Attending: The Personnel Committee was scheduled to meet in the Denver Conference Room at 1 PM on Friday, April 4, 2014. As the Committee members arrived, we were informed that because of a senior administration meeting in that room, we would need to meet in the Colorado Springs Room on the same floor. Prior to the April 4, 2014 Committee meeting, the Committee chair had been informed that neither Faculty Council Chair, Melinda Piket-May nor Isabella Sauve would be able to attend. Arrangements had been made for a graduate assistant to set up the phone call-in system for Committee members unable to attend this meeting at 1800 Grant. Recording capabilities were also to be established at the time of or before the meeting. Unforeseen technical issues precluded full telephone or recording capabilities from being operational at the beginning of the meeting. The system was not fully functional until approximately 1:45 PM. Gail Katz was able to join by phone shortly thereafter at approximately 1:50 PM. Although they made several attempts to join by telephone, Committee members remotely located could not join at any point during the meeting. VP Jill Pollock was out of town and therefore unable to attend. Committee members attending from the beginning of the meeting and present at 1 PM were Chair John McDowell, Bruce Neumann, Don Eron, Gloria Main and David Forlani.

March Minutes Approval

Deferred

New Business (1):

The Committee had requested a presentation from Mr. Mark Stanker and Mr. Tony DeCrosta regarding our health plans: Prior to the meeting, topics for discussion were sent by mail to Mr. Tony DeCrosta and Mr. Mark Stanker. Specific items included:

1. Description of how rates were set, including which plans were subsidized and which were not subsidized.
2. Description of how the employer and employee monthly accounts were calculated.
3. Description of how new plan benefits were assessed and why they were included in this year’s benefit plan. Similarly, descriptions of which new benefits options were assessed and rejected. In other words, explain why some new benefits were included and some were not included.

What is the monthly cost of PEPM for each new benefit?
No actual health care plan rates were actually presented. The committee was told that the average rate increases would be about 8%. When asked whether this average included such disparate rates as 0% and 16%, which happens to average 8%, we were informed that all of the health plan rates experienced approximately 8% increases. We were told that no plan rate increases were close to 0% or 16%. In actuality, when actual employee plan rates were announced, one rate was actually 0% and another exceeded 12%.

4. Discussion plans for open enrollment, required or not required (?), default options, provisions for dealing with non-English and non-computerized (computers not available or potential subscriber is not computer-competent).

Mr. DeCrosta began the discussion with describing his most recent (APR 2014) presentation to the Faculty Council. In response to a question regarding potential rate increases, Mr. DeCrosta stated that there would be an approximate 8% “overall rate increase across the four existing plans.” He said that the 8% increase is related to direct costs, slightly higher utilization, medical and pharmacy trends and changes due to health care reform and actuarial rates. He further stated that the high deductible plan performed very favorably last year but the other plans did not perform as well as did the high deductible plan. When asked about the Trust reserve, Mr. DeCrosta said that the majority of the reserve had likely been contributed by CU although the Trust’s risk pool was shared at the time. He further stated that the present reserve total is not inconsistent with industry recommendations and actually below industry recommendations. In response to a direct question, Mr. DeCrosta stated he is closely examining over and underutilization issues going forward. Mr. DeCrosta further provided what he described as an “historical perspective” that University Hospital initially though that the overall health care organization of their subscribers would be better than it is.

Further discussions regarding CU Health Plan updates were held in general terms with Mark Stanker and Tony DeCrosta. Unfortunately, both Mr. Stanker and Mr. DeCrosta were scheduled for another meeting at 1:45 PM so were limited in the amount of time they had available to discuss issues previously sent to them by the Committee. Mr. DeCrosta and Mr. Stanker agreed to return to the Personnel Committee for further discussions in the future.

Regents’ Climate Survey:

A discussion was held regarding the regents’ “climate survey” that has begun. Chair McDowell reported to the Committee that significant concerns were expressed by many members of the Faculty Council to Regent Kyle Hybyl and Regent Secretary Patrick O’Rourke in the April, 3, 2014 Faculty Council meeting. Several Faculty
Council Members shared their concerns regarding the advisability and validity of the survey as presently written. Following the discussion with Regent Hybyl and Secretary O’Rourke, the Faculty Council recommended that the climate survey be discontinued and that although faculty members could choose to participate or not participate, it was the Council’s recommendation that faculty not participate in the climate survey at this time. [During the Personnel Committee meeting, an email was received by Chair McDowell from Faculty Council Chair, Melinda Piket-May advising faculty not to participate in the climate survey. Later that same week, the regents withdrew their climate survey with the intent of improving the survey in content and security.]

New Business (2):

Chair McDowell stated he had received an inquiry from a faculty member regarding the Regent Policy addressing “bereavement leave” (Regent Policy 11.3.b) and how it might be applied unevenly in some cases. Specifically, the inquiry was related to 9-month faculty benefits vis-à-vis benefits available to twelve month faculty. Chair McDowell sent an inquiry to Lisa Landis requesting possible clarification of the bereavement leave policy. Ms. Landis responded, “In Regent Policy 11.3.b, (the policy is listed below)…I do not know of any policy for 9-month faculty. Also, the policy below is up to five days of paid leave and it is up to the supervisor’s discretion.”

As presently stated, the Bereavement Leave Policy (Regent Policy 11.3.b) is: “Officers, exempt professionals, and faculty on twelve-month appointments may receive up to five working days of paid leave to arrange for and attend the funeral and other affairs of a member of the employee’s immediate family when they would otherwise have to work. Immediate family members include: spouse, children, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brothers, sisters, mothers-in-law, fathers-in-law, sisters-in-law, brothers-in-law, sons-in-law and daughters-in-law and any other person who is a member of the employee’s established household. A supervisor may allow an employee to receive up to five paid working days of funeral leave for an equally significant other person not included in this definition.” Some discussion was held regarding the potential for uneven application by using the present wording “…supervisory discretion…may receive up to five working days of unpaid leave…” The Committee recommended that the regents consider amending Policy 11.3.b such that the Bereavement Policy replace “twelve month appointments” with “full-time faculty.” This suggested change will be brought to Faculty Council at their next meeting for consideration for presentation to the Regents Laws and Policies Subcommittee. Chair McDowell will not only bring this specific recommendation but will present other associated concerns (potential application to 9-month faculty) to the April 24, 2014 Faculty Council meeting for the Council’s discussion and possible presentation of any Council recommendations to the regent’s Laws and Policies Committee at their next meeting.
Further Business (1):

A question was presented regarding the recent “health fairs” held during spring break. An inquiry was sent to Lisa Landis, Assistant Vice President of Employee Services. Ms. Landis’ response was:

“The Employee Services Expo’s were not health fairs. We set up the expos to showcase our department and all that we offer. The information can be found at our website: https://www.cu.edu/employee-services/news/save-date-employee-services-expos. As always, Employee Services can assist employees and retirees on pay or benefit issues during normal working hours.

“Unfortunately, reserving rooms on the campuses is a challenge and spring break was the only time we could confirm space. The only Expo that was held after spring break was on the downtown campus, which was April 9.

“We know that many faculty and staff were out of the office and will take that into consideration when we schedule for next year. Even with the events overlapping with spring break, we felt our attendance was fantastic for our first Expo, reaching close to 1300 employees.

“We will be back out on the campuses for Open Enrollment in May. The complete schedule can be found at: https://cu.edu/employee-services/oe-calendar.”

Further Business (2):

Recommendations were suggested from Committee members for potential faculty/retired faculty to be added to the Committee so that empty Committee positions can be filled. The names of suggested Committee members will be provided to Faculty Assembly Chairs for their review and consideration. It is hoped that positions presently vacant can be populated by faculty/retired faculty members at the June 2014 Faculty Council meeting.

Adjournment

Chair McDowell had to excuse himself at 2:45 PM to attend another meeting on the Anschutz Campus. The Committee was formally adjourned at 2:45 PM with some Committee members continuing to hold “informal discussions” following Chair McDowell’s departure.

The next Personnel Committee meeting is scheduled for May 2, 2014 in the Denver Conference Room at 1800 Grant Street.