As the state’s central HR policy making body, we provide leadership and support on enterprise HR strategic planning, collective bargaining and oversight of HR systems and structure, rules and policy.

State HR Teams:

- State Labor Relations
- Enterprise Classification, Compensation & HR Analytics
- Workforce Strategies
- Rules & Appeals
- Personnel Resources Board
Collective Bargaining Overview
Background

• OFM negotiates contracts covering workers represented by 38 unions.
• 28 separate agreements (some unions bargain in coalition)
• 18 agreements can be subject to interest arbitration
General government

- 7 master agreements (two with interest arbitration)
- 50,000 employees

Higher education (community colleges)

- 2 Master Agreements
- 26 community colleges
- 2 unions
- 4,500 employees
Washington State Ferries (WSDOT)

- 10 agreements (with interest arbitration)
- 14 unions
- 1,700 employees
RCW 41.56

Washington State Patrol commissioned officers

- 2 agreements
- 2 unions
- 1,100 employees
RCWs 41.56 and 74.39A

Nonstate employees

• 4 agreements (with interest arbitration)
• DCYF, DSHS and HCA budgets
• 4 unions
• 38,900 home care individual providers
• 2,600 adult family owners
• 1,000 language access providers
• 7,000 family child care providers
RCW 41.80, 47.64 and 41.59.106

Health care coalition

- 1 agreement
- Applies to all state and higher education employees

K-12 school employees health care funding

- 1 agreement
- Applies to classified school district employees.
Bargaining lifecycle

- Bargaining
- Tentative agreement
- Administration
- Funding
- Preparation
Bargaining timeline

- **Sept. 2019**
  - Agency Class & Comp proposals due to State HR

- **Jan. 2020**
  - Team selection & bargaining strategy development

- **March 2020**
  - Final Class & Comp proposal recommendations

- **June 2020**
  - Employer’s economic proposals bargained

- **Sept. 2020**
  - Conclude bargaining, unions submit agreements for ratification

- **Oct. 2020**
  - Official financial submittal
Collective Bargaining Funding Process

January - April
Legislative funding

April
Budget bill signed

July 1
Implementation of the new CBA

October 1
Submittal

November
State revenue forecast

December
Financial feasibility determination

December
Governor’s budget proposal

01
CBA Funding Process

02

03

04

05

06

07
Agency engagement in bargaining

• Submission of classification & compensation proposals
• Help identify all impacts should proposal be adopted
• Internal HR and budget communication on proposals with statewide impact
• Participate as subject matter experts for bargaining
IT Professional Structure
Implementation
• **2005** — Generic IT classification implemented
• **2011-12** — OCIO review finds structure not meeting business needs
• **2013** — Agencies and higher education identify ongoing issues with IT classifications
• **2014** — State HR & OCIO initiate comprehensive study of IT classifications
• **2017** — State HR IT class study completed and IT Professional Structure implementation plan approved
• **2019** — IT Professional Structure implemented
Why did we do it?

• Recruitment and retention problems
• Specialized talent acquisition
• Misallocation of employees
• Generic classification structure
• Lack of alignment with industry and market definitions of IT work
• Unable to compete for specific specialized skills in the job market
• Legislative interest in the management of state government IT workforce
How did we do it?

Strategic principles – IT Professional Structure implementation

**Recruitment / retention / adaptability**
- Market-informed alignment of jobs by job family / level
- Improved Opportunities for Career Growth

**Comply with statute**
- Ability to audit

**Good policy**
- Financially sustainable

**Consistency**
- Enterprise-wide similarity in classification

**Innovation**
- Study effectiveness for continuous improvement efforts
The Compensation Architecture

A comprehensive compensation program addresses all the components in this architecture and is aligned with the strategic principles.

Business strategy

Comp strategy:
- Comparison Markets
- Pay position
- Work valuation

Job structure

- Class structure
- Job families / levels
- Titles

Outcomes:
- Attract / retain talent
- Part of total rewards
- Credible with stakeholders

Job evaluation system

- Evaluation criteria
- Evaluation process

Base pay delivery

- Pay progression & administration

Pay ranges

- Ranges, steps
- Control mechanisms
IT Professional Structure goals

Classification goal: Industry-relevant job titles and job levels

• Realign state job classifications to accurately reflect work, enabling comparisons to local public and private sector jobs

• Ability to benchmark work internally and externally

Compensation goal: Market-informed pay range alignment

• State IT ranges vs local public and private sectors

• Enhance state efforts to recruit and retain IT talent
IT Professional Structure timeline

IT Position Evaluations

- May-June 2016: IT study evaluations (*approx. 70% of workforce*)
- July 2017: Initial position evaluations
- April 2018–Feb 2019: Quarterly position evaluations
- March–June 2019: Monthly evaluations
- July 2019–ongoing: State HR consultation process
## Current ITPS status

**9,549 evaluations submitted since July 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Family</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Journey</th>
<th>Sr/Specialist</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>IT Manager</th>
<th>Sr. IT Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Development</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Business Analyst</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Policy and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Project Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Vendor Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network &amp; Telecommunications</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administration</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9,549 evaluations submitted since July 2017
Positive impacts

• Establish foundation to assess market competitiveness of our pay ranges
• Enterprise and organizational alignment and equity
• Ability to implement targeted increases to address areas of concern
• Funding for progression increases (PIDCs)
• Ability to respond to workforce issues by providing more detailed classification and compensation data by job family and level of work
• IT Governance Committee oversees management of the ITPS
Challenges

• Adherence to evaluation standards and making consistent allocation decisions
• Employee appeals
• Potential inversion/compression with exempt and/or management positions
• Employee discontent with job class titles
• Employee Y-rating – salary above new pay range
• Employee positions excluded from the ITPS
Questions?