

Present: Terrence Edwards, Kathy Craun, Shelly Finzen, Susan Hoskins, April Prohl, Bethany Kauffman, Herbert Rotunda, Lisa Spieker,

Guest: Kelsie Bohm

Kauffman: PLA Scholarship situation with three Glencoe staff

Spieker, Edwards motion and second to approve: all approved

Kelsie Bohm introduced herself and her background in the HR field

PLE HR Analysis:

The process used included document review, HR questionnaires, individual interviews, and analysis & report.

Team feedback: addressed what's working well, and what flags are seen

Opportunities:

Documentation: employment agreements written as contracts, job descriptions missing FLSA classification, signatures & physical requirements, hours language in admin assistant agreement creates pay confusion, six point eval scale is subjective. Risks: disputes, inconsistencies, litigation exposure

Policy Compliance: personnel policies document covers internal SOPs with employee facing policies, causing confusion about intended audience and purpose, missing compliance sections especially MN PFML, inclement weather policy references outdated building. Risks: direct legal and compliance exposure right now

Comp and Benefits: Director salary below market, director working 50-60 hrs a week. Both employees seek supplemental income outside of PLE, PTO below national average, PTO lumped together- employees avoid using sick days when sick. Risk: losing key staff and institutional knowledge which would be very costly

Craun asked about the historical practice of lumping PTO + sick days. Bohm clarified that the current best practice is to separate these out.

Spieker inquired as to whether or not working multiple jobs in normal/expected, or if this practice is also outdated.

Recommendations:

Comp and Benefits analysis (including updated job descriptions as first priority). Create an employee handbook with clear, current policies and procedures. Sign updated documents (job descriptions, new employee handbook). Organize employee files (separate personnel and confidential files are stored securely, present, and maintained). Update performance review process (simplify eval criteria to align with strategic plan). Create a standard offer letter (create template for next hire, replace annual agreements with non-contractual wording).

Next Steps:

Ongoing HR Support:

30-40% of HR work is unplanned

MN employment law is complex and constantly changing

Less PLE hours spent on HR means more PLE work being done

Spieker asked for clarification of how the “Next Steps” would be handled- Bohm suggested that having a designated on-call HR firm would be beneficial, and that there are many different roads to get to a pro-active support stage.

Craun asked how to go about starting to tackle these tasks. Kauffman answered with picking one item, addressing it. She would work within her skill set, and the board would hire someone to supplement the gaps. Finzen clarified that it would be the Board’s decision to finalize many of these decisions.

Finzen shared a concern that tackling one thing at a time, as the Board, meeting on a quarterly basis, would take years to finalize things. Spieker stated that any things that could become a legality issue should be priority. She is also unavailable for extra meetings after during the summer, after June.

Bohm spoke towards how other nonprofits handle it: with an HR committee built from the Board. Bohm strongly recommended having an HR professional helping to navigate these conversations and discussions.

Rotunda weighed in, sharing that the HR team at his church is completely hired in and that’s worked well for them as they have a similar lack of expertise. Finzen stated her preference for Bohm/Renard as they already have our background information and footwork.

Spieker asked what the structure HR support would look like after the recommendations are made. Bohm answered with a few examples of different options including checking in once a quarter or month for an hour, or on an as-needed approach.

Bohm does have availability coming up in the next 1-2 months if we want to go with her specifically. Renard also has others available. Several Board members indicated a preference for sticking with Bohm as our point of contact.

Craun, Finzen, and Prohl stated they have availability to meet frequently over the summer. Spieker offered to serve as sounding board sporadically. Craun, Finzen and Prohl will serve as the HR committee and will keep the rest of the Governing Board informed.

Finzen asked Bohm for an estimated time of how long this will take. Bohm said six months is possible, but setting a goal of within the next year is more reasonable.

Move to work with Renauld consulting for the next six months up to one year to address the concerns mentioned above. Finzen motioned, Craun seconded. All approved.

Finzen mentioned priorities of legal, then compensation. Prohl agreed, Craun added that some resolved issues will cause a cascade effect of resolving other flagged areas.

Finzen asked who decides/writes the job descriptions. Bohm clarified that they are a group project- starting with HR/Board expectations. Finzen expressed an interest in having a month's worth of data regarding time spent on different projects during the work day.

Kauffman to list priorities and start an email conversation to move forward with HR committee. Kauffman will meet with Bohm to share the priorities determined, then HR will meet with Bohm.

Approval of minutes from February:

Motion by Finzen, seconded by Rotunda. All approved.

Adjournment at 5:05 pm

Prohl

