

ADDENDUM 1
RFP 15191 - PROFESSIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION SERVICES
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1: Is the Commission open to the design and use of multiple salary structures?

Answer 1: Yes. West Virginia Code makes reference to “the classified salary schedule” and is written based on the fact that only one salary structure previously existed for the employee category. However, if best practices in compensation warrant multiple salary schedules, and multiple structures would meet the goals for equitable compensation among the organizations of the Commission and Council, the Commission is open for such recommendations from the consultant.

Question 2: Approximately how many employees would need to be trained on job analysis and compensation management?

Answer 2: Approximately 46 individuals who are or will be responsible for classification and compensation recommendations or decisions at our colleges and universities will need training on the specific application of the final classification and compensation program developed by the consultant. This number includes the Job Classification Committee. (Two persons from each of 21 organizations; plus 4 classified representatives on the JCC for a total of 46.)

Question 3: The RFP discusses the Validation Analysis of Integrated Point Factor Methodology. Is this analysis intended to identify only where there is a lack of alignment to market salary data?

Answer 3: Not only is the Commission seeking to determine where there is lack of alignment to the market salary data, we also expect recommendations for adjustment and/or resolution of any issues discovered.

Question 4: How many different surveys are currently in use to assess market competitiveness throughout the system?

Answer 4: The last compensation market study for classified employees used 14 reputable higher education and general industry survey sources.

Question 5: With regard to the request for supporting software, is the intention only to retain records in the software of the classified employees in the system?

Answer 5: No. The intention for purchase of supporting software is to maintain the classification and compensation system developed from this project. We anticipate having the ability to maintain and update job specifications, apply the methodology used for classification decisions, document outcomes, maintain point factor data-lines, update market information and produce updated salary structures. We

anticipate having the ability to load or access updated market information and to update the salary structure(s) annually.

Question 6: Is the supporting software expected to import data from multiple data feeds? If so, approximately how many? One per institution? Several per institution?

Answer 6: The Commission will depend on the consultant to recommend the appropriate software and methods for populating data elements. As background, the higher education system is currently working toward implementation of a statewide enterprise resource planning project (wvOASIS) that includes a new HRM/Payroll system. The ability to export employee specific classification and compensation information for all West Virginia higher education organizations using a common flat file format for import to other systems is available. The Commission expects guidance and support from the consultant and/or software vendor with loading new market information to the system for maintenance of the compensation structure(s). With limited specifics regarding the software, we anticipate one interface for employee related information and as many as necessary to maintain market salary data.

Question 7: Section 5, Page 6 of the RFP requests software or software services to support the new compensation and classification programs. Our firm does not offer software of this nature, but we have experience assisting our clients with the evaluation and selection of these types of systems. Is the software aspect of this RFP a minimum requirement to be considered for selection? If not, should we include in our proposed services assistance with the evaluation and selection of another vendor that offers these products?

Answer 7: The ability of the firm to provide the software is not a minimum requirement for consideration for selection. If the firm does not provide software, a separate pricing option should be included for proposed services assistance, or for partnership with a separate software provider to deliver the desired ability to automate maintenance of the classification and compensation system.

Question 8: Do you anticipate that the selected consultant would need to visit all of the System's 22 organizations throughout the project? In other words, do you have any expectations regarding the amount of time consultants would need to be onsite? This is an important consideration as vendors prepare a price proposal.

Answer 8: There is no expectation that the consultant will need to visit all 22 organizations. The majority of on-site work will be performed in or near Charleston, WV. The consultant should plan for onsite visits sufficient to support the project for planning, organization, guidance, updates to constituents, presentation of recommendations, introduction of final results and training. The Commission is amenable to on-line meetings, but expect sufficient presence to build credibility and confidence with employee constituents.

Question 9: Regarding proposed fees, are you requesting a firm fixed fee or is a fee range acceptable (which would be further refined as a detailed scope of work is developed)?

Answer 9: A fee range which would be further refined as a detailed scope of work is developed would be acceptable. However, the initial analysis and consideration for further discussion of the scope of work will be based on the range affordability. As such the consultant should make serious effort to design the bid using the background information provided, and including cost saving options for further consideration.

Question 10: It sounds like you are requesting the consultant to conduct a market assessment for classified jobs only, as well as to recommend a *process* for the annual reporting of compensation market data for the other two categories of employees (faculty and non-classified). Is that correct?

Answer 10: Yes. The Commission requests the design of a clear and uniform reporting process for annual compensation market data and employee pay supplied by the 22 organizations of the system. The process will be used for reporting faculty and nonclassified data, as well as classified compensation data after implementation of the outcome of the market study for classified employees. The market study work in the proposal is only for the classified category of employees.

Question 11:

- a. For the market analysis, should we anticipate that different institutions will have different market definitions (based on category, size, and academic offerings)?

Answer 11a: Yes. Institutions will have different local markets based on geographic location. Regional or national markets may be the same for multiple institutions. The majority of classified employee jobs are unaffected by academic offerings. However, jobs may differ based on the size and mission of the institution. For example, classified positions involved in research may exist in only one or two institutions. More common jobs related to the operation of the organization, may be common among all institutions.

- b. Should we also anticipate that different job categories may have different market definitions, such as a national, regional, or local depending on the job level?

Answer 11b: Yes.

- c. Do you wish the market comparisons to include higher education institutions, local/state governments, and private sector entities (for-profit and non-profit)?

Answer 11c: Yes, where appropriate. Market comparisons should be based on compensation best practices. Private sector entities may be part of the local and regional market for jobs common to both public sector and private industry. However, some classified jobs are higher education specific and may not exist in private sector entities.

Question 12: Also with regard to the market analysis, do you anticipate that the consultant would use published data sources or are you expecting custom surveys distributed to specific peer institutions/employers?

Answer 12: The Commission anticipates that published data sources will be sufficient. Custom surveys are not required.

Question 13: Section 4, Page 4 of the RFP requests "Review documentation representing jobs in the classification system and facilitate or draft job specifications necessary to update and manage the system." Do you anticipate that the selected consultant would use existing documentation to develop recommended changes to the classification structure?

Answer 13: Yes. Current Position Information Questionnaires (PIQs) and job descriptions drafted at each institution should be used for this purpose.

Question 14: Do you expect that the consultant would need to gather additional information from employees or managers regarding the current job content and responsibilities?

Answer 14: Gathering of additional job content would only be necessary if the consultant recommends a method for classifying jobs that include factors other than existing compensatory factors in the system. Factors currently addressed in Position Information Questionnaires are: Knowledge, Experience, Complexity of Problem Solving, Freedom of Action, Breath of Responsibility, Scope and Effect, Internal Contacts (nature and level of contact), External Contacts (nature and level), Physical Coordination, Working Conditions and Physical Demands.

Question 15: Are you asking the consultant to write or update class specifications (job descriptions) for all titles covering classified employees?

Answer 15: Yes. Consultants are expected to bid on drafting the job specifications. Alternatively, consultants may bid on this as a facilitated project using members of the Job Classification Committee and Chief Human Resources Officers (or staff) to do the actual writing.

Question 16: What HCM software do the Commission and Council currently use? Has the organization deployed the compensation and/or talent management module (if applicable)?

Answer 16: As mentioned is the answer to question #6, the higher education system is currently included in West Virginia's enterprise resource planning program and is working toward implementation of a new HRM/Payroll system. The accounting program is called "Advantage" and was developed by a Canadian firm called CGI. See wvOASIS for more information. WvOASIS does not include a compensation management module, but does include time/leave and payroll. It does include modules found in talent management software. WvOASIS was not developed for human resources management in higher education and lacks many basic data elements and processes used by higher education. WvOASIS does not include a recruitment/applicant tracking software but will work with the NEOGOV software currently used by the state civil service system. KRONOS is used for time and leave. The system includes modules for tracking education and training, performance management, and grievance processing.

Currently, several higher education institutions use Ellucian's Banner HR. Some have in-house developed systems. Others use spreadsheets to maintain human resources information. Approximately 5 institutions use "PeopleAdmin" as their applicant tracking software. All 22 organizations in the West Virginia higher education systems will transition to wvOASIS by the end of calendar year 2015.

Question 17: Do the Commission and Council currently use a software and/or SaaS solution for job evaluation, market data and/or compensation structures? If so, which solution(s)?

Answer 17: No. Initially the Commission and Council used a system call CompMaster. However the software was not maintained and user licenses were not renewed. As such, an excel spreadsheet was developed to automate the job evaluation process and maintain resulting data lines. Market data and compensation structures are not maintained by the systems.

Question 18: Section 4.4 of the RFP discusses the current integrated point factor system. Is this a custom point factor tool or provided by a vendor? If it is vendor provided, which tool/solution is currently being used?

Answer 18: The current point factor methodology in use was developed in consultation with William M Mercer, Inc. and implemented in 1994. The resulting point values were integrated with market compensation levels and validated at implementation of the system. An audit of the system was conducted in 1998. No additional audit or validation against market pay rates has been performed.

Question 19: Section 4.5 of the RFP discusses training materials. Do the Commission and Council wish for the consultant to provide training session(s) for the JCC members?

Answer 19: Yes. In addition to training JCC members, training will include the professionals responsible for making classification and compensation decision at each of the higher education organizations. See the answer to question #2.

Question 20: Section 6 of the RFP discusses reporting programs. The WV Code includes faculty and non-classified employees as a part of the reporting requirements but they are not part of the compensation study. Section 6.2 of the RFP implies all categories be included in the guidelines. Please confirm.

Answer 20: This is correct. See answer to question #10.

Question 21: Page 11 (Section 11.4.6) of the RFP references 3 client references. Page 12 (Section 11.6.3 (2)) indicates 5 client references. How many references are required?

Answer 21. 5 client references are required. A revised Page 11 is attached.

Question 22: Section 5.1 of the RFP discusses the need for a software and/or SaaS solution for several components of compensation management (e.g. job specifications, job evaluations, market pay data and compensation structures). Do the Commission and Council require a single software and/or SaaS solution to maintain all of the aforementioned components of compensation management or would the Commission and Council consider multiple products to meet the need in Section 5.1 of the RFP?

Answer 22: Multiple products to meet the needs of Section 5.1 will be considered. Multiple products recommended and included must work together and/or include process/procedures and training to enable users to make full use of the products recommended.

Question 23: Please confirm that submission of a joint proposal by two firms is allowed for this RFP.

Answer 23: The Commission and Council will consider joint proposals by two firms.

Question 24: Please confirm if the Terms and Conditions as noted in Appendix B of the RFP are subject to negotiation with the vendor selected to complete this project.

Answer 24: If necessary, the Commission will discuss negotiation of terms with the successful vendor. Those terms required by West Virginia State Code or the West Virginia State Attorney General's Office are non-negotiable.

Question 25: Please confirm if the organization is legally required to use a Point Factor system to determine the compensation of organizations positions, whether classified, non-classified or faculty.

Answer 25: The Commission and Council *are not* legally required to use the point factor methodology of job classification. West Virginia Code requires an appropriate method for classification of jobs to create a job worth hierarchy.

Question 26: Please confirm that all services that would be provided pursuant to Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the RFP are related to "Classified" organization employees. Please confirm if any services would need to incorporate "non-classified and faculty" employees.

Answer 26: Section 4 of the RFP relating to job evaluation and compensation market study relate only to the classified employee category of employees. The software in Section 5 should be applicable to management of the system of classification and compensation for classified employees. Section 6 requests the design of a reporting process that enables the 22 higher education organizations to consistently and uniformly report compensation market information(as determined by the organization) and employee pay for all three categories of employees, nonclassified, faculty AND classified. Reports by organization for classified markets will include the Section 4 results of the work provided by the consultant. See also the answer to question #10.

Question 27: Regarding occurrence of positions that appear as both classified and non-classified, as alluded to in Appendix 1 of the RFP, please advise as to whether this position will need to be benchmarked according to the duties of the classified position and once again according to the duties of the non-classified position, along with an estimate of the number of positions where this occurs.

Answer 27: Only positions occurring in the classified category of employees are to be included and benchmarked in the market study. There is no requirement for identification of the number of occurrences. This information was provided as full disclosure for development of the reporting structure requested in Section 6.

Question 28: Please confirm any proprietary or education industry surveys or compensation benchmark databases the organization uses or to which the organization has access.

Answer 28: The Commission subscribes to the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) Data on Demand services. Access will be provided for the contracted consultant. 2014-15 survey reports purchased and available include: Administrators in Higher Education; Professionals in Higher Education; and Non-Exempt Staff in Higher Education.

Question 29: Please confirm if the organization provides any sort of incentive or bonus and if applicable, the details regarding that plan or program.

Answer 29: The West Virginia higher education system organizations are publicly supported. As such, employees of the organizations are prohibited from receiving bonuses. However, merit and incentive programs are allowed as long as payment for compensation under the programs is spread over the course of the fiscal year and not via lump sum payment.

Question 30: Please confirm if the organization provides any sort of benefits as a part of compensation that should also be considered for the compensation market study.

Answer 30: Benefits are not to be included as part of compensation considered for the compensation market study. However, the workweek for higher education organizations is 37.5 hours per week and analysis of annual market compensation should take this into consideration.

Question 31: Please confirm the proposal order format – should it be pursuant to Section 11.1-11.4.7 or 11.6 of the RFP?

Answer 31: Follow the format as listed in Sections 11.1-11.4.7.

Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission or the State of West Virginia. Disclose any information about you or your firm with presently or in the future could impair you or your firm's ability to provide the level of services outlined in the RFP.

11.4.2 Qualifications of the Firm: Provide a statement/response to your firm's experience with similar work, in specific multi-institutional higher education systems.

11.4.3 Relevant Experience of the Firm: Provide a list of at least five (5) previous clients for which you performed related work. In specific, highlight any work performed for multi-institutional higher education systems.

11.4.4 Approach/Philosophy: Describe in detail your planned approach to the requirements of this RFP. Specifically provide detailed information on work required to be performed in Sections 4, 5 and 6.

11.4.5 Qualifications of Staff: Identify proposed staffing with a statement of each individual's role in the project and their qualifications. Describe the experience key personnel have and the type and extent of training they have had related to this project.

11.4.6 References: The names, telephone numbers, e-mail and mailing addresses of at least three clients and the contact person from whom references may be obtained for both the firm and the key personnel assigned to this project. References should be from clients comparable to the type and scope of services solicited in this RFP.

11.4.7 Addendum Acknowledgement: The vendor should acknowledge knowledge and acceptance any Addendum released for this RFP prior to bid opening.

11.5 Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description of the bidder's abilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Emphasis should be placed on completeness and clarity of content.

11.6 The proposal will be evaluated on a 100-point scale with points assigned as outlined below: The response proposal shall contain the following sections:

11.6.1 Title Page: Provide the RFP project and number, the bidder's name, business address, telephone number, name and e-mail address of authorized contact person and include a signature and date.

11.6.2 Section 1: Discussion of Services (45 points). Describe the process you will undertake to perform the requirements of this project including addressing the services required to be performed in Sections 4, 5 and 6 of this RFP. Provide an overview of the principals and methodologies that will be used. Include detailed work phases, work plans, communication plans, reports and documentation that will be provided and time frames for the completion of work. Proposals will be evaluated based on demonstrated understanding of the complexities of a systems-wide project, the variety of colleges and universities in the public higher education systems and an understanding of the content provided in the appendices.

REVISED