



STATE OF COLORADO
Annual Human Resources Survey
2003-2004

Overview and Results

The Department of Personnel and Administration, Division of Human Resources (DPA/DHR) annually conducts a self-audit survey of all state department and institution human resources operations. The purpose of the survey is to gather information on general human resources activities that cannot be measured through existing electronic systems. The resulting data is used to respond to information requests from the legislature, the State Auditor, state and local governments, and others.

The survey collected information in five functional areas: job evaluation, compensation, selection, leave management, performance management, and employee relations. The survey was sent to all 48 human resource administrators. Data gathering occurred between late-August 2004 and mid-January 2005.

A copy of the survey instrument is attached for reference. The questions on this survey will be the foundation questions for all future surveys, constituting the “standard” questions for subsequent annual survey requests. As new legislation is enacted and events create new issues requiring data, questions may be added. However, efforts will be made to keep this survey at a manageable size.

The Consulting Services unit of DHR prepared this report. Please contact Joy Lindsay at 303-866-4643 or joy.lindsay@state.co.us with questions or comments.

OVERVIEW

The 2003-2004 HR Annual Survey was sent to 20 principal departments and 28 institutions of higher education; 19 departments and 28 higher education institutions provided responses. Following is a list of the human resource offices that responded to the survey.

Departments	Higher Education Institutions
Dept Of Agriculture	Colorado Commission On Higher Education
Dept Of Corrections	Colorado Historical Society
Dept Of Education	Community College Access Network
Dept Of Health Care Policy & Finance	Community College Of Aurora
Dept Of Human Services	Colorado Northwestern Community College
Dept Of Labor & Employment	Adams State College
Dept Of Law	Arapahoe Community College
Dept Of Local Affairs	Auraria Higher Education Center
Dept Of Military & Veterans Affairs	Colorado Community College System
Dept Of Natural Resources	Colorado School Of Mines
Dept Of Personnel & Administration	Colorado State University
Dept Of Public Health & Environment	Colorado State University – Pueblo
Dept Of Public Safety	Community College Of Denver
Dept Of Regulatory Agencies	Fort Lewis College
Dept Of Revenue	Front Range Community College
Dept Of State	Lamar Community College
Dept Of Transportation	Mesa State College
Dept Of Treasury	Metropolitan State College Of Denver
Governor's Office	Morgan Community College
	Northeastern Junior College
	Otero Junior College
	Pikes Peak Community College
	Pueblo Community College
	Red Rocks Community College
	Trinidad State Junior College
	University of Colorado
	University of Northern Colorado
	Western State College

The number of responses varies by section, as some respondents did not answer all questions. Following is a brief analysis of the results of the self-audit survey.

Section I - Human Resources Staff Data

This year respondents were asked to provide the number of human resources employees and the full-time equivalency (FTE). Respondents were asked to include all employees performing the following functions:

- Job evaluation/compensation
- Selection
- Leave management
- Performance management
- Employee relations

Of the 47 responses, three were excluded from this section, as the number of HR staff or FTE was not reported. For the 44 respondents reporting, the total number of state personnel system employees served is 30,697. A total of 320 employees were reported to perform HR work in these 44 departments and institutions, for an average of 1.02 HR staff per 100 employees. In terms of FTE, the total is 290 FTE assigned to HR functions, for a ratio of .93 FTE per 100 employees. This number includes professional, technical, and support personnel and includes both employees within and exempt from the state personnel system.

Section II - Job Evaluation/Compensation

Job evaluation is a critical component of human resources administration. The State of Colorado uses a non-numeric factor system to evaluate and allocate positions in the state personnel system. Evaluating a position description questionnaire (PDQ) involves analyzing duties in relation to four job evaluation factors and identifying the correct class series and the appropriate functional level within that series.

HR professionals conduct job analysis and evaluate PDQs to:

- Ensure that PDQs are current and adequate; and,
- Determine whether the class series and levels, as related to the job description, are appropriate.

Data from 47 respondents show that during FY 2003-2004 it took an average of 16 calendar days to complete individual allocation actions from the day an official request was received in the HR office to the date of the allocation notice. This turn-around time includes the PDQ evaluation and writing the allocation report. The range of calendar days reported varied from zero to 45. The average 16 days reported for FY 2003-004 is an increase of 3 days from last year's data (13 days).

A total of 4,617 allocation requests were received in the 47 departments and institutions reporting (see below for breakdown).

Job Evaluation Activity	Quantity
Average number of days to complete allocation requests	16
Number of allocations for occupied positions	2,304
Number of allocations for new positions	1,212
Number of allocations for vacant positions	1,101

Compensation

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) is a federal law that establishes the minimum wage, overtime compensation standards, record keeping requirements, child labor provisions, and other regulations that affect employers and employees. The effective date of the Act as it applied to state and local governments was April 15, 1986. The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) is authorized to investigate any alleged violations and generally enforces the FLSA.

Respondents were asked one question related to FLSA, how many complaints were filed with the US Department of Labor. Two departments reported having a claim filed. This is an increase compared to last year where no complaints were filed

Section III – Selection

This section of the survey requested data on the number of days it took to fill positions. Of the 47 responses to this question, one department and two institutions were excluded because no selection activities were performed in the fiscal year.

Selection time-frame	Average Calendar Days
Average number of days to fill a position (from date of receipt of personnel requisition to appointment)	40
Average number of days between receipt of requisition to referral	28
Average number of days between referral and appointment	15

A total of 4,625 state personnel system vacancies were filled in FY 2003-2004 as reported by 47 survey respondents. Respondents were asked to identify vacancies filled through open competitive versus department/institution promotional processes.

Fiscal Year	Number of Responses	Promotional	Open Competitive
2002-2003	34	263	941
2003-2004	44	1,193	3,432

The FY 2003-2004 ratio of approximately 1 promotional position to 3 open competitive positions being filled is similar to last year's ratio; however, only 34 responses were received in FY 2002-2003.

Section IV – Leave Administration

Annual Leave and Sick Leave

Employees accrue annual leave according to the number of years an employee has worked for the state, and any remaining leave over the maximum accrual rate at the end of a fiscal year is forfeited on July 1. The following table illustrates the leave accrual rates based on years of state service.

Years of Service	Hours/Month (for full-time employees)
1-5	8
6-10	10
11-15	12
16+	14

The maximum accrual rate ranges from 24 to 42 days, depending on years of service. Upon retirement or separation, unused accrued annual leave is paid out, subject to the maximum accrual rate.

The table below illustrates actual hours and average number of days of annual and sick leave used. All 47 respondents reported the number of annual and sick leave hours taken; however, one response was excluded because the number of employees reported was zero. Excluding this department's reported hours did not change the overall average number of leave hours taken. As illustrated in the table, the average number of annual leave days taken by employees has decreased in the last three years. For sick leave, the average number of days used per year has remained consistent – within one day.

LEAVE TAKEN FY 2003-2004 (Does not include payouts to separated employees.)					<i>FY</i> 2002-2003	<i>FY</i> 2001-2002
Type of Leave	Overall Hours Taken	Number of Employees Taking Leave	Average Number of Hours	Average Number of Days	<i>Average Number of Days</i>	<i>Average Number of Days</i>
Annual	2,888,348	29,544	97.76	12	14.5	18.1
Sick	1,644,002	28,294	58.10	7	8.0	6.8

For annual leave payout a correlation between the number of separating employees in FY 2003-2004 and the total number of paid leave hours indicates that if each employee were paid out equally, the number of days paid out would be 12. Given the average monthly salary of \$3,785, this represents an average payout of approximately \$2,096.

Analyzing the data using the total number of retirees for FY 2003-2004, the average payout to retirees for sick leave is approximately \$2,308 per retiree, based on 1,090 retirees in FY 2003-2004 at an average retiree salary of \$4,586 per month (\$26.46/hour).

The sick leave conversion program allows eligible employees to convert all or a portion of accrued sick leave in excess of 360 hours to salary for PERA purposes. The conversion rate is 15 percent. The enabling statute sunsets on June 30, 2005. During FY 2003-2004, 263 employees chose to convert sick leave. Figures on the total sick leave conversion payout will not be available until after June 30, 2005, when the bill's provisions expire.

LEAVE PAYOUT INFORMATION				
Leave Payout Type	Total Hours of Leave Paid Out	Number of Employee Separations recorded for FY 2003-2004	Average Number of Hours Paid Out	Average Number of Days Paid Out
Annual Leave Paid Out	364,595	3,899	93.01	12
Sick Leave Paid Out (only applies to retiring employees)	83,974	1,090 (<i>number of retirements recorded for FY 2003-2004</i>)	77.04	9.6
Sick Leave Conversion Paid Out (employees who converted sick leave to salary prior to retirement)	152,749	263	580.79	72.6

Funeral Leave

Funeral leave is granted based on the employee's relationship to the deceased, and the distance and mode of transportation to attend services. An appointing authority is permitted to grant up to 40 hours leave. Based on data submitted from 47 respondents, the average number of funeral leave days used is decreasing.

FUNERAL LEAVE TAKEN FY 2003-2004				<i>FY</i> 2002-2003	<i>FY</i> 2001-2002
Overall hours	Number of Employees Taking Leave	Average Number of Hours Taken	Average Number of Days Taken	<i>Average Number of Days</i>	<i>Average Number of Days</i>
102,562	5,775	17.76	2.2	2.95	3.6

Injury Leave

Injury leave is paid leave provided to permanent employees who have a work-related injury or illness in the line of duty that is compensable under Workers' Compensation. Eligible employees are granted up to 90 working days of leave with full pay, provided the employee assigns, endorses, or otherwise causes his temporary compensation to be paid to his employing agency. Because injury leave is granted on a per day basis, each day an employee misses any work due to the illness or injury is counted as one of the 90 occurrences of injury leave.

Of the respondents, 36 reported employees using injury leave. The total number of employees using injury leave was 784.

Leave Sharing

A leave-sharing program allows employees to transfer annual leave to an eligible employee who has an immediate family member experiencing a catastrophic illness or injury that poses a direct threat to life. In the 2002-2003 report, 43 respondents reported having established a leave-sharing program. For FY 2003-2004, the number has increased by one.

Eligibility is limited to permanent employees with at least one year of state service who have exhausted all applicable accrued leave. Leave sharing is intended to be a "court of last resort" and is not a substitute for short-term disability, long-term disability, or workers' compensation benefits. Each department or institution determines whether or not to offer a leave-sharing program.

For the 2003-2004 year, 30 respondents received a total of 162 applications for leave sharing. The following table illustrates the number of applications accepted and rejected for the last three fiscal years.

LEAVE SHARING APPLICATIONS FY 2003-2004					
FY 2003-2004		FY 2002-2003		FY 2001-2002	
Number of Applications Accepted	Number of Requests Rejected	Number of Applications Accepted	Number of Requests Rejected	Number of Applications Accepted	Number of Requests Rejected
138	24	147	11	149	27

Following is a summary of the documented reasons for leave sharing applications. This data does not equal the total of all accepted and rejected applications because not all respondents reported the relationship to the employee for rejected applications.

LEAVE SHARING – TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP FY 2003-2004 ONLY	
Relationship	Number of Reported Applications
Self	110
Child	6
Parent	9
Spouse	14
Other (brother and granddaughter)	2

The leave sharing program was originally designed for catastrophic medical events. The policy was expanded to allow leave sharing for catastrophic events and military hardship through executive order and the state personnel director’s policy. This is the first year that information was requested through this survey on the reason for granting shared leave to employees.

Catastrophic events leave has been in effect since June 21, 2002. Departments and institutions are authorized to expand their leave-sharing programs to include employees who are directly affected by life-altering catastrophic events or emergencies, such as wildfires, floods, tornadoes, and other natural disasters. This includes employees who suffer loss of life or property as a consequence of such events, or who are serving as first-responders to such tragedies.

Personnel Director’s Administrative Procedures provide for paid leave of up to 15 working days (120 hours) within a calendar year for military service whether for training or active duty. On December 11, 2001, the state personnel director temporarily extended administrative leave and annual leave-sharing programs to employees called to active duty following the September 11 terrorist attacks. Through the policy, department heads and presidents of colleges and universities are encouraged to grant administrative leave to state employees called to active military service. The purpose of this administrative leave is to make the salaries of these employees “whole” for a period of 90 calendar days following the exhaustion of their paid military leave to help relieve some of the financial hardship.

The following table summarizes the usage of these different leaves.

Reason for Leave Sharing	Number of Responses	Number of Employees Approved	Number of Hours Approved	Average Number of Hours Approved	Average Number of 8-hour Work Days Approved
Medical Leave	30	1,189	183,917	154.7	19.3
Catastrophic Event	5	10	1,408	140.8	17.6
Military	6	22	2,868	130.4	16.3

Section V – Performance Management

The performance pay system consists of three components: performance management, performance awards, and dispute resolution. Departments and institutions develop and implement the components of their own performance pay programs based on system-wide requirements.

Statewide, uniform core competencies (communication, interpersonal skills, customer service, accountability, and job knowledge) must be incorporated into each individual performance plan and evaluation. Departments and institutions may designate additional competencies specific to their organizations.

Performance Plans

A planning session must be held between the supervisor and employee at the beginning of the performance cycle by a date specified in the department’s or institution’s performance pay program. All supervisors, including non-classified supervisors in higher education institutions, who fail to provide timely plans and evaluations in accordance with established timelines, are subject to a corrective action and become ineligible for a performance award. Performance planning time frames are not defined in statute but by each principal department or higher education institution. The following table represents information received from the departments and institutions that responded to the HR Annual Survey in Fall 2004.

PERFORMANCE PLANS COMPLETED OR LATE				
Number of Responses	Number Completed	Number Completed Late	Number Never Completed	Compliance Rate
47	30,658	1,373	70	95.3%

Performance Ratings

All employees are evaluated, in writing, at least annually based on job performance within the performance evaluation cycle. The deadline for completing annual evaluations is defined in the department’s or institution’s performance pay program. Employee performance is rated based upon four levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, above standard, and outstanding. An unsatisfactory performance rating results in a performance improvement plan or a corrective action. Based on the data, only one employee from a single department received no performance evaluation for the performance cycle. The reason given for not completing this rating was that the employee resigned employment prior to the final evaluation. The compliance rate for timely completion of performance evaluations for FY 2003-2004 is 100%. Following is a summary of information reported to the Joint Budget Committee regarding the completion of performance plans for FY 03-04.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS COMPLETED OR LATE				
Number of Responses	Number Completed	Number Completed Late	Number Never Completed	Compliance Rate
All	31,178	0	1	100%

Supervisor Sanctions

Each department’s or institution’s program must outline how supervisory compliance will be tracked and how noncompliance will be addressed. Sanctions must be specified in the programs, including those required by procedure or statute, for any rater who fails to complete performance plans and evaluations. Sanctions required by Director’s Administrative Procedure P-6-2 are:

“Absent extraordinary circumstances, failure to timely plan and evaluate in accordance with the department’s established timelines results in a corrective action and ineligibility for a performance award. If the individual performance plan or evaluation is not completed within 30 days of the corrective action, the designated rater shall be disciplinarily suspended in increments of one work week following the pre-disciplinary meeting.”

CRS 24-50-104 (c.5) provides that if any evaluations are not completed by July 1, a supervisor may be demoted. If failure to evaluate by July 1 happens for a consecutive two-year period, the supervisor shall be demoted to a non-supervisory position. Respondents were asked to provide information on supervisory sanctions under both statute and administrative procedures. Following is a table representing the 47 responses reflecting sanctions for FY 2003-2004.

Type of Sanction	Number of Sanctions Imposed in Compliance with Director's Administrative Procedure P-6-2	Number of Sanctions Imposed in Compliance with Statute
Performance increase withheld	1	0
Corrective action	1	0
Suspension without pay	4	0
Demotion	1	0
Termination	0	0

Dispute Resolution

Employees may question certain matters regarding performance plans and ratings through the department's or institution's internal performance pay program dispute resolution process and the state personnel director's dispute resolution system. The table below illustrates the reasons for performance pay disputes for the 47 responses during FY 2003-2004.

Reasons for Performance Pay System Disputes	Number of Disputes
Lack of supervisory training	2
Lack of a plan	3
Unclear measurements in plan	3
Lack of coaching or feedback	0
Lack of community regarding the program	0
Subjectivity of the rating	23
Unclear distinctions between rating levels in program	1
Lack of consistent distribution of ratings	0
Overall rating or <i>lack</i> of a final overall rating	55

Performance Salary Adjustments

Performance salary adjustments were funded for the performance cycle ending in 2004. The percentage awarded for each rating level was determined by the individual department or higher education institution within the percentage parameters for each rating level issued by the State Personnel Director. Employees rated at Level 1, Needs Improvement, are not eligible for a performance salary adjustment.

Respondents were asked to provide the dollars budgeted and expended for performance salary adjustments. See the table below.

PERFORMANCE SALARY ADJUSTMENTS - BUDGETED AND EXPENDED FY 2003-2004			
Number of Responses	Amount Budgeted	Amount Expended	Amount Expended for Non-base Building Adjustments
47	\$16,120,712.50	\$16,070,889.60	\$110,611.53

Section VI – Grievances, Corrective Actions, Disciplinary Actions

Grievances

Board Rule R-8-5 states that “a permanent employee may grieve matters that are not directly appealable to, or reviewable by, the Board or director.” Each department and institution is allowed flexibility to establish an internal grievance process to address and resolve problems, provided the process complies with the time frames and basic procedures in Board Rule R-8-8.

Corrective Actions

Corrective actions are written statements “intended to correct and improve performance or behavior” that do “not affect current base pay, status, or tenure.” (R-6-8). Corrective actions include statements regarding the areas for improvement, the actions to take, the time frame, and consequences for failure to correct behavior.

Disciplinary Actions

Disciplinary actions can be taken against an employee for (1) failure to perform competently, (2) willful misconduct or violation of rules or law, (3) false statements of fact during the application process for state positions, (4) willful failure to perform, including failure to plan or evaluate performance in a timely manner or inability to perform, (5) final conviction of a felony or other offence of moral turpitude, and (6) final conviction of an offense of a Department of Human Services’ employee subject to statutory provisions. Disciplinary actions may include a reduction of base pay, demotion, dismissal, and suspension without pay (R-6-9). The following table illustrates the number of occurrences in each category.

Grievances		
Category	Number of Responses	Number of Occurrences
Written grievances filed with HR offices	24	175

DISCIPLINE		
Corrective Actions		
Corrective actions administered	34	1,186
Disciplinary Actions Given*		
Reason: failure to meet standards of efficient service	25	256
Reason: willful misconduct	25	175
Reason: willful failure or inability to perform the job	20	100
Reason: final conviction of a felony	3	7
Outcomes from Disciplinary Actions*		
Dismissal	30	251
Suspension	12	80
Demotion	9	31
Pay reduction	15	174
Other disciplinary actions taken	10	31

*Overall, a total of 570 disciplinary actions were reported; however, some departments did not report the reason for the disciplinary action and/or the outcomes of the actions given.