**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP# 202411204 Comprehensive Classification Review, Analysis and Recommendations |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Administrative and Financial Services |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | January 7, 2025 |
| **QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | January 15, 2025 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | January 28, 2025, no later than 11:59 pm local time |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | [Proposals@maine.gov](mailto:Proposals@maine.gov) |

**Provided below are submitted written questions received and the Department’s answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | What is the budgeted amount for this initiative? |
| **Answer** | |
| The cost of this study shall not exceed $1,000,000.00 | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D | Does the State participate in the National Compensation Association of State Governments (NCASG) Compensation Survey? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State has participated in the NCASG Compensation Study historically. We did not participate in 2024. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | Who is your Workday implementation partner? |
| **Answer** | |
| Accenture | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | What is the timeline for the Workday Implementation? Can you please describe major milestones for this initiative? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is working to go live in 2025 with our new HRMS, PRISM. These projects will run concurrently, and we do not anticipate that this classification review will impact the go-live for Workday. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | Our point of view is that Communications & Change is an imperative integration throughout all compensation and evaluation initiatives. What is the current strategy for Communications & Change? Do you anticipate changes needed in this area? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State will gear its communication strategy based on the recommendations of the vendor. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt 2, section B Title page 7 | Define the term “classification,” as this can have a variety of meanings. Does the scope of this work include job evaluation using a point factor methodology, compensation review, and salary range development/refinement? |
| **Answer** | |
| A classification is a list of duties, knowledges, abilities, and qualifications that defines a job. The scope of the work is limited to review of existing classifications and recommendations of additions, deletions, combinations, and/or changes to those classifications. The scope of the work does not include review of the scoring, compensation, or salary range of those classifications. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt 2. Section B, bullet 5, Page 7 | Classification Review: “review for inequities related to promotion, demotion, or transfers…” – is the State seeking a pay equity study, or simply looking to ensure internal hierarchy & internal equity among similar roles? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is not seeking a pay equity study, we are seeking recommendations on streamlining, adding, removing, and/or retitling classifications. For example, the State has 20+ classifications in the administrative/secretarial field and would be looking for suggestions about how these classifications may be combined/streamlined. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A & B, Page 7 | Will the value of benefits, time off, etc. be taken into consideration in this review? Given that State Governments typically have a rich benefits program, it is our point of view that a Total Rewards calculation/view is most beneficial to help articulate the overall employee offering.  Should bidders expect to evaluate both compensation and benefits in this study? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is not expecting the bidder to evaluate compensation and benefits in this study. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1 & 3, Page 7 | Do you have recent employee survey/engagement information on their satisfaction with benefits and/or compensation? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State does have a recent engagement survey, but this will not be considered in the initial review of the classification system. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 4, Page 7 | Segal analyzed 7,181 JDQ survey responses of executive branch employees – are these survey responses still relevant to the jobs, and will we have access to the response data? |
| **Answer** | |
| The data will be made available to the selected vendor. The JDQ survey responses may or may not be relevant as some classifications have been updated since the Segal survey. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 4, Page 7 | When was the last time you conducted a pay/workforce planning study? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State conducted a market pay study in 2024. Workforce planning was not part of that study. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 1, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1, Page 7 | What is the list of job classifications in the scope of the review? How many incumbents are in each? Which classifications are excluded from the review? Are all of those in scope within the same HRIS System? What is the system being used now? Prior to the Workday go-live? |
| **Answer** | |
| The review will consist of roughly 1,200 bargaining unit classifications representing approximately 11,000 positions. Positions outside of the executive branch and positions not subject to collective bargaining are excluded from the review. All classifications are housed on the State’s intranet, and classifications will be provided to the Vendor in Word, HTM, or PDF format. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 1, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1, Page 7 | Is public safety within the scope of the review? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 1, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1, Page 7 | Are any jobs not in scope? The RFP states that this work is for the executive branch of the government. |
| **Answer** | |
| The State will exclude its Maine Management service members and other classifications not subject to collective bargaining. Judicial and Legislative branches of government will not be included. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 1, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1, Page 7 | How many supervisors are there for incumbents in the identified jobs? |
| **Answer** | |
| This data will be gathered during the study. This data changes regularly. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 1, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1, Page 7 | Where is the current job content housed? What is the format (PDF, Word, Technology system, etc.)? And what is the percentage of completeness and accuracy? |
| **Answer** | |
| Job content is housed in an internal database and can be accessed in Word, HTM, or PDF format. We will be able to provide the vendor with all classifications we would like the vendor to review, and all classifications provided will be up-to-date. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1 & 3, Page 7 | What sources of information are currently utilized to assess compensation pay levels? Survey sources, websites, custom surveys, local surveys, etc.? |
| **Answer** | |
| NA | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7 | Is the State expecting the bidders to collect compensation data from other public sector entities, similar to the approach of the 2020 market study? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is not expecting bidders to collect compensation data from other public service sector entities. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7 | Is the State still using point factor job evaluation methodology? Is that the expected methodology going-forward? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State still uses a point factor job evaluation system called “Hay” and intends to stay with its current point factor methodology. The state is seeking all recommendations to be in a format to which Hay could be applied. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1 & 3, Page 7 | Do you utilize a job evaluation system that assigns points based on key factors of a job, in order to determine the internal value/ranking of jobs? If so, what system do you use? Is the size of the agency taken into consideration for jobs that are higher in career level? (e.g., agency heads, division heads) |
| **Answer** | |
| The State of Maine uses the Hay methodology. Hay methodology breaks the working universe into four major categories which are further broken down into their component parts. These four major categories are Know-How, Problem Solving, Accountability, and Working Conditions. The size of the agency is considered in relation to those factors, but is not by itself an independent factor. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1 & 3, Page 7 | What parts of the compensation system and pay methodology are currently working and which are not? What are the reasons for this? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is not asking for a review of its compensation plan. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1 & 3, Page 7 | What is the current methodology for performance management? What technology is used? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is asking for a review of its classifications and their duties. The performance management system is not under review. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 5, Page 7 | How do you assess the proficiency level and/or performance of an employee, in terms of your Leadership Competencies? Are these assessments an input/factor into your annual performance review process for an employee? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State does assess competencies in our annual performance reviews which are a standard fillable form. However, the State is not requesting that the performance management system be reviewed. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section A, Bullet 3, Page 7  Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1 & 3, Page 7 | What is the methodology for ensuring the pay system is updated each year, to ensure alignment to market? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is required by statute to conduct a market pay study every four years. The data is reviewed and may result in salary adjustments. State Government expenditures, including state employee salaries, are subject to appropriations and allocations limits per the State’s budget. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section B, Bullet 1, Page 7 | Are there any limitations on the state statute of reviewing the classification system every 10 years? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Statutory requirement is every 10 years. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section C, Bullet 4, Page 8 | Approximately how many meetings are expected to take place with the Labor Management committee? What is the expected length of the meetings? Will these be in person? |
| **Answer** | |
| The number of meetings will depend on the scope of the recommendations. The State cannot state with certainty what the length or method of these meetings will be; this will be determined to some degree in coordination with our Labor Management committee partners. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section C, Bullet 4, Page 8 | Who will be the main contact/core team? Approximately how many groups of stakeholders will be involved in the decision-making process? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State of Maine Bureau of Human Resources is the primary stakeholder group for discussions, updates, review and evaluation of recommendations. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Pt. 2, Section C, Bullet 4, Page 8 | Which stakeholder groups will we be presented to and how often? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State expects that the Vendor will meet with the Stakeholder group at least monthly for working sessions and expects the Vendor to provide a minimum of three presentations outlining the final recommendations. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Purpose and Background / Page 5 | Are there any specific priorities or requirements to be addressed to ensure recommendations support the forthcoming Workday implementation project/process? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Current System Review / Page 7 | 1. We understand the Current System Review to be comprised mainly of a current state and desired future state assessment.    1. How long would you be agreeable to this phase taking (inclusive of ensuring management and labor agreement on the needed changes) relative to the full project timeline (particularly given the December 2025 completion requirement)?    2. Are there any publicly-available documents which may speak to the Bureau’s and labor’s review of the 2020 classification report? We would be very interested in hearing what components of the 2020 classification structure are viewed as favorable, as well as areas the successful vendor for this procurement could alleviate difficulties or issues experienced (related, in part, to #5 below).    3. Were there aspects to the MSEA administrative bargaining unit that resulted in their recommendations being implemented more easily than the others? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. The review and recommendations regarding the classification system must be completed by December 31, 2025. There is no expectation that the Labor Management committee will agree on all the recommendations. 2. The State can provide the selected vendor with documents that catalogue the feedback each State Agency/Department/Bureau provided regarding the recommendations from the 2020 review. The successful vendor will provide recommendations that are compatible with the Hay system and will provide a summary and key findings of recommended changes. 3. No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| B. Classification Review, i /Page 7 | 1. Does the State anticipate gathering questionnaires from employees to inform the creation or modification of career ladders, the creation of new or modified job classifications, etc.?  If so, from how many incumbents? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State does not anticipate gathering questionnaires from employees. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| B. Classification Review #2/Page 7 | 1. Regarding the following item in the scope:  “Review positions performing similar work with similar levels of complexity, responsibility, knowledge and skills; and where possible, simplify classification structure and reduce the number of specialized classifications; align classifications with current market demands and best practices.”    1. Does the State wish to implement a point-factor system?  If not, how does the State anticipate confirming equal pay for equal work, placing positions into salary ranges following this analysis (especially those unique to the state and therefore lacking market matches), etc.? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is committed to staying with its current point-factor methodology, the Hay system. If any classifications are changed or created as a result of this review and subsequent bargaining, the State will evaluate those internally using the current Hay methodology. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| C. Deliverables / Expectations #1 / Page 7 | 1. Can you provide additional information on the reporting requirements?  As job classification analysis is often based on employee information (for example, the essential job functions that different incumbents are performing, whether or not they’re part of the existing job description), we don’t often see extensive reporting requirements for classification studies?  Specific prerequisites would be very useful and important in ensuring alignment between the Bureau/labor’s preferences and requirements and the successful consultant’s recommended methodology. |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is looking for:   1. Detailed recommendations on how to streamline the classification system    1. This can include removing, combining, or creating new classifications    2. This can be presented in spreadsheet format, but the recommendations should be summarized in a clear and concise written format    3. Recommendations should take into consideration current bargaining unit.    4. Recommendations should include a suggested order of implementation, and the summary should include the degree of change suggested    5. Recommendations should include a broad summary, key findings and larger trends (e.g. what fields have the most/least duplication of duties between classifications).    6. Recommendations should include rationale for suggested changes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| C. Deliverables / Expectations #3 / Page 8 | 1. How many separate stakeholder audience presentations and legislative hearings/work sessions with the State like included in the fee structure? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State expects that the Vendor will meet with the Stakeholder group monthly for working sessions and expects the Vendor to provide a minimum of three presentations outlining the final recommendations. The vendor is not expected to present at legislative hearings/work sessions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| B. Classification Review #2/Page 7 | Does the State have current market data on any job classifications?  If so, how many? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State of Maine conducted a market pay assessment of the State’s bargaining unit classifications in 2024. The Team selected 20% of each bargaining unit, resulting in 154 classifications to be studied. Through this process the State has market data on 74 of its classifications. | |