

CIVIL SERVICE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MARCH 22, 2012

TC: B1 Morrill Hall  
UMD: 173 Kirby Plaza  
UMC: 105 Kiehle  
UMM: HFA #7  
UMR: room #321

[In these minutes: chair's report; subcommittee reports; job families project; human resources update; President Kaler; committee procedures]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Don Cavalier (chair), Amy Olson (chair-elect), Susan Cable Morrison, Carolyn Davidson, Rick Densmore, Lisa Mason, John Patton (for Teresa Schicker), Susan Rafferty, Pat Roth, Tom Sondreal, Chris Stevens, Sharon Van Eps

REGRETS: Rahfat Hussain, Karen Lovro

GUESTS: President Eric Kaler; Mary Luther, director compensation and classification, Office of Human Resources (OHR)

OTHERS: Emily Lawrence, Office of the President; Matt Bowers, member, University Libraries Civil Service Committee; Patti Dion, director employee relations and compensation, OHR; Bill O'Neil and Terri Wallace, CSCC-elect members

Don Cavalier called the meeting to order, welcomed those present, and called for introductions.

### **Chair's Report**

In his report, Mr. Cavalier stated

- Civil Service Consultative Committees (CSCC) members should review the 2008 report, *Attracting and Retaining Talent: The Future of U of M Employees Recommendations of the Civil Service and P&A Classification and Compensation Working Groups*.
- He received several e-mails from constituents concerned about their job classifications.
- He would like to consider ways to increase communications with constituents.
- He would like to create an FAQ about vacation time and transfers of sick leave that could be placed on the CSCC website or in the e-InTouch newsletter.

- He also suggested creating a recognition and awards program for Civil Service (CS) employees similar to the professional and administrative (P&A) employee's unit award.

### **Chair-elect Report**

Amy Olson reported that she attended a meeting of all the University Senate Committee Chairs. She noted that the representative from the P&A Consultative Committee (PACC) reported PACC's concern with the length of time it is taking to complete the Job Family Classification Study.

Ms. Olson also reported on the need to improve communication between the CSCC and the CS staff, and expressed concern about the lack of readership of the e-InTouch newsletter. Dawn Zugay, University Senate Office, provided statistics on the open rates for the e-InTouch. She stated that the December/January addition was opened by 1,600 of the approximately 4,700 recipients and 1,200 recipients opened the February/March addition. She noted that this a slightly higher open rate than that of the P&A newsletter.

### **Subcommittee Reports**

Professional Development – Carolyn Davidson reported on the Professional Development Subcommittee's pilot project to provide the StrengthsFinder Assessment to 200 civil service employees this spring. She noted that the CSCC approved the project at its February meeting, and that subcommittee members have been working with Jeff Stafford, OHR, to implement the plan. She stated that if there were a high demand for the assessment, the subcommittee would offer it again next fall. She also noted some possible future directions for the project such as including it in the new employee orientation.

Mr. Cavalier asked how the project would be communicated. Ms. Davidson responded that a communication would be e-mailed to each CS employee, there would be an announcement in Brief with a link to the registration form, and there would be an e-mail to the CS Senators. She also noted Mr. Stafford would be conducting three results sessions – two for Twin Cities employees and one via ITV for the coordinate campuses.

Advocacy - Susan Cable-Morrison reported there had been no inquires in the past month. At Mr. Cavalier's request, she briefly described the work of the subcommittee for new members of the CSCC in attendance at the meeting. She stated that the subcommittee meets on an as-needed basis. The subcommittee members listen to constituents and provide them with resources. They also help identify violations of Civil Service Employment Rules, and if an issue proceeds to the Office for Conflict Resolution, subcommittee members may be asked to provide support for constituents.

Communications –Amy Olson reported that the February/March e-InTouch was sent out and that no CS employees responded to the request for questions for the President. She also noted that she was seeking additional members for the Subcommittee.

### **Job Family Study Update**

Mary Luther, director compensation and classification, OHR, noted that she and Jackie Singer would be attending the April 26 CSCC meeting to discuss comparable compensation. Next, she provided the CSCC with two documents, *Guidelines for the Job Family Appeal Process* and PowerPoint slides for her update on the Job Family Study. She then noted the status of the job families under review.

- Communications – in the appeal stage
- Information Technology (IT) – launch on April 2
- Alumni Relations – moving into analysis
- Community Relations – soon to start pilot
- Grants Administration – will begin in Summer 2011
- Human Resources – on hold pending completion of OHR restructuring

Ms. Luther stated the Job Family Study includes a function-by-function review of the job classifications. It is intended to upgrade the classification system for CS and P&A employees by creating career paths and a more transparent process for advancement. It is also designed to create equity across colleges and revise the JEQ process, she stated.

Ms. Luther next discussed the details of the Communications Job Family Study. She stated there are 306 total positions (178 CS and 128 P&A). Five CS were moved to P&A and 16 P&A were moved to CS. No one lost pay in this process and seven employees received pay increases. Some concerns that arose from the communications reclassification included.

- Employees were concerned with the loss of the senior editor title and the director title.
- Coordinate campus members were not included in the classification design team.
- Job duties on the coordinate campuses are not always the same as those on the Twin Cities campus for similar positions, which may have resulted in incorrect classifications.

Ms. Luther noted that coordinate campus members were included on the classification design team for the IT job classifications. The IT job family study was launched April 2. Training for IT employees on completing the job family questionnaire would take place from April 11-13, she stated.

Ms. Luther then invited questions. Ms. Olson remarked that she heard many individuals were concerned about the loss of titles as a result of the communications re-classifications.

Mr. Sondreal stated his position had been part of the communications job family study and he agreed that the job duties for Crookston campus employees in the communications job classifications were different than those on the Twin Cities campus.

Mr. Cavalier asked how long it would take to complete the Job Family Study. Ms. Luther responded that the speed of the study's completion is a concern of the President's, and she has been asked to provide a plan for moving the process forward more quickly.

But she emphasized the need to balance expediency with the need to take the necessary time for evaluation because the decisions have a very personal impact.

She then noted some of the challenges in the Job Family Study process.

- Different rules for promotion and different pay plans for CS and P&A employees.
  - One method being used to smooth the transition process is to allow employees to maintain their existing classification, but to classify the job as “no new entry.”
- Differences in the P&A and CS compensation and benefits plans
- The need to look at overall pay equity after completion of the Job Family Study

She noted the Job Family Study process would become a continual review process.

Mr. Cavalier asked whether any of the recommendations from the 2008 Civil Service and P&A Classification and Compensation Working Groups had been implemented. Ms. Luther responded that the year the study was released, the budget crises began and there was insufficient staff to follow up on these recommendations. She stated the current administration is interested in committing staff and resources to improving the classification and compensation system.

Matt Bowers noted it is important to ensure that the appropriate classification and hiring is done from the start, so that individual’s skills fit the jobs for which they are hired. Ms. Luther acknowledged that more training about job classifications is needed at the local level.

Lisa Mason asked about how job pay ranges are established, and whether HR looks at national data in establishing them. Ms. Luther stated that pay ranges are set by looking at salaries for comparable positions in the public sector, private sector, and at peer Universities. This data is taken primarily from the University’s geographic recruitment area.

Ms. Olson commented that the pay ranges within job classifications are very broad. Ms. Luther agreed that the pay ranges are wide, but she pointed out that jobs fall throughout the pay range, and individuals may move upward within their own job’s pay range before they move to the next pay level.

Ms. Mason asked if there was a place for employees to view the pay range for their positions. Ms. Luther stated this information was available on the web at <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/toolkit/compensation/index.html>

### **Benefits Advisory Committee Nominations**

The CSCC considered applications for the Benefits Advisory Committee and nominated the following individuals: Susann Jackson, Michael Marroteck, and Jean Wang.

### **Changes to TXT-U Service**

Ann Freeman, director, Internal Relations, updated the CSCC on planned changes to the TXT-U Service and asked for feedback on these changes. She stated that in January the

University contracted with a new vendor for text services. This vendor provides a broader array of services than the previous vendor, such as the ability to e-mail students and employees. She noted further that the infrastructure for the new service is still being built. When the new service is in place this spring, everyone at the University will be registered to receive texts. If they do not want to receive texts they will need to opt out. An e-mail will be sent to all employees providing them with this option.

Mr. Cavalier asked how this would impact individuals who do not have texting service. Ms. Freeman responded that emergency information could be provided by other means such as on campus speakers, e-mail, the University homepage and the University safety site, [umn.edu/prepare](http://umn.edu/prepare).

Terri Wallace asked how all employees would be registered. Ms. Freeman responded that only those individuals who had a cell phone number registered with the University would be automatically registered to receive texts, and she explained the efforts to update the student cell phone registry using One Stop.

Sharon Van Eps asked if the TXT-U Service would be system wide. Ms. Freeman stated that individuals could sign up to receive only those texts that are relevant to their campus.

John Paton asked if the registry system overrides the privacy settings individual's place on the information they list in the University directory. Susan Rafferty stated that there is the ability to participate in TXT U and to keep directory information private. Ms. Freeman stated she believes that an individual's cell phone information would be used even if there were a privacy setting on it for the directory listing, but she stated she would look into this further. She also noted that the vendor contract prohibits the vendor from sharing University employees' information.

### **Office of Human Resources Update**

Ms. Rafferty noted the CSCC had expressed concerns about seniority and how it impacts lay off situations. In response, OHR provided a list of seniority units on its website. Additionally, she is working on a UM Connect script that would provide a primer on seniority. She stated the script for this was recently vetted within OHR and she would share it with Karen Lovro and then bring it to the CSCC.

She then addressed some specific questions raised by Pat Roth at the February CSCC meeting about how seniority functions for civil service employees.

- Definition - Seniority unit can be a department, a group of departments, administrative unit, or a college. This is determined at the vice presidential or collegiate level.
- Determination – The University has discretion in determining seniority units. Generally, they mirror the organizational structure of the college or the vice presidential unit. There are no specific restrictions on how they are determined.

- Civil Service Rule 12.2.1- prior to a change in an employee's seniority unit, employees must be notified of their current seniority unit, the seniority unit they have rights in during the change, the seniority unit the employee will have rights in after the change, and the dates for their rights in each of these.
- Process – OHR assists leaders and local human resources practitioners regarding seniority units when a change occurs. General guidelines for seniority units are that they are large enough to give meaning to the principle of seniority and that they are compatible with University operations.

Ms. Rafferty next discussed the impact on employee benefits of changing from a CS to a P&A classification. She stated that these two employee groups have different retirement plans, and she recommended speaking to an employee benefits counselor anytime a change in job groups occurs. She noted further that CS employees can remain in the Minnesota State Retirement System even if they move to a P&A classification. Otherwise, P&A positions participate in the Faculty Retirement Plan.

With regard to vacation benefits, she stated that CS employees accrue vacation based on hours worked, and this accrual rate increases over the years of employment. In contrast, P&A employees are given a set amount of vacation at the outset and that amount of 22 days per year remains the same over the years of P&A employment. They do not accrue sick leave but have medical leave and short-term disability benefits as part of their employment; whereas, CS employees actually accrue sick leave and oftentimes purchase short-term disability insurance to supplement sick leave balances for health-related absences.

A recent OHR change that occurred is the ability of CS employees to keep ten days of vacation if they move to a P&A classification but the rest of their accrued CS vacation is paid out instead of being carried forward.

P&A employees are appointed and many have annually renewable contracts. In contrast, CS employees begin with a one-year probationary contract have an initial probationary period and then continue employment with rights set forth in the Civil Service Employment Rules, such as layoff rights if a position is discontinued.

### **Discussion with President Kaler**

Mr. Cavalier introduced President Eric Kaler and thanked him for speaking with the CSCC. He then asked the CSCC members to introduce themselves. Following introductions, President Kaler stated he would like to respond to the written questions the CSCC submitted prior to the meeting.

Mr. Bowers asked the President if there were any plans to provide a tuition benefit to the children of University employees. The President responded that he was not sure the University had the budget capacity to provide this benefit in a meaningful way. He also noted that it was an asymmetrical benefit because it would only accrue to employees with children. He suggested the best answer is to keep tuition as affordable as possible.

Ms. Olson asked the President to update the CSCC on the review of the Regent's Scholarship. President Kaler stated that the Regent's Scholarship is a good idea and he had asked Vice President Kathy Brown to determine the costs and benefits of the program. He stated that the program would not likely be completely restored to their previous level, and he is most interested in providing the benefit to those employees seeking degrees. He also noted the importance of having student employees make some contribution to their education.

Ms Davidson asked if "degree seeking" included certificate programs. The President responded that he is open to having a conversation about this and would need to look at the issue in more detail.

Mr. Cavalier stated that many CS employees had expressed concern about the difficulty in moving between employee classifications, working under outdated classifications, and the need for a system for regular, ongoing review of job classifications. Mr. Cavalier also expressed CS concerns with the length of time it is taking to complete the Job Family Study.

President Kaler responded that he is also anxious for the Job Family Study to be completed, and he is working with Vice President Brown on this. He stated having transparent, realistic job descriptions will help to smooth the barriers to moving between positions. He stated further that the University may move away from the whole P&A employee concept, and may instead consider following the Fair Labor Standards Act concept of exempt and non-exempt employee categories. He stated that overall; the University's human resources process needs more efficiency. He remarked that it is too difficult to hire and let go, and there is no real transparency in what individuals do.

Mr. Cavalier asked how the President sees civil service employees now and in the future.

President Kaler responded that as job classifications are better organized he would be able to better answer this question. But he stated he does not generally think in terms of employee classifications. He sees all employees as working for the University, and believes they should be aligned so that the University is organized in as efficient and effective way as possible.

Mr. Cavalier commented that there are many questions about what is "professional" and what is "administrative." The President responded that this is an important issue because he has promised to reduce the administrative overhead at the University, but it is currently difficult to identify which positions are administrative. Again he stated the importance of completing the job classifications so that the spans and layers of the organization could be analyzed.

Sharon Van Eps asked about the impact on civil service employees of moving to three full terms. President Kaler stated this would depend on the area in which you work. He

stated further that the relaxed summer pace at the University is a luxury that cannot continue, and it will be necessary to level out the workload over the year.

Ms. Van Eps asked if the President believed it would be necessary to hire more CS employees, and he responded it would likely be necessary to hire more employees in general.

Terri Wallace noted that her office, the Center for Writing, provides summer programming for K-12 teachers, and asked about the impact of a summer term on programs such as the one in which she works. President Kaler stated integrating summer programs with a summer term is one of the important issues that must be worked out, and he noted it provides a good opportunity for evaluating the University's current summer programming.

Bill O'Neil asked how the President envisions civil service employees taking part in the University's efforts to work smarter, reduce costs, and enhance services. The President stated a group of senior leaders has been meeting about the issue of operational excellence and they are beginning to build a framework for operations and actions. When this is complete it will be pushed out to the individual units.

Mr. Densmore asked the President to discuss the impact on the University of the recent stories in the Star Tribune about the head of the University's School of Nursing and the pay packages for the administrators leaving the University. The President responded that these stories are very damaging to the public image of the University, and he will work to modify existing administrative policies that allowed the administrative pay packages to be awarded. He stated those types of pay packages "would not occur under his watch."

With regard to the Dean of the Nursing School, he stated that she had made two mistakes early in her career and these must be balanced against the positive work she has done. He also noted that the newspaper story had amplified her mistakes. He stated that in the aggregate the Star Tribune stories are bad for the University's public image, and this is frustrating because the University is doing so many great things.

Ms. Olson asked why another review was being conducted of the Academic Health Center (AHC). The President explained that the current review differs from previous reviews because it is less focused on internal operations and is seeking an outside look at the AHC in the context of other AHC's across the nation. It will answer questions such as how to take advantage of the Biomedical Discovery District and how do "best in class" AHC's function. He also indicated that he is the target audience for the study.

Ms. Mason asked whether the 2.5% compensation increase mentioned in the *State of the University Address* would be an across the board increase for CS employees. The President stated that the increase would be across the board, however, if the individual is in a unit using merit pay, all employees would receive \$500.00 and any remainder would be allocated on the basis of merit.

Ms. Cable-Morrison asked the President to comment about crime around campus and the perceived shortage of police officers around campus at night. The President responded that statistics indicate a decrease in crime in and around campus, and that he had recently met with the University of Minnesota police chief. Some efforts the University is taking to control crime on and around the University are engaging the Minneapolis Police Department and educating students.

Mr. Bowers informed the committee about the campus monitor security escort available at the University. He stated there are 140 monitors available to assist faculty, staff, and students who request it. The President indicated he would like to have this service more widely publicized.

Sharon Van Eps asked the President how CS employees could best contribute to the success of the University. The President stated employees should do the best job they can and when they become aware of bad processes, they should work through the system to create awareness of them. He also suggested they should propagate a good sense of morale about the future of the University.

Following the President's visit, Patti Dion, director of employee relations and compensation, clarified that the 2.5% compensation increase would be provided across the board, in units that do not have merit pay systems, but in units that do have merit pay systems in place, employees would all receive \$500 and the remainder of the funds would be distributed based on merit. She stated further that the goal is to eventually move all CS employees to a merit pay system.

#### **Questions for Vice President Brown**

Mr. Cavalier informed the CSCC that Vice President Brown would be attending the next meeting and asked committee members if they had any questions they would like her to address. Ms. Davidson suggested the topic of supervisor assessments, the availability of mentorship and growth opportunities for staff, and employee recourse when supervisors do not conduct reviews.

Ms. Rafferty responded that if HR policies regarding reviews are not being followed, the employee should make this known to their unit.

With regard to reviews, Mr. Patton noted the problems faced by employees who are managed by multiple supervisors. Ms. Rafferty indicated that there is a position management system that identifies supervisors.

#### **Committee Procedures and Governance Documents**

Ms. Zugay, staff, University Senate Office, provided the CSCC with a document titled *CSCC Procedures for Committee Consideration*. She explained that the document outlined some questions about committee procedures and the CSCC governance documents that had arisen during the year, and that she had discussed these issues with Mr. Cavalier and Ms. Olson and they asked her to outline them. The issues the CSCC needed to discuss and resolve included:

- Procedures for selecting subcommittee chairs
- Procedures for long-term absences and vacancies on the CSCC and the CS Senate
- Timing for the submission of items to the CS Senate docket

Following discussion, the CSCC approved a motion that the CSCC subcommittee chairs be members of the CSCC. It was also agreed that this should be memorialized in the CSCC Operations Manual.

**Old Business**

Ms. Cable-Morrison noted that her term of service as an Office for Conflict Resolution hearing officer is ending. She indicated that she would like to continue in this position and reminded the CSCC to review the terms of service for the other civil service hearing officers and panelists. It was agreed that Ms. Zugay would contact the OCR hearing officers and panelists whose terms are ending and would ask them if they wanted to continue their service.

Hearing no further business, Mr. Cavalier adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay  
University Senate