

Talent@Iowa

Report from the UI human resources task force

August 2016

Contents

Executive summary—page 3

Task force overview—page 4

- Current state—page 4
- Charge—page 4
- Members—page 5
- Scope—page 5
- Process—page 6

Key findings and recommendations—page 8

- Finding 1: HR as strategic partner—page 8
- Finding 2: Expanded HR IT and data—page 9
- Finding 3: Focus on talent management—page 10
- Finding 4: Standardization and flexibility—page 11
- Resources—page 12

Appendices—page 13

- Appendix 1: Task force overview—page 13
- Appendix 2: Background—page 15
- Appendix 3: Campus input subcommittee report—page 19
- Appendix 4: Data and metrics subcommittee report—page 24
- Appendix 5: Benchmarking and external review subcommittee report—page 33
- Appendix 6: Talent acquisition committee report—page 42
- Appendix 7: Enterprise-wide HR IT systems committee report—page 45
- Appendix 8: Training and organizational development committee report—page 48
- Appendix 9: Collective bargaining and contract administration committee report—page 52
- Appendix 10: Policy development and administrative oversight committee report—page 57

Acknowledgements—page 59

Executive summary

Over the past few months, and with the help of colleagues across campus, the Talent@Iowa task force has assessed the strengths of the university's central human resources functions and identified opportunities for improvement. This report recommends **strategies and priorities** for University of Iowa and UI Health Care central HR functions.

The task force's work **complements related initiatives**. It builds on TIER@Iowa objectives for distributed HR business partners, echoes earlier recommendations for UI Health Care Human Resources, and reflects joint principles established by the task force and the UI strategic planning committee:

The University of Iowa is world-class research institution because of the talented people who form our community. We are committed to creating the best possible environment for our people to carry out their responsibilities to the university. This includes recruiting, supporting, engaging, and retaining diverse and talented faculty and staff members. We will continue to nurture the growth of our people through professional development, competitive compensation, and creative collaboration to foster excellence in learning and discovery.

Fundamentally, the task force advocates a change in thinking about human resources, **shifting our emphasis from the transactional to the strategic** and viewing HR as a full business partner with university leadership.

Adopting a **strategic talent management framework** will allow the university to build human capital, fully developing and utilizing its most valuable investment—its faculty and staff. The approach has implications for HR priorities and the HR functions necessary to meet the strategic needs of different talent categories.

Organizational structures should **foster partnerships between central HR professionals and other leaders** at all levels of the institution. Specific, intentional **hiring, engagement, and retention** practices should be tailored to different categories of employees, guided by core values and long-term goals.

The task force has grouped its findings and recommendations into four areas (see page 8): **strategic partnerships, enhanced IT and data, talent management, and balancing standardization with flexibility**. Resource recommendations are included.

The task force thanks the many HR professionals and colleagues who contributed to this report and recognizes their longstanding commitment. Our work aims to examine and refine processes and best practices that enable the greatest benefits for the university.

Task force overview

Current state

Four central human resources and compliance units—University Human Resources (**UHR**), UI Health Care Human Resources (**HCHR**), Equal Opportunity and Diversity (**EOD**), and Faculty Human Resources (**FHR**)—support the University of Iowa’s colleges, departments, and programs.

Together, these units provide services for approximately 23,000 employees, including faculty, Professional and Scientific staff, Merit staff, graduate and postdoctoral staff, and working undergraduates.

As it developed recommendations for HR strategies and priorities, the Talent@Iowa task force noted these and other current strengths:

- A wide range of HR programs and systems rated effective by HR professionals and campus users alike
- A TIER@Iowa-inspired focus on sharpening the responsibilities of distributed HR professionals and strengthening their connections to central HR units
- A corresponding push for coordination and efficiency in UI Health Care HR
- An ongoing drive to invest in HR programs and professionals, recognizing their role in strategic planning and implementation

Acknowledging existing HR strengths helped the task force narrow its focus to areas for improvement and new, future-oriented proposals.

Charge

UI leadership charged the task force with assessing and recommending strategies and priorities for central human resources functions supporting the University of Iowa and University of Iowa Health Care:

- Based on campus input, evaluate the **effectiveness and efficiency** of central HR and compliance functions.
- Identify areas of **redundancy and duplication** to improve efficiencies and maximize resources.
- Recommend **organization, structure, and scale** of operations for coordinated HR roles necessary to meet diverse needs of campus stakeholders.
- Identify HR strategies to increase **diversity and inclusion** among faculty, staff, and students.
- Recommend strategies for engaging HR in the university’s **teaching, research, service, and health care missions**.

Members

The task force includes representatives from UI and UI Health Care leadership, faculty and staff shared governance units, and leaders from UHR, HCHR, EOD, and FHR:

Keith Clasen	HR director	HCHR
Angelique Johnson	Faculty HR Director	Office of the Provost
Terry Johnson	Chief financial officer and Operations Team	Finance and Operations
Jamie Jorgensen	Deputy general counsel	General Counsel
John Keller	Dean	Graduate College
Rod Lehnertz (ad-hoc)	Senior vice president and Operations Team	Finance and Operations
Kendra Malone	Diversity resource coordinator	Chief Diversity Office
Laura McLeran (ad-hoc)	Associate vice president and operations team	Office of the President
Jennifer Modestou	Director	EOD
David Moser	Assistant dean for faculty affairs	Carver College of Medicine
Cheryl Reardon (chair)	Associate vice president	Research and Economic Development
Alan Reed	Professor	Surgery
Greg Stewart	Professor and Faculty Senate representative	Tippie College of Business
Joni Troester	Interim assistant vice president	UHR
Kevin Ward	Interim vice president and Operations Team	UHR
Jan Waterhouse	Senior HR representative	College of Engineering
Jana Wessels	Associate vice president	HCHR
Chuck Wieland	Administrator and Staff Council representative	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Scope

Human resources and compliance functions are distributed throughout UI colleges, departments, and programs, with leadership and support from four central units: University Human Resources, UI Health Care Human Resources, Equal Opportunity and Diversity, and Faculty Human Resources.

The task force focused on roles, responsibilities, and relationships among these four central units, including their connection to distributed HR professionals, campus leaders, and other colleagues.

Process

The task force collected information on the current state of HR functions, developed future-state recommendations, and identified areas for further study.

It established subcommittees focused on campus input, data and metrics, and benchmarking, as well as ad-hoc committees based on areas of greatest interest and opportunity. The latter enlisted additional campus experts for in-depth studies of priority areas. Both the task force subcommittees and the ad-hoc committees provided recommendations for this report.

The committee process followed three phases: planning (February 2016), discovery (March-July), and the final report (August 2016). The discovery phase included four sub-phases:

Baseline information

Human resources and compliance leaders on the task force gathered current-state information about UHR, HCHR, EOD, and FHR.

Subcommittees

The task force designated three subcommittees to collect additional information and offer recommendations:

- **Campus input subcommittee:** Determine and implement methods for gathering campus input—e.g., focus groups, town hall meetings, online surveys, etc. Seek out feedback on diversity and inclusion strategies.
- **Data and metrics subcommittee:** Identify and collect available data points, key performance indicators, and metrics for the effectiveness of central HR functions, including those that support diversity and inclusion. Identify additional potential metrics for future development.
- **Benchmarking and external review subcommittee:** Develop and implement methods for benchmarking against peer institutions and/or conducting an external review of UI human resources and compliance functions.

Specific questions

Starting from their charge, the task force identified specific questions to guide its work. Some examples include:

- What central human resources functions are perceived as ineffective or as barriers to campus operations?
- What areas of redundancy currently exist? Are they useful or unnecessary?
- How do we best clarify relationships and optimize collaboration among central HR functions?

- How can we better integrate goals for diversity and inclusion with central HR functions and operations?

Appendix 1 includes the full list of guiding questions.

Focus areas

Task force members each ranked three priorities from a list of 22 core HR functions (see appendix 1). Based on this exercise, the task force identified five focus areas and established ad-hoc committees charged with developing two to four recommendations for each area. Committees included task-force members and additional campus experts:

- **Talent management and acquisition** (including equal opportunity/affirmative action, retention, succession planning, and dual-career programs)
- **Enterprise-wide HR IT systems** (including vended systems and talent acquisition systems)
- **Training and organizational development** (including employee orientation/onboarding and employee engagement)
- **Collective bargaining and contract administration**
- **Policy development and administrative oversight** (including leave management; classification and compensation; and other policy areas)

Members of the task force also conducted a series of discussions with campus stakeholders and leaders including:

- Collegiate leaders
- President's cabinet
- Senior HR leaders
- EOD staff
- Provost and associate provosts
- HR search consultants
- University HR leadership
- Strategic planning leaders

Report

This report includes recommendations from the task force's subcommittees and ad-hoc committees, all informed by data collected by the task force and its partners.

The following section organizes recommendations around four key findings designed to work in concert. These recommendations will be most effective if implemented together.

The appendices include committee reports that provide additional background on each recommendation.

Key findings and recommendations

Finding 1: HR should become a stronger strategic business partner

People are the university's largest investment and strategic resource, making up 54 percent of the annual UI budget (and 65 percent of GEF). HR professionals and UI leaders should collaborate at every step on strategies that strengthen our talent pool, address the university's strategic plan priorities, and reduce costs.

As strategic business partners, HR professionals can most effectively support the university's teaching, research, service, and health care missions. They can help attract, develop and deploy top talent; support employee retention, engagement, and productivity; and prepare for future workforce needs.

Recommendations

Decision-making

1. **Create a decision-making framework:** Balance risk tolerance and decision-making authority. Identify categories of local, low-to-moderate-risk decisions that improve efficiency, and empower distributed HR leaders to make those decisions. *(Policy development and administrative oversight, appendix 10)*
2. **Establish an HR roundtable:** Develop a forum for sharing ideas and strategies to enhance the role of HR in high-performing organizations. Enlist campus leaders and colleagues in shaping HR and compliance strategy. Engage deans and associate deans around faculty HR issues, tap faculty expertise in HR and related fields, invite external experts, and build professional networks. *(Benchmarking and external review, appendix 5)*
3. **Regularly review and update policies:** Develop more consistent and systematic processes for identifying policy review needs and generating campus input. Allow operational flexibility while preserving policy purpose and intent. *(Policy development and administrative oversight, appendix 10)*

Partnerships

4. **Enhance communication among UI stakeholders:** Coordinate policies and resources, and improve use of data and metrics to determine bargaining objectives and inform contract negotiations. *(Collective bargaining and contract administration, appendix 9)*
5. **Optimize the relationship between UI and UI Health Care HR units:** Model connections after other areas where central university and UI Health Care units intersect. Together, UHR and HCHR can develop more efficient central services, enhance day-to-day collaboration, and implement other priorities, including those already proposed and approved for HCHR. *(Collective bargaining and contract administration, appendix 9; policy development and administrative oversight, appendix 10)*

- 6. Develop additional benchmarking opportunities:** As UI priorities take shape, consider formal external reviews, consulting contracts, site visits, and other approaches. (*Benchmarking and external review, appendix 5*)

Finding 2: Effective and efficient HR requires streamlined IT

Acute need for HR systems, data, and reporting puts heavy demands on limited IT resources. Central HR IT units are challenged to meet competing priorities, address expectations for customization and flexibility, build and retain advanced skills, avoid duplication, and improve systems in a dynamic environment.

Strengthening governance and moving HR IT teams to central IT organizations can address these challenges. HR should continue to foster integration, identify priorities, and oversee HR IT initiatives, but development teams should be positioned to draw on expertise from across the IT enterprise.

Recommendations

Governance and structure

- 7. Create an HR IT governance committee:** Emphasize joint planning, prioritization, and coordination of HR IT with other campus IT functions. Support collaboration between IT service providers, primary and secondary customers, and constituents. Establish open and transparent methods for evaluating and addressing business needs. (*Enterprise-wide HR IT systems, appendix 7*)
- 8. Centralize HR IT teams and processes:** Transition HR IT teams to central IT organizations, relying on functional HR workgroups and the proposed governance committee to identify priorities and oversee systems. Leverage central IT expertise in data management, systems architecture, integrations, security, and other areas. (*Enterprise-wide HR IT systems, appendix 7*)

Systems and integration

- 9. Implement a state-of-the-art talent management system:** Plan, budget, and acquire tools that address emerging talent-management strategies, starting with talent acquisition. Address the full suite of talent management needs for varied constituencies in a time frame that respects those needs. (*Talent acquisition, appendix 6*)
- 10. Support talent acquisition initiatives currently under way:** Look for current needs-assessment projects to establish functional requirements, business owners, and recommendations for UI leaders. Apply similar approaches to meeting other HR needs. (*Enterprise-wide HR IT systems, appendix 7*)
- 11. Optimize current and future systems:** Reduce duplication of effort, improve integration, and identify other potential improvements to current systems, including leave tracking, compliances and qualifications, My Training, and others. (*Campus input, appendix 3; enterprise-wide HR IT systems, appendix 7*)

12. Increase resources for HR IT: Provide funding and staffing for new and enhanced systems. (*Campus input, appendix 3; enterprise-wide HR IT systems, appendix 7*)

Data and analytics

13. Create a metrics work group: Implement strategies for using HR data to better support data-driven decisions. Establish base metrics, regular reporting practices, and additional projects targeting key priorities. (*Data and metrics, appendix 4*)

14. Develop and implement an HR dashboard: Establish common HR efficiency metrics to support central HR functions and distributed HR models. Identify analytics that enable predictive decision-making. Track institutional metrics to support business outcomes and shape HR strategy. (*Data and metrics, appendix 4*)

Finding 3: Talent management must be modernized

To compete for top faculty and staff, the university must adopt an aggressive and comprehensive approach to talent management.

Talent acquisition represents an immediate need. Hiring processes should be streamlined and adopt contemporary strategies that attract new employees, recognizing that external hires can be key to building faculty ranks, filling specialized staff roles, and achieving diversity goals.

Building our internal talent pool is just as important. Proactive development, engagement, retention, and succession planning initiatives will develop, inspire, and keep our best people.

Our campus needs effective tools to track hiring and development, set market-based compensation, forecast future workforce needs, and assess results.

Recommendations

Strategy and systems

15. Develop comprehensive talent strategies: Meet the needs of a world-class research university and leading academic medical center with initiatives that attract top faculty and staff (e.g., central support for employer branding and advertising), enhance internal mobility (e.g., leadership development), and create new pipelines (e.g., encouraging students to explore UI jobs). (*Talent acquisition, appendix 6*)

16. Define roles and responsibilities for talent acquisition: Establish leads from central HR units for staff and faculty acquisition. Collaborate across units and with distributed HR leaders on diversity initiatives and regulatory compliance. Keep candidate evaluation and hiring selections local. (*Talent acquisition, appendix 6*)

- 17. Expand diversity processes and tools:** Promote best practices and recruitment resources, in part through training for search chairs, supervisors, administrators, and HR professionals. *(Talent acquisition, appendix 6)*
- 18. Enhance work/life integration and dual-career programs:** Implement programs shown to be especially valuable in recruiting faculty, women, and underrepresented minorities. *(Talent acquisition, appendix 6)*

Employee engagement

- 19. Enhance succession planning:** Promote awareness of career opportunities, and update both core and leadership competencies needed for employees to advance. Identify goals and resource needs for new succession planning systems. *(Training and organizational development, appendix 8)*
- 20. Train supervisors to foster professional development:** Improve onboarding for new supervisors to encourage a professional development focus. *(Training and organizational development, appendix 8)*
- 21. Establish a training and development consortium and standardize tracking tools:** Enhance collaboration among offices currently offering training and development programs, establishing My Training as the central system for tracking participation and outcomes. Develop common language, concepts, values, and emphases, and share best practices and development tips. *(Training and organizational development, appendix 8)*

Finding 4: HR must balance standardization with flexibility

Standardizing policies, processes, and services can boost HR efficiency, but standards must remain flexible enough to meet diverse local needs.

New or expanded central service units can address specific needs cited in campus surveys, while consolidated units can eliminate clear duplication or—in the case of IT—expand available resources. Many of the moves proposed for HR functions complement TIER@Iowa efficiency strategies.

At the same time, central units can engage distributed HR professionals and better share decision-making responsibility. Central and distributed units should shift transactional responsibilities as needed to accommodate greater strategic focus.

Recommendations

- 22. Adopt unified strategies for job classifications and compensation:** Establish compensation philosophies that offer necessary flexibility, stem from market data, and drive resource allocation. Create classification processes that speed job postings, support agile development of new classifications, and attract top talent. *(Policy development and administrative oversight, appendix 10)*

- 23. Centralize immigration and leave-management services:** Act on campus input highlighting these areas, and explore additional areas to expand central services. (*Policy development and administrative oversight, appendix 10*)
- 24. Propose new shared services:** Further study peer-institution models and determine where additional centralization can yield efficiencies and meet the needs of individual UI units. (*Benchmarking and external review, appendix 5*)

Resources

To develop its recommendations, the task force requests these new resources:

Strategic funding

Talent acquisition/applicant tracking system

To compete for top talent, the UI must adopt a comprehensive talent management system, starting with a focus on talent acquisition and applicant tracking:

- Early estimate: \$1 million in initial vendor costs, \$500,000 recurring annually
- This investment would fund the first priority for a talent-management system. Data integration, project management, and recurring costs for branding, promotions, and skill development would require additional funding.

Centralized services model

- Start-up funds to implement centralized services for leave management and immigration services in advance of a sustaining funding model

Space planning

Centralized services model

- Space to enable recommendations, particularly those associated with expanded service-center approaches
- Space needs for UI Health Care Human Resources

Appendix 1: Task force overview

Specific questions

Full list of questions developed to guide work by subcommittees, ad-hoc committees, et al.:

- **Effectiveness and efficiency:**
 - What central human resources functions are perceived as ineffective or as barriers to campus operations?
 - What opportunities and challenges influence delivery of central HR functions to different labor markets (e.g., health care, faculty, professional staff, researchers, etc.)?
 - Would improvements to recruitment processes—including technology supporting recruitment and talent management—ensure higher quality, more diverse talent pools and workforce?

- **Redundancy and duplication:**
 - What areas of redundancy currently exist? Are they useful or unnecessary?
 - Would different approaches open opportunities to reallocate resources and better support core missions?
 - How can we clarify roles and accountabilities related to labor relations, leave management and disability, compensation and classification, and organizational development across UHR and HCHR? How can these roles and relationships better address Board of Regents and UI leadership expectations?

- **Organization, structure, and scale:**
 - What are the most effective reporting structures and leadership models to ensure human resources units function as effective business partners to UI leadership in both strategy and operations?
 - How do we best clarify relationships and optimize collaboration among central HR functions?

- **Diversity and inclusion:**
 - How can we better integrate goals for diversity and inclusion with central HR functions and operations?
 - What new HR strategies and initiatives could increase and support diversity and inclusion?

- **Teaching, research, service, and health care missions:**
 - How can central HR functions better align with and more actively support core UI missions?

Core HR functions prioritized

HR functions considered by task force members, each of whom ranked three top priorities to inform charges for ad-hoc committees:

Core HR function	Average rank order
Talent acquisition	1.07
Enterprise-wide HR IT systems	1.43
Equal opportunity/affirmative action practices	1.43
Employee engagement	1.50
Leave management	1.57
Training and organizational development	1.79
Policy development and administrative oversight	1.86
Employee orientation/onboarding	1.93
Job classification system	1.93
Collective bargaining and contract administration	1.93
Compensation structures	2.00
Vended HR solutions	2.07
Immigration services	2.07
Payroll	2.64
Reduction in force	2.64
Family services	2.64
Benefits	2.79
Workers compensation	2.79
Language and cultural services	2.79
Wellness programming and services	2.79
Employee Assistance Program	2.86
Threat assessment program	2.93

Appendix 2: Background

The University of Iowa's central human resources units provide strategic and comprehensive resources for managing people and fostering a positive workplace culture and environment aligned with institutional goals. HR units offer leadership and advice on all employment related matters at the UI.

Examples of centralized HR functions include compensation, Merit employment, performance management, organizational development, safety, wellness, benefits, employee motivation, communication, administration, and training. HR units help attract and retain diverse faculty and staff, supporting their productivity, engagement, health, and wellbeing.

Intersections between HR task force recommendations and the developing UI strategic plan are important to recognize as the campus identifies opportunities and priorities for 2016-2021. To ensure we value our most critical asset, leaders of the task force and the strategic planning committee have developed the following statement:

The University of Iowa is world-class research institution because of the talented people who form our community. We are committed to creating the best possible environment for our people to carry out their responsibilities to the university. This includes recruiting, supporting, engaging, and retaining diverse and talented faculty and staff members. We will continue to nurture the growth of our people through professional development, competitive compensation, and creative collaboration to foster excellence in learning and discovery.

The HR task force also complements TIER@Iowa, the comprehensive project to make UI operations more effective and efficient. TIER business case HR-01 aims to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the distributed HR roles and strengthen their relationship to central leadership. Strategies include efforts to build and share expertise, streamline common processes, and centralize especially complex functions.

TIER does not encompass UI Health Care, but UI Health Care Human Resources has undergone three comprehensive reviews since 2007. The most recent concluded in 2015 and yielded recommendations that were approved by UI Health Care leadership and are ready for implementation.

The 2015 UI Health Care recommendations include identifying high-value HR functions HCHR can perform more efficiently in house, structuring HCHR to strengthen connections with departments, centralizing immigration and other services, and focusing on strategic versus transactional partnerships.

The following sections include brief histories for each central HR unit, plus FY 2016 budget and staffing data.

History

University Human Resources (UHR)

Functions that today comprise the university's central HR office developed over time to meet specific personnel needs—paying employees, providing benefits, administering Board of Regents merit rules, and the like. By the 1970s, these and other functions reported to an associate vice president for finance and administrative services.

In the late 1990s, HR functions reorganized as University Human Resources and moved to a common location in the University Services Building. UHR implemented a new information management system (PeopleSoft), and new resources began providing services to support individual and organizational productivity (e.g., wellness and organizational effectiveness).

Distributed HR roles evolved alongside the central HR unit. Senior HR leaders in each college and major division represent their respective deans and vice presidents, while unit-level HR roles provide local support for faculty, staff, and supervisors. As noted above, TIER@Iowa includes a focus on the efficiency and effectiveness of the distributed HR roles and their relationship to central HR leadership.

UI Health Care Human Resources (HCHR)

Owing to its scope and the specific character of health care employment, UI Health Care maintains a dedicated HR unit that collaborates with the university's other central HR and compliance units.

In 2007, Navigant Consulting—a global health care service consulting firm—examined operations for the Carver College of Medicine and UI Hospitals and Clinics—which, with the UI Physicians faculty practice group, constitute University of Iowa Health Care. Navigant recommended consolidating HR leadership and budgets for the college and the hospital into one centralized unit.

A second review in 2008 by the university's organizational effectiveness office yielded the same conclusion: “the new VPMA (vice president for medical affairs) model integrating hospital and college leadership requires an integrated, coordinated strategic HR function.” UI Health Care leaders subsequently opted to consolidate HR functions into a single enterprise.

In 2009, UI Health Care hired an associate vice president and chief HR officer who initiated an ultimately unsuccessful consolidation project. An associate vice president appointed in 2010 renewed the process, and by 2012 had completed full integration of HR staff, budgets, leadership, and service delivery.

Faculty Human Resources (FHR)

The Faculty HR team reports to the associate provost for faculty within the Office of the Provost. It was developed in 2009 to address needs unique to faculty employees, including recruitment; appointment and reappointment; professional development; effort allocation; teaching, research, and service responsibilities; promotion and tenure; leave management; shared governance policy; and salary and special compensation.

The unit supports new university-wide initiatives recommended by the provost and associate provost for faculty. Staff work closely with Faculty Senate officers and convene quarterly meetings of collegiate faculty HR representatives, associate deans for faculty, and other stakeholders.

FHR is the post-org approver for all faculty HR workflow forms and processes. The unit supports faculty-related HR IT systems, including Faculty Status and the Academic and Professional Record project.

Equal Opportunity and Diversity (EOD)

Throughout the 1960s, the UI focused renewed attention on issues of diversity and inclusion, establishing a Human Rights Committee, naming the Big Ten's first African American administrative vice president, and founding campus cultural centers. In 1972, President Sandy Boyd created an Office of Affirmative Action to ensure employment opportunities for people of all backgrounds.

In 2003, the unit changed its name to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. It eventually joined the Chief Diversity Office that developed from the appointment of the university's first special assistant to the president/associate provost dedicated to diversity initiatives.

Today, the UI chief diversity officer oversees EOD, the Center for Diversity and Enrichment, and the Diversity Resources Team. EOD is responsible for implementing university policy and ensuring compliance with applicable civil rights, equal employment opportunity, and affirmative action laws and regulations.

Budgets

Together, the university's four central HR units employ 117 FTEs with budgets totaling about \$11.8 million. The budgets below represent the 22 centralized functions identified by the taskforce (see appendix 1):

Central HR function estimated budgets and staffing FY16

	UHR	HCHR	FHR	EOD	Total
Salaries/fringe	\$9,635,000	\$1,238,724	\$292,013	\$245,564	\$11,411,301
General expense	\$238,944	\$142,064	\$4,500	\$4,358	\$389,866
Total	\$9,873,944	\$1,380,788	\$296,513	\$249,922	\$11,801,167
Staff (FTE)	97.9	13.5	2.52	3.25	117.17

Appendix 3: Campus input subcommittee report

Members

John Keller, Kendra Malone, Jan Waterhouse (chair), Charles Wieland

Charge

- Determine and implement methods for gathering campus input—e.g., focus groups, town hall meetings, online surveys, etc.
- Seek out feedback on diversity and inclusion strategies
- Summarize information and themes from campus feedback
- Identify two to three recommendations for task force consideration

Methods

The subcommittee conducted two campus surveys May 17-27, 2016. Survey questions reflected the task force’s central HR function priorities.

Approximately 425 HR professionals received the one survey. This group included senior HR leaders for each UI college and org; HR unit reps; faculty HR reps; P&S search consultants; and staff from University Human Resources, UI Health Care Human Resources, Faculty Human Resources, and Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

The survey generated a 47 percent response rate, with 30 percent of responses from UI Health Care. Staff comprised 100 percent of respondents.

Approximately 1,600 HR customers—people who use central HR services—received the second survey. This group included associate deans for faculty; supervisors (both faculty and staff) who had hired a faculty or staff member within the preceding six months; and a sample of all faculty and staff distributed evenly across years-of-service categories: less than one year, one-five years, and more than five years.

This survey generated an 18 percent response rate, with 56 percent of responses from UI Health Care. Faculty comprised 13 percent of respondents, staff 86 percent.

Findings

From these two surveys, the subcommittee charted highest- and lowest-rated services and systems, identified common themes, and ultimately developed its recommendations.

HR professionals survey

The survey asked HR professionals to propose priorities, rate effectiveness of services and systems, and provide feedback on task force priorities.

Priority areas

HR professionals clearly identified talent acquisition as their highest priority. Other areas of high priority included orientation/onboarding; policy development and oversight; and employee engagement. Mid-priority areas included training and organizational development, and equal opportunity/affirmative action practices.

Effectiveness of central HR services

The subcommittee calculated average ratings provided by respondents who reported using each central HR service. Ratings used a four-point scale, with 1 denoting “very effective,” 2 “effective,” 3 “somewhat effective,” and 4 “not effective.”

HR professionals’ highest-rated services included immigration services (1.7), compensation and classification (1.7), and leave management (1.9). Lowest rated services included talent acquisition (2.5), policy development and oversight (2.3), and organizational development (2.2).

Asked what additional services should be centralized, 38.6 percent of HR professionals identified immigration services, including I-9 processing.

Effectiveness of HR IT systems

Highest-rated HR IT systems included ELMS (UI Health Care system) (1.8), UI Workflow (1.9), vacation/sick reporting (2.0), and time and attendance reporting (2.0). Lowest-rated systems included My UI Career (2.7), ERMA (UI Health Care system) (2.6), position management (2.6), and FMLA report/inquiry (2.5).

In open-ended comments on HR IT systems, clear themes emerged:

- Better applicant-tracking system to enhance talent acquisition
- More integration across HR IT systems to reduce duplication of work and provide more efficient access to HR data and reports
- Improvements to leave-tracking systems including the vacation/sick report and FMLA leave tracking

Talent acquisition, equal opportunity, and succession planning

Respondents made it clear that the hiring process takes too long, causing departments to lose good candidates. Multiple approvals at every stage of the process (including but not limited to EOD approvals) cause too much delay and hinder the ability to successfully recruit.

Among respondents involved in hiring, only 34 percent rated the equal opportunity/affirmative action process as “very effective” or “effective” in enhancing diversity of applicant pools. On average, the EO/AA process rated 2.9, or “somewhat effective.”

Respondents identified a need for centralized advertising and sourcing strategies to attract better-qualified and more diverse candidates. Some voiced the opinion that recruiting and hiring processes are unnecessarily conservative and can be improved to draw qualified, diverse pools.

To enhance succession planning, respondents requested electronic tools that track employee skills and development progress. Respondents also asked for more training and support in identifying high-potential employees and developing succession plans, highlighting the need to better identify competencies necessary for advancement, developing systems to facilitate knowledge transfer, and integrating succession planning with promotion processes and EO/AA requirements.

Employee engagement

Among respondents involved in developing employee engagement strategies for their departments, only 31 percent rated the Working at Iowa survey as useful in shaping strategy. Average rating was 2.8, slightly better than “somewhat effective.”

Leave management

Most respondents who work with leave management rated these services “very effective” or “effective,” resulting in a 2.2 rating. Suggested improvements included centralization and coordination of all aspects of leave, including FMLA, workers’ compensation, catastrophic leave, and long-term disability, as well as an electronic tool for tracking leaves using current or live data.

Compensation and classification

Most respondents who work with compensation and classification issues rated central services as “very effective” or “effective,” with an average rating of 2.4.

Common concerns include the view that salary ranges are not competitive for new hires. In addition, restrictive pay practices hinder departments’ ability to give raises to current staff, causing equity, morale problems, and departures when new hires receive higher salaries. Likewise, pay practices prohibit competitive raises when current staff are hired into new UI positions.

Finally, some expressed concern about inconsistent responses in the process of reviewing search documentation.

HR customers survey

The survey asked HR customers campus-wide to rate services and systems, provide feedback on task force priorities, and reflect on their own professional experiences.

Effectiveness of central HR services

HR customers’ highest-rated central services included immigration (2.0), HR IT systems (2.1), and leave management (2.2). Lowest-rated areas were talent acquisition (2.7),

policy development and oversight (2.5), and training and organizational effectiveness (2.4)—the same three areas rated lowest by HR professionals.

Respondents expressed appreciation for the expertise and good service provided by HR units. In particular, basic HR IT systems including Workflow and Self-Service are easy to access and function well. However, respondents called for these and other HR IT systems to be integrated into a single, comprehensive system.

Talent acquisition

Nearly half of HR customers called for improvements to the talent acquisition process, particularly to increase speed of hiring. On a related note, customers requested more flexibility in compensation and classification to accommodate more competitive salary offers. They identified a lack of skilled or certified candidates for specialized positions.

Organizational development

Customers identified a need for more employee-development opportunities, particularly supervisor and leadership development, as well as a better orientation and onboarding program.

Perceived barriers to success

Respondents were asked to identify the most significant barriers to success in their current positions. Some 31 percent highlighted organizational culture, while others cited workplace politics (30 percent) and lack of advancement opportunities (27 percent). Twenty-nine percent reported encountering no institutional barriers to success.

Commenting on their career trajectories, respondents suggested they might leave the university due to limited advancement opportunities or compensation issues. Some noted concern with perceived unfair processes or decision-making practices among leaders in their units.

Common themes

Results of both surveys emphasized the following needs:

- Improvements in talent acquisition, including faster time to hire, less auditing and fewer approvals required at every step, and better resources for finding and recruiting diverse candidates
- Enhancements to existing HR IT systems, including integration across systems to reduce duplication of effort and yield better, more efficient reporting
- New IT systems to support strategic HR planning in areas including talent management, succession planning, and leave management
- Additional centralization of immigration services

Recommendations

To address areas emphasized by both HR professionals and HR customers, the subcommittee recommends focused improvements to search processes, additional resources for HR IT systems, and additional study of centralized immigration services.

- **Streamlined search processes:** Focus on achieving compliance through post-hire auditing rather than multiple levels of pre-hire approval. Increase resources to help identify avenues for finding and retaining diverse candidates and hires.
- **Expanded HR IT capacity:** Increase staffing and other resources to support development of new and enhanced IT systems. A comprehensive applicant-tracking system is one high-priority deliverable.
- **Centralized immigration services:** Study the feasibility of further centralization, including I-9 processing.

Appendix 4: Data and metrics subcommittee report

Members

Angie Johnson, Terry Johnson, Joni Troester (chair), Jana Wessels

Charge

- Identify and collect readily available data points, key performance indicators, and metrics for evaluating central HR functions, including those supporting diversity and inclusion
- Identify additional metrics that should be considered for future development to inform strategy and decision-making
- Summarize information and themes from available data
- Identify two to three recommendations for task force consideration

Methods

The subcommittee reviewed standard HR metrics using Society for Human Resources Management and American Society for Health Care Human Resources metrics as guides.

University Human Resources, UI Health Care Human Resources, Equal Opportunity and Diversity, and other units delivering centralized HR functions provided available data from the following categories:

- Demographics
- HR efficiency/productivity
- Key performance indicators
- Focus areas
 - Talent acquisition
 - Training and organizational development; orientation; employee engagement
 - Policy and administration, including compensation and classification

Findings

The subcommittee assembled readily available data, providing a current-state snapshot and identifying gaps to address in recommendations.

Demographics

Assessments of age and gender in the UI workforce compared data across all employment types: student employees, graduate assistants, Merit staff, Professional and Scientific (P&S) staff, SEIU staff, UI Health Care house staff, fellows, post-docs, institutional officers, and emeritus faculty.

Faculty include adjunct, clinical, clinical track, fixed-term, research track, tenure track, and visiting faculty. Breakouts for faculty categories are included with gender statistics below.

Employees may be counted twice if they hold multiple positions across employment types.

Assessments of ethnicity in the workforce looked at the percentage of employees who self-identified as underrepresented minorities in 2014 and 2015.

Age (10-year bands and employment type): The largest group of faculty is aged 40-49, while the largest cohorts of P&S and SEIU staff are aged 30-39. Merit staff tend to be slightly older, with their largest count aged 50-59:

	< 20	20 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 59	60 - 69	70+
<i>Bi-weekly students</i>	1,337	4,456	126	30	14	5	0
<i>Graduate assistants</i>	2	1,968	676	61	17	4	0
<i>Merit</i>	19	894	935	848	1,490	730	56
<i>P&S</i>	5	1,292	2,045	1,806	1,815	849	100
<i>SEIU</i>	0	937	954	586	665	310	14
<i>Faculty</i>	0	60	729	843	708	661	112
<i>House staff</i>	0	279	503	33	2	2	0
<i>Fellows</i>	0	351	133	17	7	2	0
<i>Post-docs</i>	0	62	201	28	3	0	0
<i>Institutional officers</i>	0	0	3	7	28	34	4
<i>Emeritus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	15	35

Gender (female/male and employment type): P&S and Merit staff are very similar—63 percent female, 37 percent male. Faculty are 59 percent male and 41 percent female, while SEIU staff are 88 percent female and 12 percent male:

All UI employees					
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Percent female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Percent male</i>	<i>Total headcount</i>
<i>Bi-weekly students</i>	3,397	56.91	2,572	43.09	5,969
<i>Emeritus</i>	11	22.00	39	78.00	50
<i>Faculty</i>	1,295	41.27	1,843	58.73	3,138
<i>Fellows</i>	279	54.71	231	45.29	510

<i>Graduate assistants</i>	1,299	47.62	1,429	52.38	2,728
<i>House staff</i>	320	39.07	499	60.93	819
<i>Institutional officers</i>	28	36.84	48	63.16	76
<i>Merit</i>	3,126	62.87	1,846	37.13	4,972
<i>P&S</i>	4,982	62.97	2,930	37.03	7,912
<i>Post Docs</i>	109	37.07	185	62.93	294
<i>SEIU</i>	3,060	88.03	416	11.97	3,476

Faculty by type					
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Percent female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Percent male</i>	<i>Total headcount</i>
<i>Adjunct</i>	144	54.55	120	45.45	264
<i>Clinical</i>	16	19.75	65	80.25	81
<i>Clinical track</i>	354	48.43	377	51.57	731
<i>Fixed-term</i>	217	60.28	143	39.72	360
<i>Research track</i>	15	39.47	23	60.53	38
<i>Tenure track</i>	489	32.49	1016	67.51	1505
<i>Visiting</i>	60	37.74	99	62.26	159

Ethnicity (as reported by EOD in 2015 reports to the Iowa Board of Regents): Across all employment types, about 11.6 percent identify as Asian/Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian, or two or more races:

	<i>2014 percent</i>	<i>2015 percent</i>
<i>All minority groups</i>	11.10	11.60
<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	5.00	5.00
<i>Black/African American</i>	2.70	2.90
<i>Hispanic/Latino</i>	2.70	3.00
<i>American Indian</i>	0.30	0.30
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.40	0.50

HR efficiency/productivity

The subcommittee reviewed efficiency and productivity metrics for UHR and HCHR, relying on standards established by each unit’s preferred professional association.

For UHR, the subcommittee looked to Society for Human Resources Management measures of HR efficiency that permit comparisons across different sized institutions:

- Number of human resources personnel per 100 employees
- Human resources cost per employee

The subcommittee used UHR staff and budget totals to calculate efficiency measures. Calculations include all UI employees including UI Health Care:

- **HR FTE/100 EEs:** $(117.17\text{FTE}/23,084 \text{ FTE}) \times 100 = .51$
- **HR cost/FTE covered for FY:** $\$11,801,167/23,084 = \mathbf{\$511}$

The UI figure cited above factors in central HR budgets, but not costs of distributed HR functions. Further analysis is needed to determine appropriate benchmark comparisons and establish standards for UI.

HCHR uses American Society for Health Care Human Resources measurement criteria, plus benchmark data from Action OI (service provided by Truven Health Analytics), to establish metrics for comparison purposes. These include HR expenses (labor and non-labor) per employee supported.

The Action OI benchmark goal for UI Health Care is the 25th percentile. HCHR has consistently met and exceeded this goal for total expenses each quarter since the beginning of calendar year 2013. Relative to peers in calendar year 2015, HCHR had the lowest total expenses in the fourth quarter. When comparing relative to health care institutional data (average paid employees, institutional new hires, unionized employees supported) HCHR staffing is very low given UI Health Care's large workforce.

Key performance indicators

In 2012, UHR established a work group of unit staff and senior HR leaders to develop standardized metrics that guide decisions at the university and unit levels. UHR generated the resulting KPIs annually since 2013.

The subcommittee collected the following metrics for calendar year 2015:

- Retention rate
- Time to fill (P&S and faculty positions)
- First-year termination
- Turnover rate
- Source of hire (internal v. external)

For each KPI, the subcommittee calculated measures for all university employees, non-UI Health Care employees, and UI Health Care employees. Most were broken down by employment type (retention is the exception, given that current employees often move between employment types).

Retention rate (first-year and five-year): Overall first-year retention rate is 92 percent for all UI employees, with a five-year rate of 69 percent:

	<i>Percent retained at one year</i>	<i>Percent retained at five years</i>
<i>All UI</i>	92.30	69.30
<i>UI Health Care</i>	92.30	69.40
<i>Non-health care</i>	92.20	68.90

Time to fill (days from workflow/requisition completion to search and screen completion): Searches overall average 77 days from the start of Workflow to search and selection completion (70 days from requisition completion to search and selection completion). Faculty searches exceed the average, at 106 (96) days:

All UI		
	<i>Average days from Workflow start</i>	<i>Average days from requisition completion</i>
<i>Faculty requisition</i>	105.4	95.8
<i>P&S requisition—Existing</i>	75.3	68.5
<i>P&S requisition—Existing permanent residency</i>	88.9	69.7
<i>P&S requisition—Temporary</i>	44.7	39.7
<i>All types</i>	76.7	69.7

UI Health Care		
	<i>Average days from Workflow start</i>	<i>Average days from requisition completion</i>
<i>Faculty requisition</i>	118.9	104.3
<i>P&S requisition—Existing</i>	76.9	69.7
<i>P&S requisition—Existing permanent residency</i>	110.0	88.2
<i>P&S requisition—Temporary</i>	63.0	60.0
<i>All types</i>	77.9	70.5

Non-health care		
	<i>Average days from Workflow start</i>	<i>Average days from requisition completion</i>
<i>Faculty requisition</i>	98.2	91.2
<i>P&S requisition—Existing</i>	70.5	64.8
<i>P&S requisition—Existing permanent residency</i>	67.8	51.2
<i>P&S requisition—Temporary</i>	35.5	29.5
<i>All types</i>	73.4	67.5

First-year termination rate: Across all employment types, the rate averaged 11 percent for employees hired during 2014, with Merit highest at 15.7 percent:

All UI	
	<i>Percent with termination date within 365 days</i>
<i>All employees</i>	11.0
<i>P&S</i>	8.9
<i>Faculty</i>	3.7
<i>Merit</i>	15.7
<i>SEIU</i>	10.9

UI Health Care	
	<i>Percent with termination date within 365 days</i>
<i>All employees</i>	12.5
<i>P&S</i>	10.5
<i>Faculty</i>	3.4
<i>Merit</i>	16.9
<i>SEIU</i>	10.9

Non-health care	
	<i>Percent with termination date within 365 days</i>
<i>All employees</i>	7.5
<i>P&S</i>	7.6
<i>Faculty</i>	3.9
<i>Merit</i>	10.6
<i>SEIU</i>	0

Turnover rate (overall, voluntary, involuntary, and other): Overall average rate encompassing all separations is 11.3 percent annually, with 1.5 percent involuntary and 5.9 percent voluntary turnover. Merit classifications exceed the UI average at 15.1 percent, 2.2 percent, and 8.4 percent, respectively. Merit positions within UI Health Care have the highest voluntary turnover rate at 10.2 percent:

All UI				
	<i>Percent involuntary</i>	<i>Percent voluntary</i>	<i>Percent other</i>	<i>Total percentage</i>
<i>All employees</i>	1.5	5.9	3.9	11.3
<i>P&S</i>	1.1	5.9	3.7	10.7
<i>Faculty</i>	0.8	1.0	3.3	5.1
<i>Merit</i>	2.2	8.4	4.5	15.1
<i>SEIU</i>	0.6	9.6	1.8	11.9

UI Health Care				
	<i>Percent involuntary</i>	<i>Percent voluntary</i>	<i>Percent other</i>	<i>Total percentage</i>
<i>All employees</i>	1.8	7.0	2.8	11.5
<i>P&S</i>	2.3	6.1	2.6	10.1
<i>Faculty</i>	0.8	1.1	1.2	3.1
<i>Merit</i>	2.6	10.2	2.6	15.4
<i>SEIU</i>	0.7	9.6	1.7	12.1

Non-health care				
	<i>Percent involuntary</i>	<i>Percent voluntary</i>	<i>Percent other</i>	<i>Total percentage</i>
<i>All employees</i>	1.0	4.2	5.7	10.8
<i>P&S</i>	0.8	5.3	2.8	9.0
<i>Faculty</i>	0.8	1.0	4.9	6.7
<i>Merit</i>	1.7	5.8	7.4	14.9
<i>SEIU</i>	0	0	0	0

Source of hire (current employees v. hires new to the university): Internal hires are 80 percent and external hires 20 percent (65 percent internal and 35 percent external for faculty). At present, there is no additional data on the source of external hires, a metric that could inform talent acquisition strategies:

All UI					
	<i>P&S</i>	<i>Faculty</i>	<i>SEIU</i>	<i>Merit</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>External hires</i>	189	51	90	120	450
<i>Internal hires</i>	726	105	357	553	1,741
<i>Percent external</i>	21	33	20	18	20
<i>Percent internal</i>	79	67	80	82	80

UI Health Care					
	<i>P&S</i>	<i>Faculty</i>	<i>SEIU</i>	<i>Merit</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>External hires</i>	107	25	90	89	311
<i>Internal hires</i>	549	62	355	431	1,397
<i>Percent external</i>	20	29	20	17	18
<i>Percent internal</i>	80	71	80	83	82

Non-health care					
	<i>P&S</i>	<i>Faculty</i>	<i>SEIU</i>	<i>Merit</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>External hires</i>	82	26	0	31	139
<i>Internal hires</i>	182	43	2	122	349
<i>Percent external</i>	31	38	0	20	28
<i>Percent internal</i>	69	62	100	80	72

Recommendations

The subcommittee's recommendations emphasize refinement of existing KPIs for talent acquisition, a closer look at measures of HR efficiency, and a new work group dedicated to metrics and strategy.

- **Talent acquisition:** KPIs and other metrics require additional study and development to inform talent acquisition strategies and priorities.
 - For time to fill, defining hiring process milestones and tracking time to each point may identify specific areas for improvement.
 - For retention, further analysis may identify factors that contribute to a drop in retention during the first five years of employment. Establishing retention metrics for specific job classifications also may yield areas of focus.
 - For source of hire, new metrics and tracking processes may offer more information about external hires, in particular, including former UI employees returning to the university after working for another, non-UI employer.
 - For diversity, appropriate metrics for applicant pools are needed.
 - Additional outcomes metrics also are needed to better assess the quality of new hires.

- **HR efficiency:** Additional data and comparison sets will help put UI metrics into context.
 - Ongoing work should identify any additional data sets that shed light on efficiency and productivity.
 - Defining measurement periods, determining a benchmark group, and purchasing customized benchmark reports through the Society for Human Resource Management will help the UI assess its performance relative to other organizations.
 - UI Health Care should continue to use Action OI data for peer comparisons.

- **HR metrics work group:** A functional work group led by University Human Resources should define future-state HR metrics, monitor their consistent application across the organization, and use resulting data to drive HR strategy.

- Standardized base analytics may target overall demographics; internal mobility; hiring, turnover, and retention; and leave.
- Building on this work, the group should drill down or expand to identify other useful metrics.
- The group should establish regular review and reporting periods for base analytics (monthly, quarterly, annually, etc.)

Appendix 5: Benchmarking and external review subcommittee report

Members

Keith Clasen, Jamie Jorgensen, Jennifer Modestou, Cheryl Reardon (chair), Greg Stewart, Kevin Ward

Charge

- Develop and implement methods for external review and benchmarking
- Provide support to ad-hoc committees
- Summarize information and themes from benchmarking research
- Identify two to three recommendations for task force consideration

Method

The subcommittee identified eight institutions for use as comparators. They include three institutions from the UI's established peer group, three additional institutions with large health care enterprises, and Iowa's two other public universities.

Committee members identified the following topical areas for comparison:

- Public/private status
- Chief human resources officer job title
- Human resources reporting line
- Health care chief human resources officer job title
- Health care human resources reporting line
- Membership in a state higher education system
- Location of payroll within the organizational structure
- Compliance function reporting line
- Classifications of employee groups
- Shared services model
- Centralized functions of human resources department
- Number of human resources FTE or organizational structure of human resources
- Number of FTE in health care and FTE in non-health care departments
- Outsourced functions

The subcommittee compiled information from online research. The subcommittee also interviewed chief human resources officers at two institutions—Michigan and Ohio State—included in the most recent UI Health Care Human Resources analyses:

- **Michigan:** The subcommittee interviewed the associate vice president for human resources at Michigan, who leads all campus HR policy, labor strategy, benefits structure and approach, and communication. Michigan Health

maintains a separate human resources entity due to its unique labor market (30,000 employees). The leader described a collaborative environment at Michigan.

- **Ohio State:** The subcommittee interviewed the senior vice president for talent, culture, and human resources at Ohio State, who leads strategic and tactical aspects of human resources across the entire campus (including health care). This position reports to the university president with a dotted line to health care.

Findings

The subcommittee compared institutional and workforce characteristics, HR structures and functions, and other criteria.

Institutional characteristics

	UI peer group	AAU member	Private/public	Part of system	Medical school
University of Iowa	NA	Yes	Public	No	Yes
University of Michigan	Yes	Yes	Public	No	Yes
Ohio State University	Yes	Yes	Public	No	Yes
University of Wisconsin-Madison/UW Health	Yes	Yes	Public	Yes	Yes
University of Kansas	No	Yes	Public	Yes	Yes
Johns Hopkins University	No	Yes	Private	No	Yes
University of Pennsylvania	No	Yes	Private	No	Yes
University of Northern Iowa	BOR	No	Public	No	No
Iowa State University	BOR	Yes	Public	No	No

Workforce characteristics

	Employee types	Employee counts	Unionized employees
Iowa	Merit, SEIU, P&S, faculty	23,000 total	Yes
Michigan	Merit, P&S, faculty, nurses assoc., other union staff	32,000 total; 19,000 health care (source)	Yes
Ohio State	Merit, P&S, Faculty	33,000 total FTE (source)	Yes
Wisconsin	University staff (P&S, merit), faculty	21,600 UW-Madison (source); 17,900 UW Health (source)	Yes
Kansas	Faculty, unclassified staff, support staff, union-covered staff	10,100 Lawrence campus; 3,800 medical center (source)	Yes
Johns Hopkins	Faculty, SEIU, professional staff, temp staff	25,100 FTE hospital and health center (source)	Yes
Pennsylvania	Faculty, professional staff, contract-covered staff, temp staff	17,000 non-health care; 20,200 health care (source)	Yes
UNI	Merit, P&S, faculty	1,800 total (source)	Yes
ISU	Merit, P&S, faculty	6,000 total (source)	Yes

Senior HR positions and reporting lines

	HR title	Reporting line	HCHR title	Reporting line
Iowa	VP for HR	Senior VP for finance and operations	Associate VP	VP for medical affairs and dean of CCOM
Michigan	Associate VP for HR	VP for business and finance	UMHS chief HR officer	Executive VP for medical affairs and dean of UMMS
Ohio State	Senior VP for talent, culture, and HR	President	Chief human resources officer	Senior VP for health sciences
Wisconsin	Assistant vice chancellor	Vice chancellor for finance and admin.	Associate dean for HR and equity and inclusion	Dean of SOMPH
Kansas	Assistant vice provost for HR mgmt.	Executive vice chancellor	Associate vice chancellor	Vice chancellor for admin.
Johns Hopkins	VP for HR	Senior VP for finance and mgmt.	Senior VP	CEO of Medicine
Pennsylvania	VP for HR	Executive president	NA	NA
UNI	Director	Senior VP for finance and operations	NA	NA
ISU	VP for HR	President	NA	NA

Titles for senior UI Health Care administrators—HR included—differ from titles for leaders in other health care systems. Industry-wide, comparable titles often include “chief,” “vice president,” or “senior vice president.” Iowa’s practices for titling associate

or assistant VPs can cause confusion outside the organization and complicate recruiting for these positions.

Location of select functions

	Payroll office	Compliance office	Outsourcing
Iowa	HR	Chief Diversity Office	NA
Michigan	Finance (website)	Office for Institutional Equity (website)	None found
Ohio State	HR (website)	Office of Diversity and Inclusion (website)	Parking
Wisconsin	HR (website)	Office for Equity and Diversity (website)	None found
Kansas	Comptroller (website)	Office of Diversity and Equity (website)	None found
Johns Hopkins	HR (website)	Office of Institutional Equity (website)	Temp staffing
Pennsylvania	Comptroller (website)	Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs (website)	Some custodial and facilities operations
UNI	Business operations (website)	Office of Compliance and Equity Mgmt. (website)	None found
ISU	Controller (website)	Office of the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion (website)	None found

Central HR functions and service centers

	HR website	HR shared services	HR central functions	HR org chart
Iowa	hr.uiowa.edu	NA	Payroll, comp/class, IT, benefits, L/D, ADD, ELR	Central HR
Michigan	hr.umich.edu	Shared Services Center (website)	Benefits, comp/class, recruiting, L/D, HRIS, SS, ELR	Central HR
Ohio State	hr.osu.edu	Business and Finance Service Center (website)	Benefits, recruitment, payroll, recognition, comp/class, ELR, HRIS	Central HR (leadership)
Wisconsin	www.hr.wisc.edu	Admin. Services Unit (website)	Benefits, comp/class, international , payroll, ELR, recruitment, EAP, HRIS, leave, ADA, diversity	Central HR Medicine
Kansas	humanresources.ku.edu	Shared Service Center (website)	Benefits, L/D, recruitment, ELR, comp/class, org. dev., leaves, ADA	Central HR
Johns Hopkins	hrnt.jhu.edu	HR/Payroll Shared Services (website)	Benefits, pay, leaves, recruiting, L/D, work/life, comp/class	Central HR (staff directory) Health Sciences
Pennsylvania	www.hr.upenn.edu	NA	Recruiting, comp/class, L/D, work/life,	Central HR (unit directory)

			benefits, HRIS, ELR	
UNI	www.universityofillinois.edu/hr	NA	Benefits, recruiting, leave, ADA, comp/class, EAP, L/D	Central HR (staff directory)
ISU	www.hr.iastate.edu/hrs	NA	Benefits, recruiting, leave, ADA, comp/class, EAP, L/D	Central HR

Emerging themes

Five themes emerged from these comparisons: position titles for the chief HR officers for the institution and the health care enterprise (where applicable), reporting lines for both HR officers, and the administrative home for the compliance function.

- **Position titles: Chief university HR officer**
 - Vice president or senior vice president: four (Ohio State, Johns Hopkins, Penn, Iowa State)
 - Associate vice president: one (Michigan)
 - Director: one (Northern Iowa)
 - Assistant vice chancellor or assistant vice provost: two (UW School of Medicine and Public Health¹ and Kansas, the two system institutions)
- **Position titles: Chief health care HR officer**
 - Chief human resource officer: two (Michigan, Ohio State)
 - Associate dean for human resources: one (UW School of Medicine and Public Health)
 - Associate vice chancellor: one (Kansas)
 - Senior vice president: two (Johns Hopkins, UW Health)
- **Summary of reporting lines for the university chief HR officer**
 - President: three (Ohio State, Penn, Iowa State)
 - Business/finance: four (Michigan, Wisconsin, Johns Hopkins, Northern Iowa)
 - Chief academic officer: one (Kansas)

¹ The University of Wisconsin health care enterprise (UW Health) is organizationally separate from the University of Wisconsin campus, including the UW School of Medicine and Public Health. This list includes the chief HR officer for the campus—the chief HR officer for UW Health appears in the next list.

- **Summary of reporting lines for the health care chief HR officer^{2*}**
 - CEO/VP for medicine/health system: four (Ohio State, Michigan, Johns Hopkins, UW Health)
 - Vice chancellor for administration: one (Kansas)
 - Dean, School of Medicine and Public Health: one (UW School of Medicine and Public Health)
 - Vice president for human resources and CEO/VP for medicine/health system: one (Ohio State)

- **Compliance Function**
 - All eight institutions locate compliance functions for affirmative action and related areas in a diversity/equity office separate from human resources.

Recommendations

The subcommittee's recommendations foreground additional research to identify structural and service-center options, as well as a new initiative to foster campus-wide discussion of HR priorities:

- **Shared/centralized services:** Most institutions reviewed utilize a shared-services or service-center approach to deliver HR services. The subcommittee did not explore individual models, but the concept appears to be an important component of HR service delivery for these institutions. The subcommittee recommends additional evaluation to identify where more centralized approaches may yield efficiencies and meet the needs of individual business units.

- **Human resources roundtable:** Both Michigan's and Ohio State's HR offices routinely receive input from advisory committees representing diverse campus leaders. The subcommittee suggests that University Human Resources consider a roundtable group to solicit feedback on big-picture HR concepts and issues.
 - In particular, the subcommittee sees potential benefit in regular discussions with deans and associate deans around faculty issues.
 - Similarly, the roundtable could include faculty experts to discuss general trends in the field and issues specific to higher education.

² This list includes only direct reporting relationships, not any dotted line or matrix relationships (to provost, chief health care officer, et al.).

- We also suggest inviting representatives from outside the UI community to discuss HR trends, common challenges for strategic HR leaders, successful strategies and practices, and opportunities for collaboration.
- By diversifying roundtable representation, participants could expand their networks on campus and across the region.
- **Future benchmarking efforts:** Once the UI has clarified strategic directions for human resources, reporting structures, and leadership, the subcommittee recommends considering additional benchmarking and site visits with similarly structured institutions.

Appendix 6: Talent acquisition committee report

Members

Diane Finnerty, Phyllis Jacobsen, Jennifer Modestou, Cheryl Reardon (chair), Rebecca Schwertfeger, Kevin Ward, Sherrée Wilson

Charge

- Recommend structures, roles, and outcomes related to talent acquisition and affirmative action compliance processes

Methods

The committee reviewed the following sources:

- Published articles and reference materials
- Results of surveys conducted by the campus input subcommittee
- Report from the data and metrics subcommittee
- Campus interviews conducted by Angie Bell and Rebecca Schwertfeger for talent acquisition needs assessment
- Meetings with university leaders and current staff search consultants

The committee also discussed key terminology, defining “talent management” and “talent acquisition”:

- Talent management is a holistic HR strategy to attract, develop, deploy, engage, and retain the workforce and skills necessary for organizational success. The term often describes integrated HR functions and data that anticipate and meet needs through employee hiring and development across the employment “life cycle.”
- Talent acquisition is a subset of talent management focused on sourcing, recruiting, hiring, and managing potential talent. This process typically relies on technology to source and recruit candidates, manage job postings and applications, and provide data to optimize the process and demonstrate regulatory compliance.
- While both frameworks apply to faculty hiring and retention, faculty recruitment often relies on disciplinary networks and relationships. The faculty life cycle is unique, influenced by type of appointment, academic discipline, and professional productivity.

Findings

To remain competitive in a knowledge-based economy, the UI must be able to attract and retain world-class talent across all university sectors. HR professionals and campus leaders have identified talent acquisition as their highest priority for HR enhancements.

An up-to-date and fully integrated HR system will streamline search process administration and enhance the applicant experience. A modern applicant tracking system will offer a more efficient process for federal regulatory compliance and effective assessment of diversity efforts.

Recommendations

The committee developed two sets of recommendations—one focused on talent acquisition in general, the other on enhancing diversity:

Talent acquisition recommendations

- **Comprehensive talent strategies:** Develop and deploy strategies that meet the specific talent needs of a world-class research university with a comprehensive academic medical center.
 - A robust recruitment process should bring in new talent to meet current and future needs.
 - Internal mobility initiatives should develop talent within the existing UI workforce.
 - New talent pipelines developed in partnership with UI academic departments, liberal arts institutions, and community colleges should target specific workforce needs.
 - Short-term academic contracts, flexible appointment options, and agency partnerships can address immediate staffing needs.

- **Contemporary talent acquisition and recruitment system:** New solution should encompass the full employee life cycle, beginning with identification of campus staffing needs and proceeding through onboarding of new employees. The new system should be flexible, promote best practices, and enable process improvement, plus provide data that enhances talent acquisition and supports regulatory compliance. Given its scope, scale, and change management effort, this project will require significant resources and investment:
 - Preliminary vendor estimates of at least \$1 million initial investment and approximately \$500,000 annual recurring maintenance.
 - Additional funding for implementation, including project management, business analysis, data integration, consulting, and training.

- **Clear roles and responsibilities:** Consistent with TIER@Iowa recommendations, the university should establish talent acquisition roles and responsibilities, helping set the stage for talent strategy by identifying who owns the process.
 - University Human Resources (UHR) should lead overall strategy for staff talent acquisition.
 - The Office of the Provost should lead overall strategy for faculty recruitment, in partnership with colleges and academic departments.

- Equal Opportunity and Diversity, UHR, and the provost's office should partner to ensure an effective and efficient process that meets regulatory requirements and recruits a diverse workforce.
- Distributed HR leaders and associate deans for faculty will continue to share talent acquisition and compliance responsibilities for their units.
- Hiring managers and administrators retain responsibility for defining necessary knowledge and skills, evaluating candidates, and making final selections.

Diversity recommendations

- **Expanded processes and tools:** Invest additional resources to strengthen established tools and develop new approaches.
 - Promote best practices, talent pipelines, networks, diversity councils, and other intentional efforts to attract and employ diverse candidates.
 - Require training to improve diversity effectiveness for search chairs, supervisors and administrators, and HR professionals who manage recruitment, addressing issues including unconscious biases and inclusive processes.
 - Encourage students and trainees to consider UI employment by building internship, practicum, and other experiential partnerships between academic and business units.

- **Work/life integration and dual-career employment:** Target these and other priorities proven to be especially important in recruiting faculty, particularly women and underrepresented minorities.

Appendix 7: Enterprise-wide HR IT systems committee report

Members

Angie Bell, David Bergeon, Lee Carmen, Steve Fleagle, Angie Johnson (co-chair), Mike Kaplan (co-chair), Mike Noel, Joe Wagner

Charge

- Evaluate operational effectiveness and efficiency of enterprise-wide IT systems for HR and compliance functions.
- Identify areas of duplication to improve efficiencies, integrate systems, maximize resources, and reduce administrative burdens.
- Recommend appropriate HR IT organizational structure and scale of operations to coordinate roles while meeting needs of campus stakeholders.
- Recommend IT strategies to support a talent acquisition/talent management system, including strategies to support workforce diversity and inclusion.

Methods

The committee reviewed current structures and processes, available data, and feedback from colleagues.

Findings

The university's enterprise IT groups have a long track record of delivering comprehensive IT systems for campus customers.

The core HR system (PeopleSoft HCM) has proven reliable, accurate, and well maintained since its 1999 implementation. Faculty and staff have used related enterprise-level systems daily for 17 years. The campus benefits from close, longstanding relationships between HR units and enterprise HR IT providers.

Information technology is strategically and operationally essential to HR for the university and UI Health Care, and is a primary enabler of HR processes and data visibility. It is critical that HR IT remain a priority, and that systems, data, and business be integrated in ways that support the university.

Recommendations

The committee's recommendations complement and support each other, underscoring the importance of HR IT systems and proposing areas for improvement:

- **Governance committee:** An HR IT governance committee should provide joint planning, prioritization, and coordination for enterprise HR IT teams and align their efforts with university priorities. Previously, each team has developed

projects independently with its primary customers, leading to redundancies and inefficiencies in certain systems.

- The governance committee will improve efficiency, effectiveness, cooperation, and communication.
 - The committee should include HR IT service providers and primary customers.
 - In addition, participation and feedback from secondary customers and constituents should address faculty and staff requests for greater input into priorities.
 - Open and transparent methods for receiving, analyzing, and aligning requests with strategic directions and prioritizing required work are essential.
 - Additional deliverables should include roadmaps and resource recommendations.
- **Review and optimize systems:** Campus feedback identifies opportunities to eliminate duplication and improve integration within HR systems. Some colleges are running redundant faculty information systems, and while UI HR systems consistently earn favorable reviews, users express interest in functions available from HR systems used by corporate and non-academic health care organizations.
 - Improving systems should be a continuous, iterative process informed by clear understanding of UI requirements and external systems.
 - HR IT providers and customers should review internal and external systems and processes to reduce redundancies and shadow systems, improve integration, and strengthen systems.
 - **Centralize HR IT teams and processes:** Enterprise HR systems are ubiquitous on and off campus, and survey responses reflect interest in complex new systems, integrations, and functions. While functional workgroups must identify priorities and retain oversight of HR systems, IT teams must cultivate expertise in data and systems architecture, integrations, security, development, and other aspects of systems delivery.
 - Given the importance of HR systems, breadth of priorities, and need for coordination, HR IT teams and processes should be located within central IT organizations.
 - Central IT organizations will best ensure continuous, effective delivery of systems while providing cross-workgroup development opportunities and career paths, succession planning, access to tools and resources, and some independence from functional workgroups.
 - **Talent acquisition needs assessment:** HR professionals express clear interest in processes and products that facilitate the recruitment, selection, and onboarding of new hires. Several campus groups have begun needs assessments to identify the best potential functional and technical directions.

- Needs assessments should continue to identify internal requirements, survey the external environment, and provide strategic input to university leaders.
- This process should include identifying a functional business owner that can guide final recommendations.
- Similar approaches should be used in other areas of HR IT (talent management, etc.) to establish business owners that can determine priorities for new tools and processes.

Appendix 8: Training and organizational development committee report

Members

Lori Berger, Sean Hesler, Lindsay Jarratt, Teresa Kulper (chair), Grace Moore, Jim Sayre, Ellen Twinam

Charge

- Deliver recommendations related to training and organizational development
- Consider areas including new employee orientation, onboarding, professional development, succession planning, and engagement

Methods

The committee developed a common set of definitions:

- *Training*: Development of knowledge or skills necessary to perform specific tasks required in one's current position
- *Development*: Educational process that provides opportunities to gain in-depth theoretical or applied knowledge and aids overall growth
- *University/UI Health Care orientation*: Regular welcome and introduction to the university and/or UI Health Care, including general information about campus, policies, resources, benefits, and rights and responsibilities
- *Department/unit orientation*: Structured process that acquaints employees with specific jobs, co-workers, and their department or unit through information about policies, procedures, work-specific resources (including people and tools), goals, culture, and work rules
- *Onboarding*: Comprehensive process (including orientations) to help new employees quickly and smoothly adjust to interpersonal and performance aspects of their work, learn organizational culture and values, and develop knowledge, skills, and behaviors to function effectively
- *Succession planning*: Process of identifying long-range organizational needs and cultivating a supply of internal talent to meet those needs and ensure preservation of institutional knowledge; typically involves developing employees for key organizational and leadership positions
- *Engagement*: A heightened emotional connection to an organization that inspires greater discretionary effort from employees in their work
- *Organizational development*: A planned effort driven by data and theory to increase an organization's effectiveness, productivity, return on investment, and overall employee engagement; sometimes an umbrella term that includes training and development, leadership development, and consultation
- *Efficiency*: Doing work through optimal use of resources at the lowest possible cost

- *Effectiveness:* Doing work aligned with priorities, quality, and potential impact on other areas of the organization

Findings

The committee assessed current states and issues in five areas:

Training, learning, and development

Several UI and UI Health Care departments provide training and development. Given the case for addressing local needs with local experts, these structures and reporting relationships work well and reflect similar arrangements at most universities.

The committee identified opportunities to increase collaboration across departments:

- **Tracking systems:** At present, each office can design its own system for tracking registration, attendance, and outcomes. When training and development is not tracked centrally, HR professionals—as well as faculty and staff participants—lack access to a single comprehensive record.
- **Best practices:** Separate offices could benefit from sharing practices, using common language, and embedding university and UI Health Care values and priorities across curricula.
- **Duplication:** Different offices are unaware of similar training in other areas, which results in unnecessary redundancy in content and delivery.

Organizational development

The Organizational Effectiveness (OE) unit within University Human Resources currently is the university's only department offering campus-wide services in this area.

UI Health Care is home to an Operational Improvement office not associated with UI Health Care Human Resources, and the State Hygienic Laboratory maintains an Organizational Development office. Staff from these offices regularly meet with OE colleges to coordinate efforts and share best practices.

In addition, Tippie College of Business faculty consult with UI departments and external organizations as requested. Departments also draw on MBA students for assessments and recommendations.

OE surveys indicate satisfaction with services and predicted increases in productivity and engagement. The committee has no concerns about overlap between OE and other departments.

Onboarding and orientation

UHR and HCHR conduct separate new employee orientation sessions. The provost's office holds an orientation for new faculty every August, and faculty attend UHR and

HCHR orientations throughout the remainder of the year. Business needs support offering three types of orientations, and sponsoring units coordinate their programs effectively.

Supervisors also receive automated onboarding messages once they have welcomed new hires, but this program can be refreshed and improved. Surveys conducted by the HR task force's campus input subcommittee support the need for improved onboarding, and this committee believes those improvements can come without new IT or staff resources.

Culture of development and engagement

The university offers many professional development resources, but these resources are not consistently used or promoted. Surveys indicate that staff may not feel support for career development, and these perceptions likely influence employee engagement.

Leaders drive culture, and the committee feels it is critical to create a culture that values development. Supervisors equipped with simple tools—and held to shared expectations for supporting professional development—are the best agents for building this culture.

The committee has identified two issues that influence ongoing progress:

- **Balancing development and workloads:** Employees of all types observe that striking this balance is difficult. Contractual barriers raise special issues for Merit staff, and upcoming changes to FLSA regulations may exacerbate the challenge.
- **Variations in supervisory skill and support:** Not all supervisors are equal in their ability to influence their units, and units vary in their support for development and engagement.

Succession planning

UHR Organizational Effectiveness has established a process for succession planning and consults with units upon request, but planning to fill key roles remains uncommon.

The campus input subcommittee finds HR professionals interested in elements of succession planning, including tracking development progress, identifying high-potential employees, and understanding competencies needed for promotion. This priority ranks below others, but merits attention.

Establishing core leadership competencies will enable cross-unit succession planning while maintaining flexibility for units to address their specific needs. Models exist, but need review and development.

Recommendations

Based on its findings, the committee developed recommendations in three areas:

- **Trainers consortium and My Training:** Create a training and development consortium representing various offices, and study using the established My Training system as a common portal for registration, participation tracking, and outcomes assessment.
 - The consortium should implement common language, concepts, values, and emphases where appropriate (for example, embedding diversity and inclusion across training modules).
 - Consortium members should trade best practices for adult learners, reduce training redundancy, ensure consistency when multiple trainings are warranted, and share information about development resources.
 - With buy-in from leadership, this recommendation can be implemented using current staff and adjustments to IT systems.

- **Supervisor training and engagement culture:** Develop supervisors and leaders to drive a culture that values development and engagement.
 - Improve onboarding for new supervisors to emphasize common responsibilities and competencies, addressing diversity and inclusion, employee engagement, feedback, and development.
 - Incent all supervisors to encourage employee development, and promote leadership programs that develop and reinforce these competencies.
 - Ensure that staff and aspiring leaders can create individual development plans.
 - Done in phases with the support of campus leaders, this recommendation can be implemented with adjustments to IT systems, established responsibilities, and simple tools.

- **Succession planning:** Promote awareness of career paths, and update core and leadership competencies.
 - Expand understanding of career opportunities.
 - Define both core and leadership competencies common across units to support individual development plans and succession planning performed at the discretion of campus leaders.
 - Increase engagement by investing in development while building bench strength.
 - This recommendation will require significant IT and staff resources, but with leadership support, could start with existing tools and personnel.

Appendix 9: Collective bargaining and contract administration committee report

Members

Josey Bathke, David Bergeon, Ellen Chambers, James Jorgensen, Terry Johnson, John Keller (chair), Laura McLeran

Charge

- Review current processes and responsibilities for establishing and implementing collective bargaining agreements.
- Recommend areas of focus and improvement.

Methods

Adapting the list of guiding questions developed by the overall HR task force (see appendix 1), the committee considered the following:

- What opportunities and challenges existing when delivering labor relations representation and support (collective bargaining and contract administration) for different segments of the university (e.g., health care, graduate education, campus operations, faculty, professional staff, etc.)?
- What collective bargaining and contract administration functions or practices are perceived as ineffective and/or barriers to supporting and facilitating campus operations?
- What would be the most effective leadership structure and service delivery model for labor relations in support of the university and its operations?
- How can we better align the structure, roles, and outcomes for labor relations functions with Board of Regents and university leadership expectations?
- What redundancy and duplication exist regarding HR support for collective bargaining and contract administration? Are these useful or unnecessary? Would a different approach provide opportunities to reallocate resources to core mission activities?

Findings

Currently, the Iowa Board of Regents and the university negotiate and administer three collective bargaining contracts:

- **AFSCME** is a statewide contract under the direction of the governor's office by the state's Department of Administrative Services (DAS) covering blue collar, clerical, technical, and security employees of the Board of Regents' Merit system. The board and the university exercise a secondary, advisory role in negotiations for this contract. Given distributed responsibilities for administering this contract across state agencies, regents' institutions, and university units,

variability and sometimes inconsistency in contract interpretation and administration exist.

- The Board of Regents negotiates both **SEIU** and **COGS** contracts with active participation from the university through two UI collective bargaining teams. Each team is responsible for administering its respective contract. This approach has worked well, but personnel changes at the board office and the UI make this an opportune time to review established practices for negotiation and administration.

Opportunities and challenges

The university would benefit from **additional input into the collective bargaining process and its outcomes**. While collective bargaining agreements for SEIU and COGS are established with the Board of Regents, most contract administration is carried out at the local level.

For the SEIU and COGS contracts, the UI would benefit from coordinating bargaining responsibility more closely with UI Health Care and the UI COGS team, particularly given that the UI is the only regents' institution with SEIU and COGS locals.

The university needs to **better use data and metrics to determine bargaining objectives** that are well suited to employee segments within and outside collective bargaining units, coordinating these efforts across employee populations.

Tapping into local expertise from UI Health Care and the UI colleges—which work with staff and students every day on contract application—can yield efficiencies and reduce redundancies and inconsistencies.

To develop and maintain consensus and support for effective employment policies and practices that meet different campus needs, **campus HR is most effective when one central voice has final institutional authority and responsibility**. A central authority can:

- Better recognize the complexity of relationships between the regents' universities, the state DAS, the governor, and legislators, and how these relationships affect employment policies, practices, and positions
- Better assess institutional risk tolerance and make appropriate decisions informed by that assessment
- Better maintain consistency and support employee morale, retention, and productivity

Reducing perceived barriers

The university, UI Health Care, UI colleges and departments, and other units must **speak with a unified voice, communicating clearly and consistently** to current and potential bargaining units and other stakeholders.

Using enhanced metrics, bargaining teams and UI leaders should continue to hold **advance planning sessions** that establish objectives for upcoming negotiations.

UHR, UI Health Care, and colleges and departments should **expand on successful collaborations** that address performance management, employment investigations, and disciplinary processes, particularly in training supervisors and HR professionals.

Including both university and health care HR units in all UI Health Care grievance hearings appears redundant. This could be resolved by both units committing to **weekly grievance reviews** established by University Human Resources, and by routinely sharing grievance data, issues, and answers for disciplinary practices and records.

Leadership structures and service delivery options

The university should establish a **clear administrative structure that provides central responsibility and oversight to the process while maintaining an important level of autonomy among** bargaining groups and their respective HR units:

- The SEIU contract is distinct from other campus contracts, and UI Health Care has long assumed responsibility for its day-to-day administration. Given nuances of health care HR issues and the diverse types of health care professionals covered under the SEIU agreement, HCHR's specialized knowledge and experience is valuable in interpreting and administering the contract.
- HCHR's role in administering the AFSCME contract for health care employees appears to yield benefits, given HCHR's collaborative relationship with UHR. This structure creates some redundancy, but the size of the bargaining units and complexity of the contracts establish a need for dedicated, specialized staff. The university could realize efficiency by assigning UHR responsibility for UI AFSCME employees and HCHR responsibility for AFSCME health care staff and coordinating responses and action centrally between the two teams
- UHR should retain central authority and responsibility with respect to non-organized units should they petition and certify a union representative at any future point.

Consistency with board and university expectations

In light of board office staff and university leadership changes, these **expectations should be reestablished through discussions** that help UHR and HCHR best inform and meet those expectations.

Once expectations are made clear, reestablishing **UHR as the single point of contact** for board staff and unions will help ensure ongoing consistency with expectations. SEIU and COGS planning sessions, regular updates during negotiations, and opportunities to adjust negotiation strategy also should help maintain consistency.

Redundancy and duplication

As noted above, HCHR employee and labor relations staff hear second-step AFSCME and Level III SEIU grievances. UHR staff attend all these grievance hearings—along with hearings from all other campus units—to stay informed on issues and developing trends. An HCHR reporting relationship to UHR would **eliminate the need for multiple staff members present at health care grievance hearings.**

Recommendations

Based on these recommendations, the committee offers recommendations in these areas:

- **Increased university participation in contract negotiations:** With appointment of outside counsel to represent the Board of Regents and the university in contract negotiations, and given the university's responsibility for contract administration, it will prove valuable to strengthen communication with the regents' office concerning the collective bargaining process and its outcomes.
- **Enhanced communication between contract implementation groups:** Groups responsible for contract administration must coordinate policies and procedures, and more fully utilize data and metrics in preparation for contract negotiations.
- **Responsibility for bargaining and administration:** The university should reaffirm responsibilities for different collective bargaining agreements based on central accountability and local experts:
 - UI colleges and departments should continue to rely on UHR for overall administration of the COGS contract, an approach that has worked for almost 20 years.
 - HCHR should assume responsibility for both bargaining and administration of the SEIU contract, as well as administration of the AFSCME contract for health care employees. Size of bargaining units, complexity of agreements, unique features of health care contracts, and diversity of health care professions argue for specialized knowledge and experience.
 - The relationship between UHR and HCHR for bargaining and contract administration should be modeled after other examples where similar issues are being addressed. Examples include IT and finance and operations, where substantial autonomy for health care units is warranted, but where the central university unit is the best point of contact for external communications. Ultimate decision-making authority rests with the Office of the President.

Appendix 10: Policy development and administrative oversight committee report

Members

Cheryl Reardon, Kevin Ward, Jana Wessels

Charge

- Recommend strategies that improve effectiveness of central HR policy and delivery of HR services.

Methods

The committee reviewed campus input and feedback from members of the overall HR task force.

Recommendations

Based on information collected and ideas expressed from the start of the HR task force's work, the committee offers recommendations in the following areas:

- **Periodic policy review:** HR policies need periodic review to ensure consistency with campus needs, best practices of peer institutions, Board of Regents policies, and federal and state regulations and law.
 - Policy owners regularly provide updates to policies in the UI Operations Manual, but new processes for identifying policy review needs, consulting with constituents, and collaborating with shared governance groups would assure a more transparent and inclusive approach.
 - Policies should be broad enough to allow for operational flexibility while remaining true to their purpose and intent, as well as to institutional values.
- **Balancing risk tolerance and decision-making authority:** UHR is implementing a strategic business partner approach to delivering HR services at the local level. Senior HR leaders must be granted the latitude to make local, low-to-moderate-risk decisions—for example, regarding temporary appointments—that improve efficiency.
 - Oversight of routine HR decisions increases administrative burdens and sacrifices productivity at all organizational levels.
 - Reducing review and process around low-to-moderate-risk decisions improves efficiency and maximizes effective operations. Identifying higher-risk areas will help streamline decisions in those areas and establish who needs to be consulted.

- **Centralized immigration and leave-management services:** The university should address campus input and build services in these areas, while evaluating options for central services in areas including routine HR transactions. Options could include a service center or outsourcing, with a strong emphasis on cost-benefit analyses that ensure efficiency and savings.
 - Recent centralization of leave management and establishment of an HCHR workflow center have yielded positive results. Also, UHR has launched a pilot effort to offer departments additional support around leave management and administration.
 - Leave-management compliance is complex, requiring coordination across leave programs (Faculty and Staff Disability Services, catastrophic leave, long-term disability, Workers Compensation) for efficient and effective processes.

- **Unified strategy for job classifications and compensation:** Work in this area should cover all employee categories—Professional and Scientific, faculty, SEIU, graduate assistants, et al.
 - Compensation philosophies for different employee groups should be flexible enough to meet recruitment and retention needs of different campus sectors.
 - Compensation must be based on robust and accurate market data and periodic analysis across job classifications.
 - Compensation should inform resource allocation to meet compensation goals and requirements for all employee categories.
 - Creation and content of job classifications and descriptions should allow for efficiency in posting new and replacement positions.
 - Processes for creating new classifications should be more agile to recruitment and retention needs.
 - Acquiring and retaining talent drives all organizations—these recommendations offer opportunities to increase efficiency and effectiveness.
 - Job classifications and descriptions are fundamental to recruiting qualified candidates. Streamlining the classification process will reduce administrative burden.

Acknowledgements

Task force and ad-hoc committee members included:

Josey Bathke	Kendra Malone
Angie Bell	Laura McLeran
David Bergeon	Jennifer Modestou
Lori Berger	Grace Moore
Lee Carmen	David Moser
Ellen Chambers	Mike Noel
Keith Clasen	Cheryl Reardon
Diane Finnerty	Alan Reed
Steve Fleagle	Jim Sayre
Sean Hesler	Rebecca Schwertfeger
Phyllis Jacobsen	Greg Stewart
Lindsay Jarratt	Joni Troester
Angelique Johnson	Ellen Twinam
Terry Johnson	Joe Wagner
Jamie Jorgensen	Kevin Ward
Mike Kaplan	Jan Waterhouse
John Keller	Jana Wessels
Teresa Kulper	Chuck Wieland
Rod Lehnertz	Sherrée Wilson

The task force also thanks survey respondents, stakeholder-meeting participants, and all colleagues who contributed to this project, and thanks Lin Larson for helping to assemble and edit this report.