**Minutes of Meeting**

| **Date and Time** | 23 October 2025<br>09:00 PST | **Meeting type** | Zoom |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Organiser** | Mr. Rupesh | **Client** | Citywide |

| **Attendees (Internal)** |
|---|
| • Rupesh<br>• Jaspreet<br>• Ravinder<br>• Ajay<br>• Gurpreet<br>• Kapil<br>• Pankaj<br>• Akash |
| **Attendees (Client Side )** |
| • Tom, Teresa, Matt |

| **Agenda** |
|---|
| • **Discussions on the following:**<br>○ KPI Demonstrations<br>○ Employee Management Updates<br>○ Scheduling Module Discussion<br>○ Call Management Permissions<br>○ Scheduling & Team Support<br>○ Apple Developer Program License<br>○ Instance Management<br>○ Team Work Allocation<br>○ Client Access & Trial Readiness |

**The following things are discussed:**

1. **KPI Demonstrations**
    a. **KPI Updates and Modifications**
        i. **Pankaj** demonstrated the changes made to the KPI module based on Teresa's feedback:
            1. The **comment section** has been removed.
            2. Common KPI rule types (e.g., late check-in, punctuality, positive/negative remarks, highlights, callouts) are standardized across departments.
            3. A new **KPI Rules tab** allows admins to **add custom rules** with name and description.
            4. Newly added rule types appear in department-level KPI lists.
    b. **Manual vs. Automatic KPIs**
        i. Manual KPIs require admins to assign points manually (e.g., "negative remark" or "manual bonus").
        ii. Automatic KPIs are system-tracked (e.g., punctuality, highlights).
        iii. Teresa emphasized the need to **differentiate levels within positive/negative remarks** (e.g., "Manager Compliment" vs. "General Compliment") with varying point weights.
        iv. **Kuldeep suggested** categorizing these as "Positive – Manager," "Positive – Field Officer," etc., under a prefix-based naming convention.
        v. **Teresa confirmed** that different severity levels should carry corresponding point differences (e.g., -5 for lateness vs. -20 for theft-related incidents).
    c. **Rule Association and Hierarchy**
        i. Teresa requested the ability to **align KPI rules to departments** and, if required, **specific employee profiles**.
        ii. **Jaspreet** raised a concern about overlapping manual and automatic KPIs affecting total point calculations.
        iii. Consensus:
            1. Department-level KPIs apply to all employees under that department.
            2. Individual manual KPIs may be added for specific exceptions or supervisory tracking.
            3. KPIs should be editable for supervisors with appropriate permissions.
    d. **Editable Automatic KPIs and History Tracking**
        i. **Teresa** requested that **automatic KPIs be editable** for special cases (e.g., adjusting points during performance improvement plans).
        ii. **Kuldeep** agreed to provide an editable option, conditional on:
            1. Maintaining a **change history (audit trail)** showing original and modified scores.
            2. **Permission-based editing access** limited to authorized users (e.g., supervisors, admins).
        iii. **Tom** reinforced that all manual edits should be **logged for accountability**.
    e. **Company Grading System**
        i. Based on Teresa's email, Pankaj presented the **company grading system**:
            1. Defined score ranges (e.g., 100–999 = "100 Club", 90–99 =

"Passing").
            2. Employees' total points are calculated as **Rewards - Penalties = Net Score**.
            3. Category labels like "Suspension" or "Termination" are displayed based on score thresholds.
        ii. Descriptions (e.g., "Major Performance Issue") can be customized and shown as tooltips in the grading view.
        iii. **Teresa approved** this logic and asked to make descriptions visible on hover or in the profile summary.

    f. **Grading Duration and Frequency**
        i. Current grading recalculates daily via cron job.
        ii. **Teresa requested configurable grading durations** — Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Yearly — as different companies may evaluate performance at varying intervals.
        iii. For her organization:
            1. Daily grading for report performance.
            2. Monthly consolidation of all metrics (highlights, callouts, compliments, complaints).
        iv. **Action Item:** Add a **"Duration" dropdown** in the company grading setup to define frequency of grading recalculations.

    g. **Performance Graph and History**
        i. A **performance history graph** displays employee rewards and penalties over selected durations.
        ii. **Teresa** confirmed this feature aligns with requirements and helps visualize trends.

    h. **Department vs. Company Grading**
        i. Discussion on whether grading charts should exist per department or only company-wide.
        ii. **Teresa's view:** One company-wide grading chart is sufficient; departments will only have rule variations.
        iii. **Tom's clarification:**
            1. The **company-level grading chart** defines general standards applicable to all departments.
            2. **Department-level KPIs** will produce monthly departmental scores.
            3. Departmental averages roll up into the company's overall performance summary.
        iv. Consensus:
            1. The company-wide grading chart remains primary.
            2. Departmental KPIs contribute to department-level and company-wide scoring hierarchy.

    i. **Department-based Analytics Overview**
        i. A dropdown is provided to view analytics for all or specific departments (e.g., Dispatch, Field, Sales, HR).
        ii. Displays total number of employees per department.

    j. **Performance Grade Distribution**
        i. Currently showing distribution based on company grading:
            1. Example: "100 Club" (Top Performers) = 15 employees.
            2. "At Risk" category includes terminated, suspended, and warned employees.
        **ii. Tom's Feedback:**
            1. Termination and suspension must be shown as **separate categories**, each with distinct colors.
            2. Employees under termination should not be part of "At Risk"

            since they are already removed.
        3. "At Risk" should only include those **under suspension**.
    iii. **Resolution:**
        1. Modify chart to display:
            a. **At-Risk (Suspension)** only.
            b. Use separate colors for Termination, Suspension, and Warnings.

k. **Risk Categorization Logic**
    i. Tom suggested a **3-level risk system**:
        1. **High Risk:** Suspension
        2. **Medium Risk:** Written Warning
        3. **Low Risk:** Verbal Warning (optional inclusion)
    ii. **Action:** Update logic and visuals to represent high-medium-low risk levels.

l. **Top and Bottom Performer Visualization**
    i. Teresa requested visibility of how many employees are in **top vs bottom scoring categories**.
    ii. **Action:** Add counts/percentages for top and low performance categories.

m. **KPI Compliance Metric**
    i. Definition: Percentage of employees meeting KPI targets across selected departments.
    ii. Tom appreciated this metric and confirmed its relevance.

n. **Department Reward vs Penalty Comparison**
    i. Visualization comparing **average rewards vs average penalties** by department.
    ii. **Action:**
        1. Add a filter to view department-specific results.
        2. Ensure red represents penalties and green represents rewards consistently.

o. **KPI Achievement Breakdown**
    i. Shows target achievement per KPI (e.g., "No Call-Out," "Highlight Report").
    ii. **Tom's Suggestion:** Add **percentage value** next to each count (e.g., "75/85 – 88%").

p. **Manual KPI Inputs**
    i. "Body Camera Usage" and "Training Completion" are currently **manual KPIs**, as no direct system tracking exists.
    ii. Team confirmed reports will pull from manually entered KPI data.

q. **Department Performance Over Time**
    i. **Graph Overview**
        1. Shows weekly performance trends per department (rewards vs penalties).
        2. **Feedback:**
            a. Graph currently confusing; red (penalties) should appear **below**, and green (rewards) **above** to clearly show positive vs negative.
            b. **Action:** Flip the graph orientation accordingly.
    ii. **Data Granularity**
        1. Currently shown on a **weekly basis** (not daily).
        2. Team is refining Y-axis labels for better readability.

r. **Print Functionality**
    i. **Tom's Request:** Ability to **print the entire analytics page** (based on filters like weekly/monthly).

        ii. Avoid exporting Excel for analytics; focus on clean print output for meetings/reports.
    s. **Employee Listing by KPI/Score**
        i. **Teresa's Request:**
            1. Need a view/report listing all employees with their **category, score, and performance grade** for a selected period.
            2. Should be exportable or viewable as a report.
        ii. **Proposed Solution:**
            1. Add a **"Run Report" or "View Listing"** option.
            2. Include date range and employee selection filters.
            3. Provide either an **on-page listing** or a **separate tab** for detailed KPI data.
    t. **Action Buttons (Employee Dashboard)**
        i. **Teresa's Suggestion:** Replace multiple action icons with a **three-dot dropdown menu** to reduce clutter.
        ii. **Tom's Response:** Prefers visible icons for faster access; finds them more efficient.
        iii. **Decision:** Keep visible icons (Tom's preference).
    u. **"Archive" vs "Terminate" Employee**
        i. Current confusion between multiple deactivation options:
            1. Archive, Terminate, Activate/Deactivate.
        ii. **Discussion & Decision:**
            1. "Archive" to be removed as a separate option.
            2. When an employee is terminated, their status should automatically be archived for record retention.
            3. Termination reasons need correction (remove "Promotion" and "Demotion").
            4. Add valid termination reasons:
                a. Terminated (Involuntary)
                b. Voluntary Resignation
                c. Forced Resignation
                d. Paid/Unpaid Leave
                e. Medical Leave, etc.
        iii. **Teresa's Input:** She will share their **Notice of Separation Form** for integration as part of the termination workflow.
            1. When a termination is processed, the form should appear, be filled, and logged automatically in the employee's ERM record.
    v. **Pending Updates Before Staging**
        i. Apply discussed changes:
            1. Risk logic adjustments (termination/suspension separation)
            2. Graph flip (red below, green above)
            3. KPI % display
            4. Termination form integration
        ii. **Timeline:**
            1. Estimated effort: **6–7 hours** for all discussed changes.
            2. Push to the Staging **Environment by tomorrow** after incorporating feedback.
2. **Employee Management Updates**
    a. **Lock Button & Password Change**
        i. **Clarification:** Lock button is used to **change employee passwords**.
        ii. **Action:** Update UI to remove confusing icons (e.g., cup icon mistaken for reward).

b. **Archive vs Termination**
    i. **Decision:** Remove the separate **archive** button.
    ii. Default behavior:
        1. When an employee's **status is turned off**, they are automatically archived.
        2. When an employee is **terminated**, their status is turned off and archived automatically.
    iii. **Action:** Ensure that termination **auto-updates employment status** and archives the employee correctly.
c. **PTO and PSL**
    i. **Pending:** Teresa to provide PTO and PSL details for implementation.
    ii. **Action:** Team awaiting input from Teresa before proceeding.

3. **Scheduling Module Discussion**
    a. **User Experience Feedback**
        i. Teresa highlighted that the current scheduling interface is **not user-friendly**, making it difficult to assign employees efficiently.
        ii. Issues identified:
            1. Ctrl+F (browser search) functionality not working as expected on the scheduling page.
            2. Applying filters resets date ranges unexpectedly.
    b. **Global Search Proposal**
        i. **Suggestion:** Implement a **global search** feature to locate employees across the schedule quickly without changing filters.
        ii. **Discussion:**
            1. Ravinder explained this would require significant development effort (multiple pages and modules).
            2. **Priority:** Nice-to-have; not urgent.
            3. Teresa agreed this can be delayed if it takes more than a week.
    c. **Permanent Date Range Filters**
        i. **Issue:** Resetting filters clears the selected date range, causing inefficiency.
        ii. **Resolution:**
            1. Implement a permanent **top-level filter** that remains applied independently of table-level filters.
            2. Ticket #1106 updated to reflect this change.
    d. **Copy-Paste Scheduling Across Sites**
        i. **Current Behavior:** Copying shifts is restricted based on site alignment.
        ii. **Request:** Pop-up message to grant temporary permission if an employee is not aligned to a site.
        iii. **Priority:** To be added to future implementation list.
    e. **Implementation Timeline**
        i. Team to review internally and provide **time estimates via Slack** for any additional enhancements.
        ii. Teresa confirmed agreement with proposed approach.
4. **Call Management Permissions**
    a. **Close Call Button Permissions**
        i. **Issue:** Close Call button currently has excessive permissions (adding users, editing calls).
        ii. **Requirement:**
            1. Close Call button should **only allow closing a call**.
            2. Add Call and Edit Call remain separate permissions.

iii. **Action:** Align Close Call functionality strictly to **close-only permissions**.

b. **Dispatcher Permissions**

i. Dispatchers can:

1. Add a new call
2. View and edit calls
3. Add additional people to calls if necessary

ii. Supervisors may only need Close Call permission without additional capabilities.

5. **Scheduling & Team Support**

a. **Discussion:** Teresa requested additional support/training for the scheduling module.

b. **Resolution:**

i. The team will either schedule a live demo session with Ravinder, Jaspreet, and Kuldeep or create a **video tutorial**, similar to the KPI video previously shared.

ii. This will help Teresa review processes asynchronously.

6. **Apple Developer Program License**

a. **Issue:** Latest Apple Developer Program License Agreement needed acceptance to enable builds and updates.

b. **Action Taken:**

i. Teresa logged into the Apple Developer account and accepted the new terms.

ii. Build updates can now proceed without interruption.

c. **Additional Note:** Tom suggested ensuring **backup access** to the Apple Developer account (e.g., Tom, Rebecca, or Arian) in case of account unavailability.

7. **Instance Management**

a. **Discussion:** Tom emphasized the need for **five ready-to-go instances** at all times to ensure client access and demos.

b. **Current Status:**

i. New instances requested by Teresa are being tested.

ii. Development team confirmed testing of new instance to be completed soon.

iii. Five instances, including testing and bug fixes, to be ready **by 29th [October]**.

c. **Demo Account:** At least **one active demo account** should be maintained at all times for immediate client access.

d. **Implementation Process:**

i. Instances can be quickly mapped to a new domain for client-specific trials.

ii. This ensures fast deployment and client confidence without delays.

e. **Priority:** High – instances and demo setup are considered **top priority**.

8. **Team Work Allocation**

a. **Plan:**

i. **60–70%** of team members will focus on **Trello tickets** and ongoing production tasks.

ii. **Remaining 30–40%** will handle:

1. Production hotfixes
2. New instance setups
3. New module implementations (e.g., KPA and PSL)

iii. **Rationale:** Ensures balanced workload and efficient handling of both ongoing and urgent tasks.

9. **Client Access & Trial Readiness**

a. **Concept Highlighted by Tom:**
    i. Rapid access to ready instances is critical to maintain client trust and close deals.
    ii. Delays in providing access may lead to negative client perception ("red flag"), impacting business opportunities.
b. **Confirmation by Teresa:**
    i. Instances can be quickly tailored and activated for client trials.