flag for reenrollment
- Add 6.7 track retirement
- Add 6.8: track student status (FLSA)
- Opportunities: clarify data dictionary? Consider data interfaces to improve/expand data to local systems
- Time and attendance needed to be higher priority than indicated on the document
- Priorities need to be rated higher than what they were
- Benefits changed so that we can capture selection changes
- Don’t limit ourselves to the system we currently know—start clean and think about what our needs are and what is it we really want, and what are the common data that represent the core, and what modules can expand on that?
- Access and security—1300 PPS users at Davis. If we put in grievance information, do we want that accessible? Reference checks? How much data do you really want in this system vs. shadow systems. Once size fits all may not be realistic in HR work
- What are the core principles we need to establish, and then build on that? Need to create the position first, then employ someone, then track the employee information.

■ **Academic Data Needs and Priorities**

- 1.1: capture bio-bibliographic information for faculty *and post-doc’s*
- 2.5 (recruitment reports): need to track housing allowance and MOP loans
- 2.8 (report identifying a person’s primary appointment): this is high priority for all appointments
- 3.2 (age analysis): should be high priority item
- 3.6 (interface with other systems to analyze workload, space requirements, etc.): should be a high priority item
- 3.7 (separation trends): need to track why are they leaving
- 3.11 (manage the changing visa status of international fellows): should be high priority item
- 4.6 (tracking sabbatical accruals and usage): also leaves of absence
- 7.6 (identify academic supervisors for TA’s): also GSR’s, RA’s, PGR
- 8.1 (allow people to identify multiple ethnicities): should be medium priority
- 8.7 (track composition of search committees by gender and ethnicity): should be medium priority
- 9.1 (scalable system): also needs to be flexible system
- In both staff and academic, accurate record history that can be sorted. History of what was changed, who made it, when, etc., is very important
- This group changed things to high priority and noted that a lot of these items would pertain to staff/all appointments, not just academics.

- Did have questions on #4, not knowing what 2.9 (reporting on information loaded from other systems), 2.11 (allow campuses to share public queries), 2.12 (capture all transactions and not just a snapshot at a given time), 5.2 (continue to do discrete adjustments to salary) meant.

Phil: we need to make a decision about certain core needs, clearly. What do we have to have? Then out from that, we think about other issues. Need to have clear guiding principles to the future use of the HRIS. Policy questions guide this project. Flexibility.

GROUP #5

Diane Davies-Conley, Terri McKown, Ray Reveles, Stan Kowalski, Lara Mellegers, Russell Fitzgerald

■ Needs and Priorities

- System should have flexibility to accommodate future requirements from the state, fed's, contracts
- System should have access and security built-in
- System should provide hierarchical reporting structure for department/sub-department levels
- Mission critical items: 1) time and attendance package; 2) merit process on-line; 3) implement position control linked to budget; 4) capture work/physical location of employees.

Phil's summary of the discussion:

- Need to reduce bureaucracy and have flexibility to change policies and procedures.
- System should be policy-compliant, with automatic system edits to populate fields according to a particular title code.
- But you're always going to have exceptions to policies. Rules can't substitute for judgment—system needs to be flexible enough to accommodate that.
- Business process—we may be doing things that don't add particular value. Things may be done very well that don't need to be done at all.
- The person that is doing the thing that we think lacks value, generally thinks it's a high-value activity. That's the challenge. We need to define what matters. Or it's mandated—e.g., the loyalty oath. It'd be great to get rid of it.

Data & Information Requests Breakout

GROUPS #1 AND #5

■ Needs and Priorities

- We need ease of use in creating additional reports—can't predict all the reporting requirements we'll have, so we'll need good tools
- The degree to which the system will be decentralized or centralized—issue for data access, entry, maintenance, enhancement priorities, tech support, and who will spec changes required

- Satellite/shadow systems being surveyed was news to a lot of us, and it's important that that be done—need to look at the departmental level to get data requirements at that level
- Need valid data, and historic data
- A data warehouse, no matter how excellent, doesn't help if the fundamental data are missing
- Concerns about layering additional solutions on PPS—may become cumbersome for the user. But could use a strategy of enhancing PPS and access to it.
- Need to establish common ways of requesting, defining, and interpreting data
- **No matter what approach is taken—one big system or 10 systems, local or not—it's going to be critically important that we mutually agree on standard data definitions. If we don't agree on the meaning of the data, we'll never be able to aggregate it. This is an absolutely central point.**
- Concerns about access and security
- What HR needs data for is decisionmaking, trends, projections, not just tracking transactions

GROUP #2

■ Needs and Priorities

- Support standard codes and definitions for data while allowing flexibility in the types of fields used
- Query tool needs to be user-friendly
- Data integrity and audit needs
- Consider the scale of the system—allow for the opportunity for “bolt on” systems

GROUP #3

■ Needs and Priorities

- Need accurate data: so need system edits and maximum data derivations
- Want strong audit reports and audit trails to keep data accurate
- Have the right tools for reporting—flexible, standard/canned reports, share reports across locations
- Training is really critical piece of data and reporting; if you don't understand data, you can't report off it; need training for both
- System integration: data elements include payroll, benefits, and staffing systems; depending on what goes into HRIS, if you're doing reporting, you need to report off of all the systems
- “Two months is too old for data”—need real-time data and have it be accurate
- Need for regulatory reporting we have to do—need canned reports designed by a single entity so we're all reporting the same way for regulatory requirements.

GROUP #4

■ Needs and Priorities

- Need to examine the corporate philosophy before we look at system needs/requirements (e.g., there are four separate personnel offices at UC Davis with different needs)
- Let's process map this first: look at the staff/faculty dichotomy; what are the expectations of the legislature/unions?
- Control issues: who determines access, training, hardware, data management on the HRIS?
- Are things already decided ("will use BRIO" as query tool)?

■ General discussion:

- We need to find the satellite systems that represent a duplication.
- When you're trying to build something on a piece of ground, you have to understand the ground you're working with, and then you architect the building for that particular landscape.

Labor Relations/Employee Relations Needs (Group Discussion)

- Campus, corporate, or both—where it says corporate, it's really both.
- Add: need to track consecutive hours worked
- Employees at salary range maximum and how long at max
- Employee history by unit
- Language suggests a mindset: pg. 3's nothing in the payroll allows us to record merit associated with rating, so it's no surprise that we can't report on this in a timely manner
- Will union's information requests to the university diminish now that unions have hired their own analysts? At the campus level (UC Davis), we're 400% over last year for labor requests. As unions hire more people, they want more detail on how we run the business
- It's amazing the rights to information unions are entitled to. In the past, there haven't been enough union officials to exercise those rights. Wages, hours, terms and conditions of employment, and matters that impact on that. As they organize they'll be asking for more information.
- We're likely going to be releasing home address and telephone numbers, but that keeps changing. We get legislated on this and it shifts constantly.
- We spend an uncommonly large amount of time dealing with requests from a number of locations—some times we attach a price tag, sometimes we give them the information free. If OP isn't going to do the reporting, it'd help if we got guidelines for dealing with these labor requests. They come through every channel for these data requests—Labor Relations, Office of the Chancellor, etc. But we don't know what other campuses are doing, and we don't want to lag behind, and we don't want to be too far ahead.
- OP has a Labor Data and Information Unit, and much of the data requests that are hitting the locations should be sent to the OP for coordination. Should check on that see how it's supposed to function.

- When Labor Relations respond to requests, they're using CPS data which is at best two months old. If there's been a similar information request sent to the campus, then the union has two responses that are totally different. The corporate information process satisfies many needs but there's still a need for a single source of data. In CPS things are defined slightly different than PPS.
- Collective bargaining area is not just about data—we need a clear philosophical approach—we don't have the power to bargain locally, it's done systemwide through OP, and there's always a difference between what the campuses want to do and the negotiation through OP. It's not just the data sets we need to respond, but we need to think more strategically about who's hanging out at the legislature and helps us get a step ahead to shape the debate at the legislature.
- Retain payroll system for timekeeping and payroll, and a separate HR system. This is what we're doing at Berkeley. At the labor relations area, the distinction gets blurred—anytime you want to do costing, you need to look at payroll. When you look at retroactive action, have to look at time. There's a challenge to integrate the two systems for labor relations, because we have two separate systems and the time information is still in PPS. That needs a serious consideration when you're looking at broad scope considerations. We're not going to be able to do the retroactive action any faster with the new system.
- Would hate to see more of these data elements crammed into PPS because the more you cram, the more conflict you create in other areas, i.e., four different addresses.
- There are a number of basic questions we've been unable to answer: how many employees we have, what units are they, what % of time are they working. If we can get that information, we can convince the legislature that we can manage our workforce.
- We have non-represented employees that we face the same exercises for.
- Under pre-bargaining group, getting training and development funds spent.
- Interface between the HR system and the payroll system is absolutely critical for these reporting needs. Davis Medical Center is using PeopleSoft and they will implement their own merits in PeopleSoft and they'll batch feed into PPS. But CX reporting for the unions isn't captured in those reports. So we're sending an incomplete picture back to CUE. Critical that the two systems be interfaced in real time.
- For both represented and non-represented employees, we have total compensation issues—cash and non-cash compensation. Total cash compensation is becoming increasingly important, more than a “medium” priority
- There needs to be clear communication when a union starts its action, how the staff should process those employees. Need specific instructions on how to code employees. For instance, when grad students were unionized, there was no process in payroll. Contract in June, guidance in September, so there were errors in the system because the code they told us to use wasn't in the system. When a union is born, a process in payroll must follow.
- Phil's recap of the employee and labor relations discussion:
 - When we're talking about labor relations, we're not just dealing with union requests, but we have the same needs for employees that aren't represented. We probably wish we could have that information. Much of what they need is what we need.

- Unions want to move to a new generation of representation and figure out how to do some strategic planning of their own. We need to get there simultaneously, or before them. It's possible for us to co-opt unions. That's a strategic issue.
- Retroactivity won't be resolved.
- Tracking employment development and training is important—in the NBA, there's a lot said about the need to train employees and do succession planning. One of the roles of HR is to help the enterprise move forward, become better—it means, therefore, that we have to ensure that we create a pool of people who are eligible and qualified to move onto other positions.
- Communication—stuff is happening, and we're often the last to know what we're doing. We have to identify the need for our individual parts to be brought together and collectively decide issues and then disseminate the information about the decision.
- The PERB rules regarding data we're obliged to provide unions are clear. We have to make a “reasonable” effort. But there are PERB rules and then there are PERB interpretations of those rules. Generally, we should be prepared for PERB to agree with unions that any data UC can gather under “ordinary circumstances” should be provided.

Group Vote Results

Need/Requirement/Issue	Number of Votes
1-time entry of data	22
Accurate data	8
Affirmative action	1
Allow bolt-on systems	6
Availability of reports/data	4
Business analytics/management reporting	6
Clean up processes	8
Clear communications	15
Clear data dictionary	10
Clear philosophical approach	3
Corporate philosophy	15
Data consistency	14
Data for decisionmaking	17
Data integrity	9
Data warehouse with valid and complete data	10
Data warehouses	4
Decentralization vs. centralization	12
Ease of creating reports	6
Easy PPS interface	9
Easy to retrieve data	11
Easy, flexible tools	7
Eliminate secondary systems of record	9
Employee at max	2
Employee history by unit	12
Flexibility for future requirements	11

Need/Requirement/Issue	Number of Votes
Hierarchical reporting	8
Historical data	29
History	7
History	8
History	16
Leave data	4
Mass change ability	13
Merit process on-line	13
Modeling	8
Mutually agreed upon standard data definitions	34
Payroll data	5
Position control	10
Position system	7
PPS HR interface	16
Process mapping	17
Resolve funding	6
Salary history	10
Self-service	3
Staffing and budget	4
Standard & ad hoc reporting	4
Standard definitions	11
Time and attendance	20
Time and attendance	6
Timely data	10
Total comp	10
Track hours	1
Track physical location	3
Track physical work location	10
Track salary actions	20
Tracking incentive awards	9
Training on data and tools	16
Trend analysis	9
User friendly query tool	4
Valid data	15
Who controls system	6
Workflow processes	7
Workforce planning	9
Workload vs. value of information	4