

Civil Service Consultative Committee (CSCC)
October 18, 2018
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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) Update; At-large Name Change to “Administrative and Central Services” and vote; Presidential Search update; Report on HR Projects Regarding CSCC; Joint Compensation Commission Resolution Discussion and Vote; Chairs Report; Subcommittee Reports; Update on Optional Retirement Plan Administrator]

PRESENT: Becky Nelson (chair), Terry Beseman, Colleen Dennie, Elise Diesslin, Missy Juliette, Kevin Kelley, Ray Muno, Jean Otto, Elizabeth Richardson, Hilary Strander, Nan Thurston, Marc Tye

REGRETS: Sanoa Hagen

GUESTS: Tim Nichols, member, Senate Committee on Information Technologies; Ken Horstman, director, Total Compensation

OTHERS: Noelle Noonan

Becky Nelson welcomed the committee and the members introduced themselves.

1. Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) Update

Tim Nichols introduced himself to the committee and told members that he is the civil service representative on the Senate Committee on Information Technologies. He then showed members the SCIT charge and membership, and briefly described the issues that the committee typically deals with. He explained that the committee does not write policy, but advises the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) on how new and proposed technologies affect the University’s mission and ability to conduct its business. The committee also advises on new technology, he said. Nichols reported that the committee makeup is primarily faculty and researchers, and for that reason, a lot of the topics address their issues. Given this, Nichols said his primary responsibility is to represent the support staff and think through how changes or updates affect them. Some current topics for the committee are: Canvas transition, duo factor, digital accessibility, Unizen, social media, data warehouse, video conference, and how to handle spam.

Terry Beseman asked if it makes sense to advocate for more representation on SCIT. Nichols reiterated that most of the topics are about academic research, so his role is mostly to listen and contribute when an issue would affect civil service employees. He said that he would always advocate for more staff representation, but cautioned that it is an advisory committee, and many of the topics pertain to faculty and researchers, not civil service employees.

Nichols told members to email him if they have any questions, or would like anything brought up at the SCIT meetings this year.

2. At-large name change to “Administrative and Central Services” (vote)

Beseman explained that the At-large Civil Service Senate unit is seeking to change their unit name to better represent the makeup of the group. Committee members discussed what the best option would be for a name change, and identified Central and Administrative Services as an agreeable alternative. The committee then voted on the change. All CSCC members voted in favor, with no opposition or abstentions.

3. Presidential Search update

Elizabeth Richardson, Presidential Search Committee member, explained that the [position profile](#) for the Presidential search has been released. The profile, she said, includes leadership criteria that was previously set by the Board of Regents, in addition to other criteria established in listening sessions and through emailed and written comments.

Beseman asked if the *Core Leadership Criteria* section was amended to include a commitment to University staff. He recalled that the original language only called for “collaborators who are committed to student and faculty.” Richardson reported that the change had not been made. Nelson told members that she brought this to the attention of the search firm at the University Senate meeting on October 4, 2018, and Dean Laura Bloomberg, Co-chair of the Presidential Search Committee, explained that it was an oversight. Nelson said she and Noelle Noonan, chair-elect of the P&A Senate, sent a follow up request to the search committee, requesting that the change be made to the profile, to which Dean Bloomberg wrote back and included Brian Steeves and Regent Omari, stating that one of them would get back to Nelson and Noonan with an answer. Committee members discussed frustration that staff is not included in any of the position profile. Richardson said that she will take that concern back to the committee. She also told members that the oversight was previously identified, separate from the comment that Nelson made at the University Senate meeting.

Richardson said the president search website has a [form](#) to submit nominations, and encouraged people to visit the site and add any nominations they have. She told members that the deadline for applications is October 29, 2018, and the pool of applications will be screened before names are forwarded to the search committee. Richardson explained that she would like to see a stronger relationship between civil service governance and the Board of Regents. Committee members discussed possibly asking a board member to come to a civil service senate or consultative committee meeting.

4. Report on HR Projects regarding CSCC

Patti Dion passed out revised performance appraisals for the Athletics department, for comments and feedback from the committee. She explained that the unit will be moving to a goal-related review, and provided some highlights for the reviews. Committee members offered the following feedback:

- A rubric should be added to the document defining what each ranking means related to job performance.
- Supervisors should recognize that not all positions can be goal-related, and each supervisor may view goals differently (i.e.-stretch goals vs. everyday work responsibilities).
- Units and departments should consider aligning review periods so that they are consistent for all civil service employees.
- Review appraisal documents should be available online, rather than in paper form only.

Dion thanked members for the feedback and explained that she will bring comments back to the department.

Dion also provided an update to members regarding the pay plans, which are brought to CSCC for approval each year. Committee members expressed concern that the pay plans were put in place very late in the year last year, largely based on budget discussions between the BOR and the University's leadership. Dion told members that the Office of Human Resources (OHR) is hopeful that the pay plan discussions will be set for March or April this year, but cautioned that the BOR will ultimately have control over the bigger budget issues, and OHR cannot do anything with pay plans until the BOR approves the budget.

Committee members also discussed Marc Tye's request to add language to the Civil Service Employment Rules requiring supervisors to discuss pay changes with employees. Dion explained that the HR leads across the University would be meeting to discuss how to ensure better communication among units, and she will bring that feedback to CSCC at the next meeting. Committee members agreed that the employment rules subcommittee would monitor progress on the issue moving forward.

5. Joint Compensation Commission resolution discussion (vote)

Becky introduced the [Civil Service Senate Resolution for the Creation of a Joint Compensation Commission](#) and committee members discussed the proposed language and the charge of the commission. Nelson explained that compensation issues have been identified by civil service and P&A employees, and the civil service and P&A leadership are seeking a focused group to develop tangible ideas to solve the issues, and report back to the groups on an on-going basis. Otto further explained that the commission will collect the issues, gather data, and assess the concerns.

All members voted in favor of the resolution, with no opposition or abstentions.

Nelson told members that there will be additional discussion with the Civil Service Senate at the next senate meeting, and leadership will send a follow up communication on how nominations to the commission will move forward.

6. Chairs Report

Given time constraints, Nelson emailed the following chairs report to members following the meeting:

Civil Service Chair's Report 10/18/18

- a. At the University Senate meeting the same day as the CS Senate meeting,
 - i. we received the [Presidential Profile](#) document, which will be used to recruit candidates for president.
 - ii. The search committee had just been replaced, so they explained what happened there, and what their approach is.
 - iii. There were also comments and multiple questions about ensuring a diverse candidate pool (in a variety of meanings of that word beyond just demographic information).
 - iv. Students asked how they would be represented.
- b. Attended the Senate orientation for Chairs - encouragement for working across Senate groups and with administration where it makes sense. The example of the Childcare task force formed by the Provost in conjunction with the senates is a good example of this work.
 - i. I asked Brian Steeves the same question about leaving out staff from the document, but I was asking him specifically about the Regents document. The answer we received was along the lines of "Faculty and Students are what separates a University from any other business - everywhere has staff, and of course people care about them," and "Faculty and students are the public face of the University." Other staff that were present did not like that answer any better than I did, and I will be working with Noelle, chair elect of P&A senate, to send a letter to Dean Bloomberg to follow up on the Senate ask and make sure the rest of the document will be updated.
 1. I have since received a message that the document will not be updated because of the reference to staff that says "*University of Minnesota staff are passionate about working where their work matters. Every two years we survey our employees to ask what they think about their jobs and work environment. The results show staff have very high levels of commitment and dedication that exceed the levels of many top performing private companies worldwide.*"
 - ii. Ian followed up with a question about how staff can productively work with the board of regents. There wasn't a super-clear answer, although Brian did mention that all the regents check their own email, and that people can try to talk with them before or after regent meetings if they are milling around.
- c. Received a request for some work on updates to info provided to University Senators, especially on system campuses.
- d. Attended a Senate leadership meeting regarding the potential pronoun policy; they were looking to find out what next steps might look like regarding the University Senate. We will be investigating some education options for either University Senate or the individual senates (Student, P&A, CS, and Faculty) to help frame the conversation before it comes up as a potential discussion and vote at University Senate. The policy may also make one more round to those senates for final feedback/approval before going to University senate.

7. Subcommittee Reports

Terry Beseman provided the following updates on behalf of the Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee:

- Subcommittee members are identifying point people to address the priorities identified on the subcommittee [issues docket](#).
- The subcommittee met with Ken Horstman, Director of Total Compensation, Office of Human Resources (OHR); Ryan Reisdorfer, Health Programs Manager, Office of Human Resources; and Mary Rohman Kuhl, HR manager, Total Compensation, to present the subcommittee issues docket.
- Mary Rohman Kuhl also presented information on the market refinement project.

Missy Juliette provided the following updates from the Communications and Outreach Subcommittee:

- A brown bag session on the University's wellbeing program will be held on Wednesday, November 14, 2018.

8. Update on Optional Retirement Plan Administrator

Ken Horstman, director, Total Compensation introduced himself and read a progress statement entitled [Retirement Single Recordkeeping Vendor and Fund Lineup Project, October 2018](#) on behalf of the [Retirement Subcommittee](#). Some of the highlights of the statement include:

- The Board of Regents approved Fidelity as the single-recordkeeper for the Faculty retirement plan and the voluntary plans.
- There will be three tiers to the retirement plans: target retirement funds, a core fund lineup, and a brokerage window that allows plan holders to choose their own mutual funds.
- The fund lineup will not include Fidelity funds, so that the recordkeeping relationship with Fidelity maintains objectivity, however, Fidelity funds will be available through the third tier brokerage window.
- The Retirement Plan Governance Committee currently plans to finalize decisions on the fund lineup by the end of calendar 2018.
- Once the contract with Fidelity is final and signed, the University and Fidelity will jointly develop an implementation plan to include all work related to the implementation of the new structure and vendor including a comprehensive communications plan for all participants including retirees.

With no further business, Nelson adjourned the meeting.

Bobbie Erichsen
University Senate Office