

System Enhancement: 132 – Implementation of New Performance Management & Recruiting System (Jan. 2017) – Detailed Comparison

Issue Date: *Dec. 14, 2016*

Audience: Human Resource Offices

Purpose: To provide a top 50 listing of the most significant system differences between the previous PeopleFluent Talent Management solution and the new SuccessFactors solution. This listing was not intended to be all-inclusive, but is intended to represent the more significant changes pertaining to look and feel, terminology, navigation, workflow, and functionality of the new performance management and recruiting system.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
GENERAL	
1	Internet Explorer 11 (not compatibility mode) and latest version of Firefox browsers are fully supported. Note: older versions of these browsers are allowed, just not supported. The previous solution fully supported older Internet Explorer and Firefox versions, while newer browser versions were allowed but not supported.
2	To Do tile on the landing page captures all tasks due in the next 365 days, tasks that are upcoming for the user and tasks completed in past 60 days. The previous solution only showed tasks that the user is currently responsible for.
3	Employees have the ability to set selected personal preferences such as turning off talent management email notifications. This was not offered in the previous system.
4	Links allow employees to set additional quick links to other places within the talent management system and to training materials. The previous solution only supported saving links to external websites.
5	Emails are provided for each step in the performance evaluation and job requisition processes. Additionally, the initial email for setting expectations and reminder emails for the performance evaluation process will be grouped emails. The previous solution sent all emails as individual emails; e.g., if manager had four employees, the manager received four initial emails and four reminder emails, instead of just one.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
6	Reports require use of a tutorial-themed reporting solution that provides enhanced reporting capabilities. The previous solution did not use the designed reporting solution and instead, reports were built out of the functional grids.
7	Auto save executes every 30 seconds within the talent management system. The previous solution executed auto save in the performance management process only and executed every five minutes.
8	Numerous save options are available, ranging from save buttons to save icons. However, save options are not centrally located and often require the user to search for the save button or icon. The previous solution had the save button generally located in the same area on all screens.
9	HR staff have pre-established proxy access to all employees in their agency, which allows them to view all performance and recruiting related data, assist users with troubleshooting and to complete processes on behalf of the user when required. HR staff have the ability to assign proxy access for other users within their organization when needed. Managers have the ability to assign proxy access from themselves (the manager) to their direct reports. Proxy access is module-specific (recruiting/performance) and is not single function-based, and does not allow users to predefine how long the proxy access should last. Instead, the proxy access has to be manually removed. The previous solution had proxy access highly contained and only assigned by system administrators. Instead, managers used a delegation function that allowed the manager to assign access to a single function (e.g., set expectations) for a specific time period.
10	New administrator tools for HR staff (users with an A, H or X security role code) that includes the ability to: (1) move employees forwards and backwards within the performance evaluation plan and skip requisitions approvers if needed; (2) update the performance plan dates for employees (e.g., extension of probationary evaluation); and (3) assign proxy access for employees. The previous solution required the user to call the service center.
JOB SITE	
11	Voluntary self-identification of disability, as outlined in a new statutory requirement (access to view is highly restricted), and extraction of EEO and disability information to the data warehouse. This option was not offered in the previous system.
12	Separate agency-specific pages to include agency-provided images and language describing the agency. This option was not offered in the previous system.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
13	Separate streamlined career opportunity categories that allows candidates to view jobs by different categories. The previous solution did not have career categories in a logical order and provided little value to the user.
14	Smart search capability allows candidates to search using key words as well as search by location (city and ZIP code). The previous solution: (1) allowed limited search capabilities (e.g., limited key word, city); (2) required users to constantly reset search results; and (3) only searched selected data elements within the requisition.
15	Ability for candidates to parse resume into his/her profile. This option was not offered in the previous system.
16	Job duties and KSA fields appear small on the screen and are not character limited. The previous solution had the fields more appropriately sized.
17	Application consists of candidate profile and additional job-specific submission information. The previous solution had a customized State of Florida employment application.
18	Attachments are limited to no more than five megabytes per attachment and no more than 10 megabytes in total. The previous solution restricted each attachment to one megabyte and did not limit the total megabytes for all attachments.
19	Option to fax customized State of Florida application to the service center is eliminated. This option was offered in the previous system and only occurred 0.6% of the time.
20	No candidate information (e.g., profiles, applications, requisitions) will be migrating to the new system. This gives the state an opportunity to clean-up the significant amount of outdated and incomplete information in the previous system.
21	Legacy requisition information and the associated applicant data will be stored in a static data warehouse table for public records requests.
22	Statewide city option for advertising jobs is eliminated to support smart search capabilities. The previous solution included a statewide city option (i.e., jobs show up regardless of city the candidate searches for), but the search capability was limited.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
HIRING CENTER	
23	Streamlined form-based approach for completing job requisition. The previous solution presented several screens.
24	Only fields relevant for the job vacancy posting will be presented as part of the job requisition. The previous solution included excess, unrelated fields in the process, which unnecessarily muddied the requisition process.
25	Ability to create requisition teams that can be easily applied to each requisition created. The previous solution required the hiring manager or HR staff to manually add each team member on each requisition.
26	Ability to create a controlled posting or private posting that allows agencies to limit who has access to apply to the vacancy (e.g., internal agency posting). This option was not offered in the previous system.
27	Advanced candidate grouping capabilities which allows hiring managers to separate candidates into various categories while reviewing. This option was not offered in the previous system.
28	Personal qualifying question library. This option was not offered in the previous system.
29	Bulk viewing/printing options do not include additional candidate attachments. Everything else (resume, cover letter, answers to qualifying questions, candidate profile and application) in the candidate submission are included in the bulk viewing/printing options. To view/print all other attachments, a hiring manager will have to select each attachment individually. The previous solution allowed all candidate attachments to be viewed/printed with the application.
30	Candidate dispositioning process can be completed by the hiring manager and includes automated dispositioning of candidates based on the candidate being placed into specific grouping categories; i.e., disqualifier question, reject – with email and based on a candidate being moved to the hired category (once the number of openings for the requisition is met). The previous solution required candidates to be manually dispositioned by the service center upon notice from the hiring manager. This process resulted in some candidates not being dispositioned, leaving them unsure of the status of their submission.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
31	Requisitions are systematically closed when the number of openings matches the number of hired candidates or all candidates are dispositioned. The previous solution required the service center to close all requisitions.
32	Searching for requisitions as a hiring manager or HR staff will change. Users will have to go to the requisition page to view requisitions they are the owner of or have been added as a team member or approver for. HR staff will have to view requisitions using the agency HR role. The previous solution allowed HR staff to have direct access to all requisitions in their agency and requisitions could be searched from the quick find option.
33	Ability for HR staff to search all candidates in the database to identify passive candidates that may be a good candidate for hard-to-fill positions. The previous solution offered a partial search capability, but it was extremely limited.
34	Ability to refer candidates to job vacancies where the hiring manager can review the candidate and determine if they would like to invite the candidate to apply. This option was not offered in the previous system.
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	
35	Seamless performance plan process. There were two separate processes in the previous system for setting expectations and evaluating performance.
36	Implementation of a performance management dashboard that allows managers and HR staff to graphically view the status of employee performance evaluations (i.e., how many employees are in each step of the process) and allows graphs to be drillable. The previous solution only had the information available through grids.
37	Ability to search for the employee in the performance management dashboard when viewing performance evaluations for employees in other agencies and for terminated employees whose evaluation was completed in the new system. The previous solution had a slightly different process for searching evaluations statewide and for searching terminated employees.
38	Ability for agency HR staff to move employees through the evaluation process. The previous solution required HR staff to call the service center to handle.
39	Both the manager and the employee will have a To Do task to acknowledge receipt and therefore, allowing the manager to easily monitor when the employee completes acknowledgment. The previous solution only provided for the employee to receive the task.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
40	Built in form navigation links that allow users to quickly navigate to a specific section of the evaluation form (e.g., acknowledgement section). This option was not offered in the previous system.
41	Improved Route Map on the evaluation form that allows users to quickly navigate to a specific section. Also provides additional information as well as who the owner of each step is by selecting an information option.
42	Ability for second-level manager to send an evaluation back to the manager for updating (e.g., typo exists). The previous solution required the manager to either call the service center to have the form moved back to the manager for updating or the manager had to find the form (no tasks) and update directly.
43	Second-level review step in the evaluation process will not be presented if there is no second-level manager (e.g., agency heads). The previous solution required the agency to either call the service center or the DMS People First team to have the second level manager step skipped.
44	Job-specific expectations completed from the previous year will auto-populate into the next year's performance plan. This option was not offered in the previous system.
45	Ability to add employee-specific performance plan dates for employees hired during the year and for probationary employees. The previous solution provided all employees in the plan the same dates, regardless of the employees actual hired or probationary dates.
46	Ability for managers to edit agency expectations. The previous solution required agency expectations to be updated annually via a mass load.
47	Comments are required for all expectations, regardless of the score. The previous solution did not require comments for a rating of "3".
48	No warning message is provided to the manager when giving a rating of "1" or "2" for an expectation. The previous solution provided a warning message in this scenario.
49	Manager notepad is no longer offered. The previous solution offered a manager notepad as an option (prior to the 2016-2017 plan), but was rarely used.

Differences in Functionality Between New and Previous Talent Management Solution	
#	Description
50	Historical completed performance evaluations (and attachments) will be migrated to an employee's profile in the new system and current plan year expectations will be migrated as well.