

CIVIL SERVICE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
JANUARY 31, 2013

[In these minutes: Election of 2013 – 2014 Chair-Elect, Chair’s Report, Family Leave, Communications Subcommittee Report, Chair-Elect’s Report, Civil Service Strategic Plan, Office of Human Resources Update, Classification/Compensation Project Update]

[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: Amy Olson (chair), Thomas Sondreal (chair-elect), Susan Cable Morrison, Adam Hauge, Lisa Mason, Bill O’Neill, John Paton, Teresa Schicker, Chris Stevens, Sharon Van Eps, Terri Wallace, Patti Dion

REGRETS: Carolyn Davidson, Alethea Oertwich

ABSENT: Don Cavalier

OTHERS ATTENDING: Matt Bowers, Terry Beseman

GUESTS: Vice President of Human Resources Kathy Brown; OHR Operations Director Lori Lamb; OHR Consulting Team Managers Kim Kopplin and Mike Overline

I). Amy Olson convened the meeting, welcomed those present and called for introductions.

II). Members unanimously approved the January 31, 2013 agenda.

III). Ms. Olson announcement that Bill O’Neill has been nominated for chair-elect for the 2013 – 2014 academic year. Before the vote was taken, Ms. Olson called for additional nominations from the floor. Hearing none, she asked Mr. O’Neill to step out of the room while the vote was taken. Members voted unanimously to elect Mr. O’Neill as the 2013 – 2014 Civil Service Consultative Committee (CSCC) chair-elect.

IV). Members unanimously voted to approve the October 25 CSCC minutes and the November 29 CSCC/CS Senate minutes.

V). Chair’s report: Ms. Olson reported that she, Tom Sondreal and Bill O’Neill had a good meeting Lori Nicol about the Civil Service rules. She added that she has had a number of other meetings as well and has been quite busy and very productive.

Regarding the family leave issue, stated Ms. Olson, Civil Service employees need to come to terms with the fact that if the family leave benefit is to be enhanced, it is likely

that employees will need to give up another benefit in return. If Civil Service employees, for example, want P&A-like benefits, they can discuss and negotiate their request with Human Resources, recognizing that they will likely need to give up a benefit(s) in exchange, e.g., sick and vacation accrual. Because the current family leave benefit does not seem to be an issue for most Civil Service employees, Ms. Olson proposed tabling this issue. In response, Ms. Schicker stated that she would like to have Civil Service employees be queried to find out if this is an issue rather than assuming it is not. She added that she does not believe the dichotomy that Civil Service employees either have to have all the same benefits as P&A, or keep what they have is an accurate assessment. Ms. Schicker proposed continuing the family leave discussion. Mr. Hauge suggested using the e-In Touch as a way to find out if family leave is an issue for a majority of Civil Service employees.

Ms. Wallace stated that before Civil Service employees can be asked their opinion on whether an enhanced family leave benefit should be pursued with Human Resources that the CSCC needs to do its research so it can accurately present the issue to Civil Service employees in order for them to make an informed decision on this matter. Ms. Schicker noted that she is not suggesting Civil Service employees have P&A benefits, but rather that the family leave portion of the Civil Service benefits be enhanced.

Ms. Cable-Morrison stated that she agrees with Ms. Olson and thinks it is naïve to assume that the University would enhance the family leave benefit for Civil Service employees without having them to give up a benefit(s). Currently, the University has a provision for Civil Service employees to have paid family leave by having them use their sick and vacation benefits. She added that she does not believe that because this is an issue for a handful of people who would benefit exponentially that it should be made an issue for all Civil Service employees. The University has very generous benefits for all its employee groups. Ms. Cable-Morrison stated that in her opinion, the current Civil Service family leave benefit is very generous.

Ms. Olson suggested bringing this issue to the Civil Service Senate for further discussion. Mr. Paton suggested that Civil Service employees be asked to rank which benefits are most important to them.

VI). Communications Subcommittee report: Ms. Olson reported that an e-In Touch will be sent out next week. She asked members for their thoughts on whether she should send out a monthly newsletter even if there is not a lot to report. Ms. Wallace volunteered to provide Ms. Olson with an article that Mary Luther has agreed to write about the status of the job family study, which can be included in an upcoming newsletter. Ms. Olson encouraged all members to send her items they would like put in the newsletter.

VII). Chair-elect's report: Tom Sondreal reported on the Civil Service employee survey that will be conducted later this spring. A copy of the draft survey had been sent out to members prior to the meeting. He solicited members' thoughts and suggestions regarding the draft survey. Mr. Sondreal noted that the current plan is to use Survey Monkey to distribute the survey. Ms. Olson stated that funds will be secured so that

Survey Monkey can be used to survey constituents. She asked members' opinions on whether one lengthier survey should be sent out or if a number of shorter surveys be conducted. Members agreed that conducting one larger survey would be a better idea than multiple smaller surveys.

VIII). Next, Ms. Olson briefly commented on the Civil Service Strategic Plan and encouraged members to review it. She further requested that subcommittee chairs be prepared to report at the February Civil Service Senate meeting what their subcommittee has accomplished as it relates to the goals outlined in the plan.

IX). Ms. Olson called on Patti Dion, director, Employee and Labor Relations, to provide an Office of Human Resources (OHR) update. Ms. Dion began by distributing three handouts - an OHR organization chart, an Employee Relations organization chart and the OHR consulting service assignments. She then took a few minutes to walk members through each of these handouts.

Regarding OHR consultants, the staff has been expanded from 4 to 12 employees. The five consulting teams that have been established are made up of a team manager and a junior and senior consultant. The goal is to move from transactional relationships with the various units to working more strategically with the units to meet their HR needs.

Ms. Dion introduced two OHR team managers who were invited to today's meeting, Kim Kopplin and Mike Overline, and asked them to share information about their background. Next, CSCC members introduced themselves to Ms. Kopplin and Mr. Overline.

Several months ago, reported Ms. Dion, President Kaler issued a directive to the central administrative offices, which includes OHR, asking them to work collaboratively with their counterpart collegiate administrative units. OHR is working on a number of initiatives as it works towards establishing a closer relationship with the collegiate administrative units. For example, a group has been established to reduce redundancies in the work being done centrally and at the collegiate level. Another group is looking at using HR data more effectively and strategically.

Next, Ms. Dion took a couple minutes to let members know about the spans and layers project that is underway. This project was spurred, in part, by the legislature's request to learn more about the University's administrative costs, how it is structured, etc. Layers, explain Ms. Dion, is how many reporting relationships are there within an organization, e.g., entry-level employee to highest-level employee. Spans, on the other hand, measures the breadth of a person's supervisory/managerial responsibility.

Regarding the Duluth vacation donation program raised at the last meeting, stated Ms. Dion, up until about a year ago Duluth was pooling their vacation donations. Since that time, however, they have made changes to their program and it is now being administered the same as on all the other campuses. Ms. Wallace suggested this information be included in the next newsletter.

A question has also arisen, noted Ms. Dion, about the StrengthsFinder assessment. She noted that OHR is planning to offer StrengthsFinder training through its Department of Organizational Effectiveness. In response to a question about what Organizational Effectiveness is offering in terms of StrengthsFinder by Ms. Mason, Ms. Dion stated that she would talk with Mel Mitchell, director, Organizational Effectiveness, and ask that he contact her to make sure the University's efforts and the Civil Service Staff Development Subcommittee's efforts are coordinated. Vice President Brown added that she does not believe that what the Department of Organizational Effectiveness is doing related to StrengthsFinder will interfere with the Staff Development Subcommittee's plans. She stated that it is her understanding that Organizational Effectiveness is planning to offer train the trainer experiences for employees. Vice President Brown added that she is aware of the CSCC's interest in professional development opportunities for its constituents, and, as a result, reported that Organizational Effectiveness will be offering some training sessions, which may be of interest. She also reported that there are plans to rollout a reinigorated President's Emerging Leaders (PEL) Program. More information about this program will be forthcoming.

Vice President Brown stated that OHR is allocating its resources on projects that will best forward the broad OHR agenda. OHR has a lot of projects going on at this time. A significant amount of effort is going into transforming OHR for the benefit of employees as well as the institution.

X). After a short break, Ms. Olson reconvened the meeting, and welcomed Vice President Brown and Lori Lamb, director, OHR Operations. Vice President Brown began by noting that she and Ms. Lamb will provide the committee with information about what is being done to create a job classification system in which the job classes actually reflect the work that is being done. A consulting firm out of New York was hired to put together a comprehensive, meaningful, substantive plan for moving forward with creating a new job classification system for the University. Now that this plan has been developed, OHR is in the process of issuing a RFP for a consultant to "supercharge" the remaining 14 job family studies. Following this brief introduction, she asked Ms. Lamb to provide more information about the project.

Ms. Lamb distributed a handout that summarizes the project, which is anticipated to take a couple of years. The goal of the Classification/Compensation Project is to create and implement a classification and compensation system that provides managers and employees with transparent career paths, and salary management principles that provide clarity and ease of administration, optimal utilization of payroll dollars, and the ability to attract, engage and retain high-performing employees. The project will consist of three phases that will be taking place simultaneously:

Phase 1 – Laying the foundation for future implementation of a new classification and compensation system.

Phase 2 – Creating and implementing the new classification and compensation system.

Phase 3 – Reviewing the terms and conditions of employment with the different employee groups, particularly P&A and Civil Service.

Ms. Lamb reported that as part of this project, the JEQ tool will no longer be used. The JEQ will be replaced by a thorough and accurate job description tool, which will be developed in consultation with various employee groups in an effort to describe and define jobs in a way that is meaningful.

Once the classification system is established, a decision about how to compensate employees will need to be made. As part of this process, OHR will gather more clear information about appropriate salary benchmarks. Finally, terms and conditions of employment will also need to be examined, particularly between P&A and Civil Service, in order to determine if differences make sense or whether certain terms and conditions should be made more similar between the employee groups. As career progressions are created for employees, it will be important to make sure they do not cause hardship for employees as they move through the various progression stages as it relates to employment terms and conditions. The University also needs to examine what makes sense from management and administrative standpoints.

Ms. Lamb concluded her presentation, and called for questions. Members' questions/comments included:

- Did the consultants only review the remaining 14 job family studies or did their review include the job family studies that were already complete? Ms. Lamb stated the consultants looked at the University's entire current system. She noted that the consultants that were used are experts in the field of higher education classification and compensation. The consultants felt that the University's current system was quite outdated, and made suggestions for how the University could establish a more modern classification system that would meet the needs of the institution. VP Brown stated that the jobs that people are doing now have evolved since the current classification system was put in place. While there will never be a perfect classification system, the new system will be a very good system. She commented that she frequently says, "Don't let 'perfect' be the enemy of good." The goal is to have a system that will define people's work as best as possible, and having a compensation system in place that will appropriately compensate employees doing that work. The University has been paying employees rather than paying them for the work they do, which is not fair to all employees in the system.
- Supervisors need to be given supervisory training. VP Brown agreed, and stated that supervisors need to be given the tools, support and resources they need in order to be effective in their supervisory role. She added that as part of this process, a step back needs to be taken in order to reflect on how the work is getting done and what work actually needs to be done.
- In the eyes of a number of Civil Service employees, P&A have the "wonder" jobs. VP Brown stated that she does not agree with this comment. In her opinion, every University employee has a good job. All employees' roles are equally valid and important.

- More information about the job family study needs to be shared with employees so misinformation about the project does not start circulating.
- What is the timeline for the classification and compensation project? Once the consultant is hired, VP Brown stated that she believes the project can be completed in about two years. This means the project will likely be done sometime in the summer of 2015.
- Please explain how the new appeal process will work? According to Ms. Lamb, the process is still being developed. She assured members that an improved process for re-evaluating jobs will be created. A fundamental principle of the new classification system is that employees need to be paid for the work they are doing.
- It is good to hear that this project will involve updating the current job descriptions. On the smaller campuses, in particular, employees are required to wear a lot of different hats. Please keep this in mind while working on this project. VP Brown agreed that this will definitely need to be considered as the job family study unfolds. She added that another goal of this project will be to implement a compensation structure that will allow people to financially advance while still continuing to do the same body of work. Ms. Lamb added that one of the fundamental principles of the new system will be broader categories of work as opposed to specific categories of work. Therefore, rather than being specific about classifications, the aim will be to be more specific in terms of titles so that titles actually reflect what employees do.
- Is there something CSCC should do to make sure they have a voice in the classification and compensation discussions that are taking place? VP Brown stated that Ms. Dion is the new liaison to the CSCC, which gives the CSCC access to senior leadership in OHR. OHR will also continue to involve the CSCC in its job family discussions. In addition, a new OHR communications officer has been hired and OHR plans to use her skills to make sure they are communicating with Civil Service constituents on relevant and important topics they should be aware of. Ms. Lamb stated that OHR needs the CSCC's help and input in order to accomplish this project, and she and others will be back to regularly consult with and provide updates to the CSCC.
- How many units are on merit pay? In addition, some units are finding it very difficult to do merit pay with a compensation pool of 2 – 2.5%. Ms. Dion stated that she would find out the number of units on merit pay and report back. She also acknowledged the difficulty of doing merit pay with a limited compensation pool.
- At a future meeting, please provide the committee with the history behind and the process for giving employees' raises and promotions. Ms. Dion stated that she would provide this information at a future meeting.

In light of time, Ms. Olson thanked VP Brown and Ms. Lamb for the overview of the Classification/Compensation Project, and for answering members' questions.

XI). Hearing no further business, Ms. Olson adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate