MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Human Resources Committee Date of Meeting: January 18, 2011
Agenda Item: Performance Pay Discussion
Proposed Approvals X Other Monitoring Policy Change Required by Policy
Information
Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda: The Board of Trustees must decide whether to continue the pay for performance compensation strategy in the coming years.
Scheduled Presenter(s): Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Outline of Key Points: • Whether pay for performance will continue into the future

The background was presented in detail as an information item at the September 2010

Background Information:

Human Resources Committee meeting.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

2

1

BOARD ACTION

PAY FOR PERFORMANCE

4 5 6

BACKGROUND:

This was presented as an information item at the September 2010 Human Resources Committee meeting. More complete detail is provided in the materials for that meeting.

8 9 10

7

<u>Legislative History</u>

- 11 The Legislature has established a requirement that each state employee shall be evaluated and
- counseled on work performance at least once a year. In addition, all individual pay increases for
- employees not represented by exclusive representatives shall be based on the performance evaluation.
- 14 Minn. Stat. § 43A.20

15

- The Personnel Plan for Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Administrators does not provide
- for across-the-board salary adjustments. All increases have historically been in variable amounts at
- the discretion of the appointing authority and based on individual performance in the prior year. The
- Personnel Plan for FY2010-2011 suspended all base salary increases other than those provided in chancellor, vice chancellor and president employment agreements.
- 20 Chancellor, vice chancellor and pre

21 22

- In the 2000 legislative session, the Legislature modified compensation for system administrators in
- several ways. First, Minn. Stat. ch.15A, which generally governs the salaries of agency heads, was modified to give the Board of Trustees the power to establish the salary of the Chancellor within a
- salary range approved by the Legislative Coordinating Commission's Subcommittee on Employee
- Relations. Minn. Stat. §15A.081. Second, Minn.Stat. § 136F.40 was modified to allow the Board to
- enter into employment contracts with the Chancellor and the presidents. The law allows the Board to
- provide "other compensation" to the Chancellor and presidents. Laws of Minnesota 2000, Chapter
- 29 453.

30

- On July 21, 2000, the Legislative Subcommittee on Employee Relations approved an amendment to
- 32 the Personnel Plan. This amendment reflected statutory changes providing for employment contracts,
- and providing for additional remuneration of up to 30 percent of base salary for administrators under
- contract. This additional remuneration has consisted of housing allowances for the Chancellor and
- 35 state university presidents, a transportation/communication allowance for the Chancellor and all
- 36 presidents, and more recently, performance pay.

37 38

- In the Special Session of 2001, the legislature again amended Minn. Stat. § 136F.40 to allow
- 39 employment contracts with vice chancellors.

40

- 41 <u>Performance Pay Background</u>
- 42 Administrators, including the Chancellor, presidents and vice chancellors, historically have been paid
- on a performance-based model. That is, they have always been paid as a "look back" for past

performance. This is embodied in the "merit pool" funds in prior years and the performance incentives currently in place for contracted administrators. This means that any increases are paid to administrators in the year following the period in which they are earned. For example, for performance in FY08, administrators received payments at the beginning of FY09. This allows for an assessment of prior performance before the award of any remuneration increases and allows for remuneration to be proportional to actual performance.

This pay practice is in contrast with the traditional pay strategy for bargaining unit employees where negotiated increases take place on the first day of a fiscal year. Thus, bargaining unit employees receive increases contemporaneously with the work they perform; with the pay increases coming in the form of predetermined step increases (employees who are at the maximum rate for their pay range do not receive step increases).

 The Chancellor's employment contract originally provided for an annual incentive payment that, when combined with his housing allowance and transportation allowance, would bring his total additional remuneration up to the 30 percent limit provided in the Personnel Plan approved by the Legislature. In 2008 and 2009, the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor agreed to new employment contracts that put his additional remuneration more at risk by making payment of the incentive optional up to a maximum amount, depending on performance. At present, the incentive amount in the Chancellor's contract us up to \$50,000 per year.

Beginning in FY03, the employment contracts provided each president and vice chancellor the opportunity to earn a performance-based lump sum payment of \$2,000 each fiscal year. These amounts were paid for FY 2003 through FY 2008.

 In 2008, the Board of Trustees instructed the Chancellor to negotiate addenda to the presidents' contracts providing for larger performance incentives, but introducing more risk. Those addenda provide generally for performance increases up to \$15,000 per fiscal year. The incentive is not guaranteed; a president or vice chancellor may not receive any performance incentive. In addition, a rigorous process was implemented to assess the performance of the presidents and vice chancellors to insure their performance warranted the potential incentive payment. These performance incentive payments are one-time funds and do not constitute base salary adjustments.

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION:

(To be determined)

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

(To be determined)

40 Date of Adoption: January 19, 2011
 41 Date of Implementation: January 19, 2011