

CIVIL SERVICE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 28, 2013

[In these minutes: Chair's Report, Communications Subcommittee Report, Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee Report, Chair-Elect's Report, Staff Development Subcommittee Report, Advocacy Subcommittee Report, Legislative Network Subcommittee Report, Strategic Plan, Office of Human Resources Update, Parental Leave, Miscellaneous Announcements]

[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), Adam Hauge, Lisa Mason, Teresa Schicker, Chris Stevens, Sharon Van Eps, Terri Wallace, Don Cavalier, Patti Dion

REGRETS: Susan Cable Morrison, Carolyn Davidson, Bill O'Neill, Alethea Oertwich, John Paton

OTHERS ATTENDING: Matt Bowers

I). Amy Olson called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). Ms. Olson began with her chair's report, and noted the following:

- She has attended a number of meeting, e.g., P&A Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), where the Classification/Compensation Project (job family study) has been discussed. She added that this project started prior to consulting with various governance committees. P&A are particularly concerned about what a job reclassification may mean for their job category given they are on annual renewal contracts.
- The Student Senate continues to work on the smoke-free campus initiative. They are no longer talking about medical amnesty.
- As follow-up to the February 20 Civil Service (CS) Senate meeting when family leave was discussed, there will be further discussion on this topic later in the meeting. To date, Ms. Olson reported receiving four messages about this issue asking the committee to remember that there are a lot of different views it.
- Carolyn Davidson has agreed to serve on the President's Award for Outstanding Service Committee, the committee that recommends candidates to the President.

- At the end of this academic year, Nancy Fulton will no longer monitor the Civil Service email account. A new volunteer will need to be recruited to take over for Ms. Fulton.

III). As part of her Communications Subcommittee report, Ms. Olson noted that she and three or four other members will meet next week to look at the Strategic Plan and talk about whether the various subcommittees are meeting their goals. The Communications Subcommittee is not meeting its goals.

IV). Next, Terri Wallace provided the committee with a report on the work of the Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee. The subcommittee has been quite busy. A few members have had to step down from serving on the subcommittee, but others have since joined. The subcommittee has been learning a lot about the job family study that is underway. Mary Luther has agreed to write an article for the e-In Touch newsletter to provide CS employees with a status update on the project. Patti Dion will attend the subcommittee's April meeting.

Ms. Olson asked Ms. Dion to once again explain what is meant by spans and layers, the analysis that the legislature has requested. Ms. Dion stated that spans and layers is an organization design methodology. Layers refers to the number of different layers of employees in an organization from the most entry level up through President (in the case of the University), or, put differently, the number of layers of decision-making from top to bottom within an organization. Spans, on the other hand, are the number of direct reports that a supervisor is responsible for. The purpose of the spans and layers analysis is to determine whether the University's organizational structure can be simplified, costs reduced and effectiveness improved. Ms. Dion noted that in a number of instances, a way to give a higher salary to an employee has been to reclassify that person. When this is done repeatedly, an organization can end up with multiple layers, which organizationally do not make sense. She added that a vast majority of University supervisors are working supervisors, which means that supervision is not their only responsibility. Conducting a spans and layers analysis does not necessarily mean that positions will go away, but rather is simply a way of looking at how reporting relationships are organized.

Ms. Shicker hopes that this analysis will lead to mandatory training for supervisors. Ms. Dion stated that the Office of Human Resources (OHR) recognizes the importance of training supervisors properly. Currently, there is nothing in place that provides for consequences if a supervisor does not attend training. The HR leads are working to stress the importance of having supervisors take supervisory training across the various units. OHR is also putting more training materials on-line, and modularizing some of the training so it can be done in blocks of time rather than an entire day, for example.

Sharon Van Eps stated that modularizing the in-person training sessions is problematic for coordinate campus employees. It is better for coordinate campus employees to do an all day training session to reduce the number of times they need to travel to the Twin

Cities. Ms. Dion thanked Ms. Van Eps for her insight and noted OHR does not want to disenfranchise the coordinate campuses in any way.

Terri Wallace stated that since merit pay will go into effect by 2015, what will happen to employees who do not get reviews? Will there be consequences for supervisors who do not conduct reviews? Ms. Dion acknowledged Ms. Wallace's concern. Ms. Schicker stated that for the AHC, Corey Bonnema in OHR along with one of his colleagues offered a very worthwhile training for staff and supervisors on how to give a good review, and how to get a quality review.

V). Ms. Olson called on Tom Sondreal to provide the committee with the chair-elect report. Mr. Sondreal stated he doesn't have a lot to report at this time. A survey is still being planned for this summer. One of the questions on the survey will be to ask employees about their experience with the new 4-UOHR line. Since this line was only recently launched, Mr. Sondreal stated he would like to wait awhile to conduct the survey to give employees an opportunity to use the 4-UOHR line. He added that no final decision has been made about which survey tool will be used, e.g., Survey Monkey or some other tool. He added that the University will be rolling out a survey application later this spring/early summer, which the CSCC may be able to use. Mr. Sondreal welcomed members' ideas about possible survey questions.

VI). Ms. Olson called on Lisa Mason to provide the committee with the Staff Development Subcommittee report. Ms. Mason stated that the Staff Development Subcommittee plans to move forward with offering the next 200 CS employees on the waiting list the opportunity to take the StrengthsFinder assessment in March and April. In response to a question, Ms. Mason noted that there are approximately 350 employees currently wait listed.

VII). Ms. Olson read the Advocacy Subcommittee report submitted by Susan Cable Morrison. She added that in light of an issue that has recently come up with possible legal implications, she believes the Rules Subcommittee may want to more clearly outline what falls under the jurisdiction of advocacy. Ms. Olson cautioned members to be careful when advocating on someone else's behalf, and encouraged members to refer constituents to their appropriate HR rep for assistance with their problem.

VIII). Ms. Olson reported that Bill O'Neill has sent his regrets for this meeting so there is no Rules Subcommittee report. She added that the Duluth vacation donation program issue has been resolved. The verbiage around vacation donation in the rules should be rewritten for clarity.

IX). Ms. Olson called on Adam Hauge to provide the Legislative Network Subcommittee report. Mr. Hauge stated that the subcommittee continues to meet monthly. Initially, the subcommittee wanted to "brand" CS employees to the legislature. After further discussion, rather than differentiating the CS message from the rest of the University message, the goal is to apply the University's legislative message to the CS employee group, and explain the message to CS employees. The subcommittee is in the

process of crafting a message that is in alignment with the University's overall message, and plans to give CS employees the tools and support they need so they feel comfortable getting involved.

X). Ms. Olson stated that some of the goals outlined in the Strategic Plan have been accomplished and some still need to be completed. An issue that was identified last year was seniority, and while it has not yet been resolved, concerns around this issue have diminished. Ms. Olson turned to Matt Bowers for his comments on this issue, which has been a big issue for the Libraries. Mr. Bowers stated that seniority continues to be a problem, particularly for long-term employees, but progress is being made in the Libraries. There have been discussions with the senior management team that have served to identify actual concerns and reduce paranoia.

Ms. Olson spent a few minutes quickly walking members through the status of each of the goals outlined in the Strategic Plan.

Regarding visiting the coordinate campuses this year, Ms. Olson stated that she will chair the April CSCC meeting from Rochester, and plans to visit the other coordinate campuses (Crookston, Duluth and Morris) sometime this spring.

Ms. Olson stated that in her year-end report, she will outline what the subcommittees have accomplished and what remains to be completed. She asked the subcommittee chairs to provide her with their next steps for meeting their remaining goals.

On a semi-related note, Ms. Olson stated that as a token of her appreciation for member's work, she will be getting t-shirts (free) for them. She asked those present to write down their name and t-shirt size for her.

XI). Following a brief break, Ms. Olson reconvened the meeting and called on Ms. Dion to provide an OHR update. Ms. Dion shared the following:

- Going forward, the University will no longer conduct Pulse Surveys. OHR has hired Brandon Sullivan, employee engagement manager, who is in the process of developing a new employee engagement survey to replace the Pulse Survey. The new survey is expected to be more user-friendly and provide the institution with more useful data. Ms. Dion suggested inviting Mr. Sullivan to a future meeting to outline his plans for the new survey. Tentatively speaking, the plan is to distribute the new survey in October and to distribute it on an annual basis rather than every two years.
- The Reduce Employment Costs through Employee Salary Savings (RECESS) Program that was put in place in 2009 is being terminated as of June 30, 2013. Under this program, employees were encouraged to consider voluntarily reducing their work hours for a specified period of time while still allowing them to receive the full University contribution toward their medical and dental benefits. OHR has other programs available to employees who are interested in reducing their work hours, but these programs will have an impact on their benefits.

- Once the new job families are put in place, stated Ms. Dion, employees will be reclassified and given new titles. Doing so, however, will not impact the seniority from their previous classification, and, in addition, will not impact their University seniority. OHR will work on a case-by-case basis with any employee who would happen to get laid off to determine their bumping rights.
- Regarding the process for handling CS rule changes, Ms. Dion stated that it is her understanding that the Rules Subcommittee puts together a proposal in consultation with staff from OHR. The proposal is then brought to OHR for negotiation. The Rules Subcommittee then brings the negotiated proposal to CS constituents to see if there is support or not, and, if there is support, Ms. Dion believes that CS employees would then vote on the proposal. There have been a few occasions over the years when CS employees and the administration could not reach an agreement.

Ms. Olson stated that she also thinks that any CS rule changes need to go to the Board of Regents for approval. She added that from the onset of this academic year there has been a push for the CSCC to produce results from a number of administrative areas. She went on to share why she personally feels the committee needs to produce results this year. Mr. Bowers assured Ms. Olson that the committee is responsible for setting its goals and that any rule changes are an on-going part of the work the committee does. The CSCC should set its goals and work with the Senate Office to accomplish these goals. Ms. Olson stated that she was under the impression that she needed to have a tangible result(s) by the end of this academic year.

- Ms. Dion reported that the University is in the midst of the Enterprise System Upgrade Project (ESUP), which will likely impact some terms and conditions of employment. Interest in possibly aligning some of the CS and P&A terms and conditions of employment continue to be discussed. OHR is looking at the differences between these two employee groups with an eye toward possibly aligning some of the benefits, which would have an impact on ESUP programming. While she believes there will continue to be some differences between P&A and CS benefits, there could be more alignment.
- OHR is contacting all the HR leads in each of the units to offer support and assistance in reviewing and/or revising performance appraisal documents as the University prepares to institute merit pay across the institution.

XII). Ms. Olson called on Mr. Sondreal to lead a conversation about the family leave issue that was discussed at the February 20 CS Senate meeting. Mr. Sondreal thanked Ms. Schicker and the guests she invited to the last Senate meeting for their informative family leave presentation. He stated that he was concerned about the large number of senators who voted against continuing to discuss this issue because it seemed as if they were thinking in terms of their own personal situation rather than the constituents they represent.

He asked members their opinion about next steps for this issue. Ms. Dion provided some context for this issue to help members decide how they want to proceed. For both groups, stated Ms. Dion, the policy was developed to address two issues:

1. Bonding with the baby.
2. Physical recovery of the birth mother.

Having said that, how the policy is implemented for P&A and CS is different. For P&A employees who do not earn and bank sick leave like CS employees they get two weeks paid parental leave for the birth mother and an additional four weeks paid leave for a total of six weeks off for bonding and recovery. The four weeks the mother uses is assigned to the P&A medical leave benefit. CS employees, on the other hand, are give two weeks paid parental leave for the birth mother and the remaining four weeks that a CS employee uses, for a total of six weeks, is assigned to their accumulated sick leave. If a CS employee does not have enough accumulated sick leave for the four weeks, they can either use vacation time, or, if they do not have enough vacation time, they can take unpaid time. CS employees earn 13 days/year of sick leave and there is no cap on the amount of sick time a CS employee can accumulate.

In Ms. Dion's opinion, it seems that the parental leave policy for P&A and CS is being misconstrued because a number of CS employees believe that P&A get six weeks parental leave while a CS employees only get two weeks, and that simply is not accurate.

Looking at the medical side of the organization for CS employees, they are able to purchase short-term and long-term disability at a group rate (the University does not pay for this). Again, because P&A do not earn sick time, they are given medical leave. If a P&A employee needs longer than four weeks of medical leave for the birth or other medical-related issues, the University provides P&A employees with a short-term and long-term disability plan. While there is no specified number assigned to the number of days of sick leave a P&A employee can use in a year, there is a cap on the number of days of sick leave a P&A employee can use per occasion. To help members understand the differences between P&A and CS sick leave policies, Ms. Dion provided an example. The point of the example was to make clear that P&A employees do NOT have unlimited medical leave.

Ms. Wallace asked whether P&A employees can use vacation time once they have exhausted their two weeks of paid parental leave and four weeks of time assigned to the P&A medical leave benefit. Yes, stated Ms. Dion, P&A employees would be able to use their 22 days of vacation time (or whatever vacation days they have remaining for that year) if they wanted to. CS employees, on the other hand, depending on how long they have been employed at the University and how much vacation time they have banked could potentially take more than 22 paid vacation days. All total, employees are able to take up to six months off for the birth of a child.

Ms. Dion suggested that the benefits of P&A and CS employees not be looked at in isolation. She added that there are a lot of differences between P&A and CS employees

in terms of vacation benefits, sick benefits, short and long-term disability, etc. With that said, the committee will need to decide if they want to ask for an expansion of the CS parental leave benefit. In Ms. Schicker's opinion, CSCC members and CS senators should represent their CS constituents as a whole rather than their own personal preference when it comes to this issue.

Ms. Olson asked Ms. Dion who within administration should the CSCC contact to continue this discussion. Ms. Wallace stated that before this issue can be discussed more broadly with CS employees that facts/data will need to be obtained so that the issue can be presented to CS employees so they can make an informed decision.

Ms. Dion stated that parental leave is one of the issues that is on the table for discussion as part of the CS and P&A benefit alignment along with vacation, sick leave, short-term disability, long-term disability, etc. In Ms. Dion's personal opinion, it is unlikely that all the CS and P&A employee benefits will be aligned, at least in the short run. However, if/when they are aligned, there will undoubtedly be some people who like the outcome and others who will not.

Regarding aligning the P&A and CS parental leave benefits, stated Ms. Schicker, she does not think it is a good idea to start the conversation with the mindset that in order to enhance the CS parental leave benefit that CS employees will need to give up another benefit(s) in exchange.

In response to Ms. Olson's question about next steps for this issue, Mr. Sondreal stated that in his mind it is still debatable whether a discrepancy in benefits for P&A and CS employees actually exists. Mr. Bowers added that in his opinion he believes the committee should draft a proposal and layout the issue for the CS constituents before thinking about bringing it to the Senate Consultative Committee and the University Senate. It will be important to frame the issue for CS constituents and get them involved. He added that given the difference between the benefits that shorter-term CS employees want versus longer-term employees, CSCC may want to think about having a conversation with OHR about the possibility of offering a cafeteria benefit plan, which would allow employees to choose what benefits are important to them. Ms. Schicker stated that her only concern about just getting input from CS constituents is that the voice of science is excluded. Mr. Bowers stated that the science aspect of this issue should be a part of the proposal.

Ms. Olson stated that this issue will start in the Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee, which will be responsible for drafting the proposal. She suggested that Ms. Schicker serve as an ad hoc member of the subcommittee given she is the person with the data who is driving this issue. Ms. Schicker agreed to do her best to work on and continue to move this issue forward. Ms. Wallace, chair, Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee, stated that it could take the subcommittee a year or so to compile the information they need to adequately present the issue to CS constituents given subcommittee members' busy schedules. Mr. Sondreal stated that he also wants to remain involved in this issue, and agreed that it will be important to properly present the

issue. He added that he often hears people saying that University employees should not complain about their benefits because they have one of the best benefit packages in the State of Minnesota. Mr. Hauge also suggested getting the support of P&A and faculty in regards to this issue because this is not just a CS issue but a people issue.

XIII). Ms. Olson used the remaining few minutes of the meeting to make the following announcements:

- Sharon Van Eps will be retiring as of June 2013. Congratulations were extended to Ms. Van Eps.
- There is open seat as of July 1 on the Benefits Advisory Committee. Joe Jameson, whose term is expiring, can be re-nominated if he is interested in serving again. The CSCC is required to nominate at least two candidates for each open seat. A call for nominations will be sent out in the next few weeks to all CS employees.
- Elections for the CSCC will take place via email given time ran out at the February Senate meeting, and no vote was taken. A call for Senate nominations will go out via email late March/early April.
- A replacement for Ms. Fulton who currently monitors the CS email needs to be identified before the end of the academic year. Anyone interested in volunteering to do this should contact Ms. Olson to let her know.

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

Renee Dempsey
University Senate