To:                          Mary Opperman

From:                    Employee Survey Team

Date:                     January 11, 2013

Subject:               Meeting Preparation for January 16 Meeting

The Employee Survey Team and its committees have finalized their proposals in preparation for the Employee Assembly Forums. The Forums will be scheduled as soon as possible in February and March 2013. Employees will be asked for their feedback and input; it will be made clear that these proposals are in draft form and nothing is finalized.

After our last meeting with you, all of the committees reconvened. We made sure each committee had EA representation in the leadership. Committees considered your feedback, reviewed the additional employee survey results, and amended their recommendations as necessary. The complete reports for each of the seven topic areas provide background, justifications, and details. These documents are attached for your review.  Following are highlights regarding changes that were made in the newest versions for each committee. We look forward to our discussion with you next week.

As a reminder, these are the seven areas:

1. Workload: Position Evaluation & Analysis
2. Workload: Personal Development
3. Workload: Energy Project Expansion
4. Workload: Alignment and Change Tools
5. Career Opportunities
6. Supervisor Feedback
7. Recognition
8. **Position Evaluation and Analysis**

Proposal remains relatively the same.  Some changes to the text include clarification that bargaining units are not in the scope of the project, an expanded explanation of the timeline, and other clarifications to the forms. (*please see PEA recommendation attached)*

1. **Personal Development**

Previous Recommendation:Create a policy or HR guideline for managers and supervisors outlining the University’s expectations and resources for addressing workplace wellness.

Current Recommendation: Add a component to the Time Away From Work Policy 6.9

Personal Development

Employees can use up to 2.5 hours of paid release time per week (not to exceed 2.5 per week or 120 hours per year) to pursue personal development. This time is in addition to time provided for meal breaks, which may also be used (and/or combined with specific personal development time) for purposes of personal development. Employees should provide a written request for release time. Staff requesting release time are expected to work with the supervisor to ensure business needs are met and the impact to the department is minimized.

Employees whose work situation makes it impossible to partake during work hours can request a stipend for up to $200 annually as reimbursement for personal development outside of work hours (gym membership, classes, etc.). The employee and supervisor must have a valid business reason why the employee doesn’t get paid release time and employee must submit receipt for reimbursement.  Ideally, all denied requests for time would be reviewed by an external person such as an HR representative or Wellness representative. Note: this option is not an either or. The employee would only be eligible for financial reimbursement if the position does not allow for this time. If the employee chooses not to use it, even though it is available, this does not qualify for funding.

It is further recommended that a concurrent study be implemented to track usage, survey supervisors and/or employees, collect other metrics, and determine impact. Ideally, HR experts would determine the optimal way to do this. Ultimately, the results of this study would corroborate the business case and lead to a further positive shift, embracing personal development both on and off the Ithaca campus.

1. **Energy Project Expansion**

Our original recommendation was to have The Energy Project deployed top down within the organization.  After reviewing the written comments to the employee survey we have revised our proposal.  Our new recommendation is that we pilot the program in units that would benefit most from the program. This would significantly reduce the start-up costs and allow us to perform a cost benefit analysis to determine if a larger deployment across campus would be a worthwhile investment.

1. **Alignment and Change Tools**

The first report included three recommendations. There are now two. The committee recommends the university only focus on the implementation of process improvement and communication of existing change tools, professional and personal development offerings and solutions to manage workload.  While Excellence in Higher Education is something a College/Division can choose to do on its own, it is no longer a recommendation. The committee believes that by focusing time and energy on process improvement and communication it will achieve the most significant results.

1. **Career Opportunities**

A campus advisory committee has been formed in place of a short term volunteer task force to analyze and recommend university responses to the identified Career Opportunities issue. This committee has met once and reviewed the relevant open ended comments from the Employee Survey.

The initial discussion did not focus on the previously proposed recommendations (below), although several themes were validated, such as lack of clear career paths, practices and cultural norms against internal movement, restrictive job requirements rather than competencies for positions, etc.

We feel most of these issues are a matter of practice, policy or culture and no single quick fix recommendation will achieve much. This group will meet again in January and monthly to review the current recommendations and fill out or edit them as appropriate. Given there were no identified conflicts to this point, several HR driven recommendations are progressing.

* Design and titles for the dual career ladders are being vetted and Workday is being prepped to accept them along with accompanying compensation framework.
* Succession planning is going forward with refinements to the executive and financial plans and with continued planning in administrative units
* Optimal Resume is operating and people are being referred to its services.
* Online Mentoring has been contracted and will be piloted with several groups over the next 3 months

**Supervisor Feedback**

The first submission of the Supervisor Feedback Committee included the following recommendations:

1. The incorporation of supervisor feedback into the Performance Dialogue process.

* The use of electronic and hard copy forms.
* Forms would be submitted by staff to both the direct supervisor and the next level supervisor.
* We envisioned some voluntary use during the 2013 Performance Dialogue season.
* We proposed making supervisor feedback required for the 2014 season.

1. A strategic communication plan must be developed to support a university-wide culture shift.
2. A project coordinator should be designated to coordinate community engagement.
3. Existing tools should be explored and new tools developed to support giving and receiving feedback.
4. Training must be developed and delivered to prepare the community for supervisor feedback.

The second submission of the Supervisor Feedback Committee included the following modified recommendations:

1. The incorporation of supervisor feedback into the Performance Dialogue process.

* The use of Qualtrics as an electronic form.
* Forms would be submitted anonymously by staff to the next level supervisor.
* We envisioned some voluntary use during the 2013 Performance Dialogue season.
* We proposed making supervisor feedback required for the 2014 season.

1. A strategic communication plan must be developed to support a university-wide culture shift.
2. A Leading Cornell team will be assigned to coordinate implementation and community engagement.
3. Existing tools should be explored and new tools developed to support giving and receiving feedback.
4. Training must be developed and delivered to prepare the community for supervisor feedback.

**Recognition**

No updates. Already in implementation phase.