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1. The RFP mentions 2,700 positions.  Does this represent 2,700 unique positions or the number of employees included in this study?

*The RFP requests review of 2700 employees who are currently categorized across 233 state titles. Within the 233 state titles, there are 821 different campus working titles.*

1. Can you provide the number unique job titles for the units mentioned in this RFP study including academic affairs, finance, administration, and other units?

*See above.*

1. Does UA have variable pay / incentive plans, and are these plans within the scope of the study?

*We do not broadly offer pay / incentive plans. Those that do exist are outside the scope of this study.*

1. Does the study include review of any Benefits? If so, what Benefits will be included in the study?

*Not at this time. The compensation insights provided by the successful vendor will be used to assess our total rewards strategy.*

1. Will this study be conducted across multiple locations?

*This study includes the Fayetteville, Arkansas campus only.*

1. How many employees are represented by the 2,700 jobs?

*See number 1, above.*

1. Do you have unionized employees in any of the 2,700 jobs?

*No.*

1. Do you have existing job descriptions for the 2,700 jobs?

*Yes.*

1. Has the university conducted an employee engagement survey? If so, what are the current pain points?

*No. If an employee engagement survey is conducted before the RFP work commences and if one is, to the extent that the results provide helpful information to the classification and compensation study, results would be shared with the vendor.*

1. Are all the 2,700 positions mentioned under the SOW unique positions? If not, how many different job descriptions will the analysis include?

*See 1, above.*

1. Are the issues/pain points the University would like to focus on with this analysis and realignment?

*The RFP details the issues we seek to address in detail.*

1. How much budget has the University allocated for this analysis and realignment project?

*The University does not disclose budget information.*

1. Are there any reasons for the vendor to be on-site during the project?

*Not continuously. We do envision that some critical project meetings are best conducted on-site to build rapport and comfort between the vendor’s team and the University.*

1. Does the University have an approximate date by when the precut should be completed?

*No. Please note vendors are asked to submit with their bid package a timeline for work milestones.*

1. Will the vendor have to account for any unions on this analysis and realignment project?

*No.*

1. When as the last time the University underwent a similar analysis? And what information would like the University see in this new analysis that was missing from the previous one?

*The University has not conducted a comprehensive classification and compensation analysis and realignment in more than a decade. There is no previous study that serves as a point of reference for this work.*

17. Can you provide a breakdown of the number of employees for the 2,700 positions in scope of the study?

*See 1, above.*

18. What is the estimated timeframe for completion of this study?  The University website indicates 18 – 24 months, is that accurate?  When do you expect the study to begin?

*The timeframe for completion is accurately listed on the website. We expect the work to begin in the early fall of 2022.*

19. Are any of the positions included in the study part of a union?

*See 7, above.*

20. Can you describe your current compensation philosophy?

*Our compensation philosophy is consistent with traditional, residential large public universities in our region. One purpose of this project is to provide insight and information into how we might modernize.*

21. What percentage of the existing positions have current and accurate position descriptions?

*All University positions have job descriptions and were reviewed during a recent ERP implementation however, a vendor will be expected to suggest improvements to them.*

22. Does the institution have a set of peer institutions/organizations that you currently use for compensation comparisons?  If so, can you describe the rationale for how these institutions were chosen?

*The University of Arkansas broadly benchmarks against the institutions noted here:* [*https://oir.uark.edu/benchmark.php*](https://oir.uark.edu/benchmark.php)*.*

23. Does the institution currently have career ladders/career paths?  If so, please describe the current state and where these career paths exist.

*The University has a few structured career ladders/career paths including the Skilled Trades Apprenticeship program and Admissions Recruiters. The request is to build a new job architecture that provides transparent options for career progression.*

24. Are you requesting a critique of your current career ladders in order to refine them, or expecting the consultant to build out a new job architecture that provides transparent options for career progression?

*This part of the question accurately frames our goal:* expecting the consultant to build out a new job architecture that provides transparent options for career progression.

25. Your current promotion policy limits pay increases to 10% or entry of the new classification, whichever is higher. Do you find that external candidates are often able to secure higher starting salaries than internal hires? Is reviewing/revising this policy within the scope of this project?

*The promotion policy identified in the question is applicable to classified positions that follow under the Arkansas Higher Education Classification and Compensation Act. Positions that are non-classified have more flexibility for career progression. Reviewing the policy (law) is not within the scope of this project.*

26. Does the University of Arkansas use matrixed reporting relationships? If so, are pay and classification decisions made at the unit level or a central level?

*There are some positions that are based in one unit with a doting line of reporting. The pay and classification decisions are mutual decisions made in collaboration with Human Resources.*

27. How does UA typically use “dotted line” reporting relationships? Can you estimate how many of these relationships exist and how you imagine them affecting our study approach?

*The University does use “dotted line” reporting relationships in certain areas such as communications, human resources, and advancement. We expect the vendor to recommend “best practices” if dotted line reporting impacts classification and compensation.*

28. Have you been subject to a recent Office of Federal Contract Compliance Program audit? If so, can you share the key findings related to job classifications, pay, and promotion issues that should inform this project?

*No.*

29. Under Scope of Work, Compensation Study – item e mentions a total compensation study.  Does the scope of work include an assessment of both base salaries and benefits?  If yes, are you looking for a custom study?

*Our primary objective is to study compensation in the first instance. This RFP does not contemplate a total rewards assessment.*

30. What internal or external stakeholder groups/committees do you anticipate having involvement with this study (e.g., Staff Senate, Advisory Council)?

*Our project lead will determine campus engagement. We anticipate that there will be a regular communication cadence with governance entities such as Executive Committee, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Campus Council.*

31. What published survey sources does the system currently use to obtain market compensation information?

*Human Resources uses CUPA-HR Salary Data and regional data provided by the NOARK Human Resources Association. We have also engaged consultants to provide market compensation data that has included additional sources such as DOL, Comp Analyst.*

32. Can you describe the current salary structure (# of bands, range spreads, etc.)?  Do you have any specific concerns regarding the existing structure design?

*The salary structure is contained within this description of classified and non-classified positions: https://hr.uark.edu/working/handbook/2-key-definitions/2-2.php*

33. Are there specific functional areas or roles where you are facing any compensation concerns?

*We will identify for the vendor a sequence of functional areas/roles that are priorities to examine.*

34. Please clarify Scope of Work, Compensation Study – item i. Are you looking for assistance in conducting a pay equity assessment (identify any gender or race/ethnicity concerns)?

*The University has the capacity to assess pay equity issues however we expect that if a vendor identifies such issues that the vendor would bring the issue to our attention along with a suggested remediation plan.*

35. Has a pay equity study been conducted in the last 3-5 years?

*The University has addressed pay equity issues as they have been detected but has not conducted a workforce-wide study.*

36. Please clarify Scope of Work, Compensation Study – item k.  Are you looking for assistance in conducting a review of the institution’s performance rating system/design and its link to pay?

*Yes.*

37. Are you seeking recommendations on your performance rating system only, or suggestions for improving your performance review approach?

*We believe that the two are linked though our performance review process has recently been reviewed and updated with ERP implementation.*

38. For Scope of Work, Compensation Study – item l, are materials in a MS Word, Ppt, and Excel format sufficient?  If not, please clarify the system documentation you are looking for.

*Microsoft apps are sufficient.*

39. Please describe the availability of resources from the Classification and Compensation Team for this study.

*The University has dedicated its seasoned Associate Vice Chancellor for HR to this study in a new role as Chief Transformation Officer for Human Resources. She will be assisted by the HR infrastructure as well as additional personnel identified as the vendor is selected.*

40. Do you prepare your annual affirmative action plan internally or do you outsource this function?

*The affirmative action plan is prepared internally with the assistance of an affirmative action consultant.*

41. What classification challenges have emerged as you prepare your annual affirmative action plan?

*With a new ERP implementation, we have experienced imperfect data issues that we routinely address but that have been time consuming.*

42. We are impressed with the way this classification and compensation project has been described on HR’s website, but note that project governance is not mentioned. Do you have a preferred governance approach in mind to ensure the success of this effort?

*No, we do not have preferred governance approach.*

43. Do the positions to be included in the study include both State Classified and Non-classified positions?

*Yes.*

44. Which elements of pay and benefits and benefits does the University include when it refers to “total compensation survey” in item e?

*At the University, total rewards includes regular salary plus employer contributions to insurance and retirement. The value of annual leave has also been included but is not currently.*

45. What is the difference between a UA class specification and UA job description?

*A class specification is the type of state title, the campus job description reflects the working title and specific job duties assigned to it.*

46. Do the 2,700 UA positions the RFP mentions represent distinct UA jobs?

*See 1, above.*

47. Of the positions in scope of this project, how many have current and complete job descriptions?

*Due to our recent ERP implementation nearly all positions have current job descriptions. We expect that the vendor will provide insight into completeness and whether our approach meets best practices.*