

CIVIL SERVICE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CSCC)

Meeting Minutes

September 16, 2015

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

[In these notes: chair's report; subcommittee updates; Civil Service Senate elections]

PRESENT: Gordon Fisher, chair; Leann Olson, Jean Wang, Terri Wallace, Lynn Hegrenes, Kim Schultz, John Paton

ABSENT: Bill O'Neill, Ray Munro, Samantha Duke

GUEST: Terry Beseman, Duane Orlovski

1. Chair's report

Chair Gordon Fisher welcomed the committee, and briefly described how he would like to see meetings run in the future. They would begin with business items, such as motions or items that require votes. There would then be reports from subcommittees. Fisher also said work plans would be established for subcommittees.

Fisher announced that due to the job classification system redesign, he had been reclassified to a P&A position, which would go into effect in November and could not be appealed. Fisher added he felt that constituents did not want leadership by someone not in their job class. Fisher discussed how to move forward with CSCC leadership and said the transition would not derail the work the committee was doing, but it would change how some things were covered. Fisher said that he was working with Duane Orlovski, Bill O'Neill, and the Senate Office to come up with a transition plan.

2. Subcommittee and task forces report

John Paton said he had been unable to attend the first Committee on Committees (ConC) meeting, which was primarily a welcome orientation. ConC planned to meet once a week on specific committee vacancies starting in October and going through November. Fisher said he looked forward to hearing from Paton about progress on ConC.

LeAnn Olson reported on the Enterprise System Upgrade Project (ESUP) task force, and said she was in the process of soliciting others for the task force and finding out about various issues. She said there was improvement in responsiveness with the ESUP helpline. Fisher said it would be good to have representation on the task force from functional areas, such as Student Services, Finance, and Office of Human Resources. Fisher asked the committee if they had ideas for people who would be good for the task force, and said he knew some people from SCFP that might be good. This task force ought to move quickly, Fisher said, and suggested they aim for

staffing the task force within two weeks. He added it was a matter of three to four people getting together to decide how to collect information.

Terri Wallace said the first meeting of the Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee would be October 8, as the September meeting had been cancelled. She noted she needed to find more committee members as they were down to five. They were also creating task forces, which need more people on the subcommittee, and Wallace said three to four people would be needed on each task force.

Fisher went on to say he had attended the Board of Regents meeting where the reduction from two years to one in employment time for Civil Servants in order to serve in governance was up for approval. It was a consent agenda item and Fisher said he had gone to the meeting to answer any questions. He also noted that the Regents would be requesting that there be more detailed data than what they had received in the past, down to the level of spending around Regents scholarships.

Fisher updated the committee on the Civil Service Senate elections, saying that nominations had been open just over a week and there had been nine nominations thus far. He said he had reached out to every person who had emailed him, letting them know service requirements had changed and encouraging them to participate. Fisher said he would also be reaching out to those who had attended listening sessions. Thus, Fisher said, task forces and subcommittees could potentially be staffed in November and December after the conclusion of the elections.

Fisher discussed strategies in getting the subcommittees staffed in that timeline. He referenced some of the things the committee had discussed at the September 2nd retreat, including a “fair” where subcommittee chairs would discuss their groups and what they were hoping to accomplish. He noted that an orientation at the first Senate meeting would also be very helpful.

Paton expressed concern that the numbers in the Senate did not support making subcommittees required, and Fisher said the point was well taken. Lynn Hegrenes said there might be a lot of people interested in Compensation and Benefits, as people care about their paychecks and benefits. Wallace said if more people were interested than her target of four to six people, it would make the job easier because there was a lot to work on.

Fisher said if they proceeded accordingly, they would need to establish work plans and the work plans should be standardized across subcommittees, including:

- Begin with charge of subcommittee
- Identify members and their roles
- Identify roles of needed members to target for recruitment process

Fisher said that Orlovski said the Communications Subcommittee could all be done electronically and with virtual participation, which might help with participation by system campuses. Fisher then reviewed suggested production dates for the Communications Subcommittee, and asked if communicating with constituents approximately twice a month was sufficient. Wallace said she felt it was, and Wang said it was definitely the right trajectory. Fisher said he had started other work plans, but wanted to make sure the format was appropriate.

He then said he would like to see a work plan from the other subcommittees/task forces in the coming weeks.

Terry Beseman, CS Senator, said he had nominated himself for an at-large seat but he was under the Provost's Office so his application could not be accepted. Fisher said because of that glitch, Becky Hippert, executive assistant, University Senate Office, had come to the retreat to explain how the different areas at the University were represented. Fisher said Beseman had offered to work on the Rules Subcommittee, but a chair needed to be appointed. Fisher also noted he was having some difficulty in getting an answer from OHR about where civil service rules were in the hierarchy. Patti Dion, director, OHR, was working on finding out if the CS rules sit alongside, above, or below OHR policy, Fisher said. Wang asked if the Office of General Counsel had been asked about this, and Fisher said would be a good avenue to pursue clarification.

Fisher went on to say that Orlovski's role as chair-elect would be expanding, and asked if anyone would be willing to chair the Communications Subcommittee. Orlovski would become chair of CSCC as Fisher transitioned off, and Orlovski could not do both unless everyone committed to generating writing for communications. Wang suggested that if Civil Service were classified by areas, they might look for those in communications areas and target them for assistance. Fisher said the idea would be that new members to CSCC would be required to contribute to the Communications Subcommittee. Wallace said she had some blog articles her committee was working on. Wang said she would chair the Rules Subcommittee. Fisher said he would share the work plan with Wang, and expressed his appreciation for her offer to chair.

Fisher said the committee needed to focus on succession planning once the next group of senators were seated after the November elections. He said they could probably accomplish many of the goals over the coming year, but they were stretched thin and people were burning out. Hegrenes said Fisher's work plan provided some continuity and was a good way forward. Fisher said "go to" people for the pending projects needed to be identified, and asked if anyone had ideas on how to transfer knowledge. Wallace referred to an idea that came up at the retreat about changing where representation came from, and suggested that be addressed first. Fisher said the job classification system redesign was coming to a close, and they needed to request data from OHR. Wang and Wallace said it might be necessary to get the preliminary information as the job family study ended, and get more data after the "clean up" i.e., after the appeals were finished. Fisher said they ought to be asking for information on an ongoing basis. Wallace said the job study summary for each job family were not consistent, and the committee looked at the summaries on the website and discussed some inconsistencies, discrepancies and oversights. Wallace said they could start looking at this to figure out what information they might want to request. Fisher said some things were not being captured in the review of the family, such as people who might have left during the process or those who were moved to a different job family.

Beseman pointed out that the rules regarding appeals had been changed during the process. At the start, employees were allowed to appeal the process without a supervisor, and this was changed midway through the process. This changed the outcome for a lot of employees because they could no longer get their supervisor's backing to appeal. Beseman said he would like to see data on employees who wanted to appeal but could not. Wallace said this data would not be

available, and Wang and Beseman said it might warrant a survey to garner some information about it. Fisher wondered if it might be useful to see data on how many people who were put into civil service exempt classification were taking overtime. His experience had been that while an employee might qualify for overtime, filing for it and receiving it is another matter. The committee briefly discussed comp time use and payout. Fisher asked Hegrenes if she would share information on the process around comp time at the October meeting and Hegrenes agreed. Paton noted he was still waiting for data he asked for in June about the job family survey, and Fisher said he would follow up with Dion that week.

Fisher reiterated the need for committee members to go out and talk to colleagues about the Civil Service Senate elections. He said he would reach out to those who had attended listening sessions and had emailed him. Fisher noted there would be another listening session aimed at system campuses, which would be followed up with another mass email about the election. The committee discussed the logistics of video and conference call connection for the listening session.

Fisher said that a CS employee had volunteered for the Community Fund Drive, and he suggested it would be good for the committee to have it on their radar for the future as he had been unaware there needed to be CS representation in attendance each year.

Fisher updated the committee on the Regents scholarship issue, saying a meeting to further discuss the issue had been cancelled and was being rescheduled. Fisher said he would report on this at the October meeting.

Wallace asked that all subcommittee chairs send meeting minutes to the Senate staff person to be sent out with the agenda. Fisher said he would send out a communication with a deadline for the minutes.

Hearing no further business, Fisher adjourned the meeting.

Mary Jo Pehl
University Senate Office