

HRC Memorandum No. 1 s. 2017

January 16, 2017

To: Sylvia Henry,
President , Faculty and Staff Senate

From: Emmanuela P. Garcia,
Chair, Human Resources Committee

Subject: HR Policies for Review

As per HRC TOR, results of discussions of HR Board Policies by HRC need to be passed on to the FSS for further discussions and review before these are submitted to HR director for further action. May I request that these policies be included in your meeting discussions.

Below are Board Policies discussed by the HRC on the recommended changes by HR. Please see attached BPs with changes highlighted in red.

1. BP 6001 - HRC moved to adopt the proposed changes as is.

2. BP 6032 - controlled substance

HRC moved to adopt the changes. Though the policy has no teeth in preventing the use of controlled substances on campuses, it can be used as basis if ever there are complaints. Rencelly explained that changes were made to comply with federal laws.

3. BP 6023 Outside employment

HRC recommended that there should be an administrative procedure to be followed. As per experience of Bert and Teetaki, many coordination took place but the immigration office has the last word. Teetaki's request for outside employment was denied and so was Bert's, even though Bert's supervisors had certified that work will not affect his classes.

4. BP 6018 - Termination.

HRC specified that the number of days effective are CALENDAR DAYS and in 4C APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

5. BP6009 (Compensation) :

HR recommends that pay increments should not be tied with Performance evaluation results and that pay increments will not be fixed at an annual 5% but will be decided on by the college based on budget. There will be cases wherein there will be no pay increments due to lack of funds.

HRC recommends that pay increments should be budgeted as much as possible and "lack of funds" must be substantiated. There should be transparency on why the % increment is reduced or why no pay increment for the year will be given. HRC believes that giving of pay increments should still be tied to performance evaluation.

6. BP6017 Performance evaluation

HR recommends that performance evaluations will only be conducted 6 months before a permanent employee's end of contract to determine continuance or termination. This is due to noncompliance to accreditation requirements wherein supervisors do not submit performance evaluations as mandated by the policy.

HRC suggests that performance evaluations should still be conducted annually. Conducting it only prior to contract renewal or termination does not solve the problem of on time submission of performance evaluations by supervisors.

Suggestions to make supervisors submit evaluations timely:

1. To lessen the power of supervisors in using performance evaluations over their subordinates, supervisor's performance should also be evaluated by subordinates.
2. Supervisors should be given reminders by HR personnel and by appropriate VPs if necessary.
3. Supervisors should be given low performance evaluation by their supervisors if they submit evaluations late.
3. Letters of reprimand should also be given if evaluations not submitted after 1 month of anniversary of employee.
4. Supervisors not heeding reminders and letters of reprimand should be given salary deductions.