

AHC FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (AHC FCC)
May 17, 2016
Minutes of the Meeting

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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: 2015 – 2016 Third Thursdays; Fall 2016 AHC FCC Meeting in Duluth; 2016 – 2017 AHC FCC Membership Changes; Free Speech at the University of Minnesota – Four Core Principles; AHC FCC Web Presence on AHC Website; Student Mental Health and Food Insecurity Issues; Job Family Study Concerns]

PRESENT: Kathleen Krichbaum (chair), Paul Bohjanen, John Connell, Les Drewes, Paul Jardine, Ned Patterson, Kyriakie Sarafoglou, Wendy St. Peter

GUESTS: Kathryn Brown, vice president, Office of Human Resources; Mary Rohman Kuhl, director of compensation, Office of Human Resources; Ian Ringgenberg, co-chair, P&A Benefits & Compensation Subcommittee

1. **2015 – 2016 Third Thursday summary:** Professor Krichbaum called the meeting to order, and said the first agenda item is to review this year's Third Thursdays in terms of speakers, topics, attendance and cost. A handout containing this information was distributed to members. Professor Krichbaum asked for members thoughts and comments about Third Thursdays in general.

Professor Jardine said he feels he needs to put more time and effort into promoting Third Thursdays among his faculty colleagues. Professor Krichbaum agreed that all members could do more to promote Third Thursdays in their schools and once the AHC FCC has more of a web presence that too may help to increase awareness. Professor Jardine added that oftentimes faculty just delete broadcast messages and suggested AHC FCC members forward the announcement out to their faculty and encourage attendance, which would make the invitation more personal.

Professor Krichbaum noted that while the committee has talked about broadcasting Third Thursdays to Duluth and Rochester, from what she has heard, the Campus Club does not have the technology to do this. She added that assuming Vice President Jackson funds Third Thursdays for the 2016 – 2017 academic year, this is something that should be looked into further; naturally, cost will be a factor. Professor St. Peter also suggested trying to find a space on the Duluth campus where faculty can have appetizers and beverages, similar to the space on the Twin Cities campus. If these arrangements can be made, said Professor Bohjanen, then he thinks the campuses should take turns hosting these receptions instead of Duluth faculty just watching presentations by Twin Cities' faculty.

Professor Krichbaum asked members to start thinking about topics and guest speakers for next year's Third Thursday receptions. She said she hopes to schedule a planning meeting or retreat in late August where the committee can continue this discussion.

2. Fall 2016 AHC FCC meeting in Duluth: Professor Krichbaum said the committee usually travels to Duluth once a year and holds a meeting there. She asked Professor Drewes his thoughts on when the AHC FCC should travel to Duluth during the 2016 – 2017 academic year. Professor Drewes said last year the AHC FCC came to Duluth on Tuesday, October 6, and thinks early October would be a good time to come next year too. He said it makes sense for the AHC FCC to hold their first official meeting of the academic year in the Twin Cities and then to travel to Duluth in October. Professor Krichbaum asked Professor Drewes to start talking with the Duluth Medical School and College of Pharmacy faculty about what a good day would be, which he agreed to do.

3. 2016 – 2017 AHC FCC membership changes: Professor Krichbaum noted that there will be three seats opening up on the committee, Medical School (basic scientist), College of Pharmacy, and College of Veterinary Medicine. Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, noted that Vet Med has elected a replacement for Professor Patterson who will be rotating off the committee, and that is Professor Cathy Carlson. Professor Bohjanen said that the Medical School has not yet elected its basic scientist representative but will do so at its next Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) meeting on June 5. Professor St. Peter said the College of Pharmacy just sent out the ballot to fill its seat and she said she was the only one on the ballot, which means she is running uncontested at this time.

4. Free Speech at the University of Minnesota: Four Core Principles: Professor Krichbaum reported that there was a discussion of the Free Speech at the University of Minnesota: Four Core Principles document at the May 5 University Senate meeting. This was an interesting discussion because a lot of the issues raised in the AHC FCC and FCC discussions related to this document were also raised at the Senate meeting. No action was taken by the Senate concerning the document; it was on the agenda for discussion only.

5. AHC FCC web presence on the AHC website: Professor Krichbaum asked Ms. Dempsey to provide an update on the AHC FCC having more of a web presence on the main AHC website (<http://www.health.umn.edu/>). Ms. Dempsey said she spoke with Rebecca Noran, communications manager, AHC Public Relations and Communications, and scheduled a meeting with her in late July about increasing the AHC FCC's presence on the AHC website. Any AHC FCC members interested in participating in this meeting are welcome to do so. Ms. Dempsey said she would send out the meeting details so members who are interested can get this meeting on their calendars.

Professor St. Peter said she thinks that those attending should bring specific ideas for increasing the committee's presence on the AHC website rather than expecting AHC Communications to do all the work.

Getting back to Third Thursdays, said Professor Krichbaum, maybe the AHC Public Relations and Communications Office can make flyers to advertise these receptions, which could then be posted across the AHC. She also suggested asking them to publicize the committee's meeting dates and times. Additionally, suggested Professor St. Peter, maybe the AHC FCC could have a link where faculty can submit comments, propose agenda item ideas, etc. Along these same

lines, Professor Krichbaum proposed creating some type of template to briefly report the key issues that the AHC FCC and other Senate committees have been working on. There is so much going on at so many different levels that people simply do not know about.

Regarding communication, Professor Bohjanen noted that the Fairview/UMP integration does not appear to be on track based on the timeline that Dr. Jackson outlined when he met with the AHC FCC earlier this month, but it is hard to know because there have been no communications. It is hard to imagine a vote will take place by the end of May. Among other things, he also reported that he heard that the Fairview/UMP merger is going to be on the June Board of Regent's (BOR) docket.

In response to a question from Professor Sarafoglou about what is holding up the agreement, Professor Bohjanen said he believes the major outstanding issues are branding, department funds flow, and due diligence. Regarding branding, noted Professor Bohjanen, it is his understanding that the BOR is being strict and cautious about how the University of Minnesota is being branded. A concern of the faculty who serve on the Medical School FAC is that this integration is being forced upon them. Professor Sarafoglou added that faculty are confused as to how the integration will directly affect them, and she has heard faculty say that they are either going to not vote, which would be a no vote, or they plan to vote no. There is a lot of misinformation floating around, which is a recipe for disaster. The next Medical School FAC meeting is on June 5, said Professor Bohjanen, but if things need to move rapidly related to this issue the FAC would schedule an ad hoc meeting. In addition, he noted that there was also talk at one time about Dr. Jackson and Fairview holding town hall meetings to speak to the issues related to the merger and integration, but, again, there has been no information communicated about these events. Professor Bohjanen also reported that the Department of Medicine has a special meeting set up with Drs. Jackson and Daniels to discuss the integration and this meeting is scheduled for May 25, 2016.

Professor Krichbaum asked Ms. Dempsey whether the committee has a meeting scheduled with Dr. Jackson in the near future. Ms. Dempsey said no but that she can try to schedule one. In addition, the committee talked about sending a message to Dr. Jackson indicating members' willingness to help with communications about the status of the merger given the lack of information/communication thus far. Professor Krichbaum volunteered to draft and send this message to Dr. Jackson on behalf of the committee. She also suggested setting up a regular AHC FCC meeting for Tuesday, June 21 from 1:30 – 3:00.

6. Student mental health and food insecurity issues: Professor Krichbaum asked for members thoughts on the PowerPoint slides that were sent out along with the agenda on student mental health and food insecurities. She noted that Boynton Health Service (BHS) presented this data to the FCC at one of its recent meetings. Members agreed the information was enlightening and disturbing. Professor Krichbaum recalled at the last meeting with Dr. Jackson that she mentioned that it seemed like the University could be doing more given it has a large academic health center. Besides BHS seeing patients, isn't there more the AHC schools could be doing? Professor Krichbaum said there will be more information to come given that Provost Hanson has agreed to set up a Joint Student Mental Health Task Force to look into this issue further, but, in the meantime, she just wanted members to be aware of the issue and that it is being discussed.

7. Job Family Study concerns: Professor Krichbaum welcomed Mary Rohman Kuhl, director of compensation, Office of Human Resources (OHR), and Ian Ringgenberg, co-chair, P&A Benefits & Compensation Subcommittee, who were invited to talk about the Job Family Study and concerns that have been raised about its impact on staff. Before beginning, however, Professor Krichbaum called for a round of introductions.

Following introductions, Professor Krichbaum said the committee is interested in hearing about the Job Family Study process and how decisions were made to reclassify some positions. Professor St. Peter commented on the lack of transparency around the process and said a number of faculty were unaware that this undertaking was even occurring. She added that based on what she has heard that a number of staff who were reclassified have left the University, and/or felt they were unfairly treated, etc. Several faculty have since become engaged in the outcome of this project because some staff have become disengaged, discouraged, etc. Professor St. Peter said concerns about the project include the lack of transparency about the process, how well the process was explained to staff, and the appeals process. She added that the AHC FCC would also like to get the statistics from the Job Family Study in terms of numbers of staff who were reclassified by race, college and other factors, the number of appeals granted, etc. What was actually accomplished by the Job Family Study?

Vice President Brown joined the meeting just as Ms. Rohman Kuhl was preparing to respond to the questions presented and asked if she could speak on the subject. Professor Krichbaum called for another round of introductions before beginning the discussion.

To begin, Vice President Brown said that the Job Family Study was a slice in time when an individual employee's work duties were looked at in terms of level of responsibility, independence of judgment, scope of work, etc., and these duties were then matched to an appropriate job classification. It is important to acknowledge that an employee's work responsibilities can and do change, said Vice President Brown, therefore, this process is not an end all, be all. She said she also recognizes that employees have attachments to job titles. Employees were told from the onset of this process that they could use any working title they wanted to use. Vice President Brown also noted that the Job Family Study did not result in a change in anyone's work or salary, except a few salaries that were actually increased to meet the base of the salary range.

For anyone who believes that their current work is not properly classified, Vice President Brown said they can ask for a review of their position. Going forward, OHR is fixing things that are wrong with the system such as making sure there are clear distinctions between job classifications so employees can see a noticeable career progression, and looking at market pay ranges to name a few. Throughout this whole process, the goal of OHR was to create a system for classifying employees and making it clear what they need to do in order to get promoted.

Ms. Rohman Kuhl said through the Job Family Study an infrastructure was created. While many aspects of the infrastructure are appropriate, there are parts that need to be adjusted. OHR's commitment, moving forward, is to take the structure that was created, and add layers of value on to it. In Ms. Rohman Kuhl's opinion, once these layers are in place, their value will be

evident, and employees will wonder how the previous system ever worked without the added layers of value. She then cited an example of a layer of value OHR intends to add to the current classification system, which is a database that will generate detailed market salary reports. Vice President Brown added that this kind of market analysis data will help make it so that people who are doing like work will be compensated in an appropriate salary range. Another important feature of the new structure, said Ms. Rohman Kuhl, is that employees will be able to see how to progress from one position to the next.

Professor Jardine said while he appreciates the need to move forward, the concerns raised by how the Job Family Study was implemented should influence how other undertakings occur in the future. He added that a big criticism in the School of Dentistry had to deal with the appeals process because the school itself had no input or influence on how staff were classified. Faculty administrators often know what a position entails better than someone in OHR. Vice President Brown thanked Professor Jardine for the suggestion. In defense of the appeals process, it was done by people who worked in the actual job families, and not by OHR staff. OHR's role was to administer the appeals process rather than making decisions on the appeals.

When referring to salary comparisons to the market, asked Professor Jardine, what market is being referred to? Defining this will provide the clarity that people need to understand the process. Vice President Brown said the market used depends on the job, and this is something that Ms. Rohman Kuhl's team will be working on. Throughout the Job Family Study process, comparisons were made to markets that were appropriate for particular jobs. There is not a single market that would apply to all University jobs. Ms. Rohman Kuhl added that without conducting the Job Family Study, OHR would not be able to build value into the structure like it intends to do.

Regarding Vice President Brown's earlier comment that jobs did not change, this is not true, said Professor St. Peter, and she cited a specific example at University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD). Vice President Brown said if the example is true, it should never have occurred. The Job Family Study should not have changed anyone's work.

Professor St. Peter asked to hear from Ian Ringgenberg, co-chair, P&A Benefits & Compensation Subcommittee, about his experience with the process. Mr. Ringgenberg began by referencing a position paper drafted by the P&A Benefits and Compensation Subcommittee - http://useenate.umn.edu/pasenate/committees/1601b&c_jfs_summation.pdf - summarizing the Job Family Study. He noted that the most pain was caused for employees who were reclassified from a P&A positions to Civil Service positions, and particularly for employees who had been at the University for fewer than five years. For employees with fewer than five years of employment at the University who were reclassified from P&A to Civil Service, their vacation was reduced from 22 paid vacation days to 13 paid vacation days with no additional compensation. Regarding the appeals process, said Mr. Ringgenberg, the report concluded that it was symbolized by poor and often adversarial communication between central OHR and unit leads, with unit leads not being able to provide accurate information about why a classification determination was made. There were instances when central OHR even admitted they would not provide this information because it would make it too easy for an employee to challenge their classification determination. Vice President Brown said to Mr. Ringgenberg that his comments

were unfair, and if he has personal issues concerning his job classification, she would be happy to sit down and try to resolve them with him. Mr. Ringgenberg said this is not about personal issues, but a common experience for many P&A employees. He noted that his frustration stems from the fact that this is the fifth time he has sat in on one of these meetings and heard the same boilerplate answers without talk of the larger systemic issues resulting from the Job Family Study. Vice President Brown reminded Mr. Ringgenberg that the Job Family Study is complete and was based on a slice in time. OHR is working hard to make sure things work well for employees going forward. What is the resolution being sought, asked Vice President Brown of Mr. Ringgenberg? For starters, said Mr. Ringgenberg, give employees who were reclassified from P&A to Civil Service back their 22-paid vacation days. Vice President Brown said this is a very specific request that can be discussed. Additionally, Mr. Ringgenberg asked that a study be conducted to determine if gender, age or other discrimination occurred as a result of the Job Family Study.

Professor St. Peter said the AHC FCC has been concerned that the Job Family Study reclassifications may have disproportionately impacted certain groups of employees based on age, sex, gender, etc. As a result, the AHC FCC would also like to get the data coming out of the Job Family Study. Vice President Brown said OHR does not have this information. The Job Family Study did not ask for demographic information such as age, gender, or race. In order to get this data, all this information would have to be pulled from the files. Professor Krichbaum said employees were not given sufficient information about the Job Family Study process, which ended up creating an infrastructure that lacks transparency. Also, there was a lack of information about the appeals process and outcomes. As a result, faculty hear from staff who have been impacted and they are saying there have been changes in job duties or salaries, despite statements to the contrary from OHR. Ms. Rohman Kuhl said an outcome of the Job Family Study was that the University has granted \$1.5 million more in salaries. Additionally, she noted that less than 10% of staff filed an appeal out of about 10,000 people who went through the process.

In response to Mr. Ringgenberg's comments, Vice President Brown said that the University has an obligation to comply with the Fair Labor Standards Act - <https://www.dol.gov/whd/flsa/> - (FSLA), which specifies who is and who is not eligible for overtime pay. If the University does not comply with this law, it puts the University at risk for federal audits and penalties. Through the Job Family Study process it became clear that there were some staff who were classified as exempt employees (not eligible for overtime pay), but who actually were eligible for overtime pay, and, therefore, needed to be reclassified. Mr. Ringgenberg agreed that the University does not have any discretion when it comes to complying with FSLA, but it does have discretion when it comes to changing employees' benefits. Vice President Brown reiterated her earlier invitation to talk with Mr. Ringgenberg about his concerns.

Mr. Ringgenberg said the P&A Benefits and Compensation Subcommittee has begun referring staff who have concerns about the outcome of the Job Family Study to the Office for Conflict Resolution - <http://ocr.umn.edu/>. Vice President Brown supported this referral.

Professor Krichbaum noted that she plans to share information from today's discussion with Professor Colin Campbell, chair, FCC. She thanked Vice President Brown and Ms. Rohman Kuhl for their time. After they left, Professor Krichbaum asked Mr. Ringgenberg if he has spoken with Professor Campbell about the Job Family Study. No, said Mr. Ringgenberg, but the

Benefits and Compensation Subcommittee drafted and approved the position paper he mentioned earlier. The P&A Senate was not ready to pass a resolution about the Job Family Study concerns. While OHR has been willing to recognize individual issues, it has not been willing to acknowledge systemic issues resulting from the Job Family Study. The committee thanked Mr. Ringgenberg for attending the meeting and sharing the concerns identified by the P&A Benefits and Compensation Subcommittee

The committee then spent the remaining few minutes debriefing from the Job Family Study discussion. At the conclusion of the discussion, it was agreed that Professor Krichbaum would talk with Professor Campbell about this issue in order to see if it is something the FCC should pursue or not.

8. **Adjournment:** Hearing no further business, Professor Krichbaum adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate Office