

April 7, 2005

School of Nursing, Denver, Room 1919

10:15 Start

In Attendance

Marianne Goodland, Mary Ulibarri, Pat Testarmata, Tim Martinez, Anne Costain, Rod Muth, Debbie Lapioli, Cheryl Gibson, Audry Newman, Jim Langstaff, Tanya Patzer, Paul Wyles, Paul Perales, Pete Wolfe, Pat Beals Moore.

Debbie called the meeting to order.

Mary shared about upcoming All Staff conference, Auraria campus, St Francis Center, Friday, April 29 @ 8:30, she will send out email to send to all staff council. Invitations have gone out for awards ceremony. Wants RSVP to plan for caterers. Parking on Fridays should be easier, trying to get free parking through chancellors, reciprocal parking in lot E. Mary would like to receive individual email RSVP for count. She showed crafted door prizes. Call or email her with questions. 8-10 for system, 10 for Boulder, 12 UCCS, 23 HSC – preliminary number that will be attending. Inviting nine regents.

Certificate of appreciation for Sue for work done on coordinating conference? Debbie will create one.

Pat says bylaws say we have to do elections today. Did not have an elections committee and asked how the group wanted to proceed. It was noted that most of the members were in attendance, and suggested elections be held. Debbie nominated Shari Patterson for treasurer; Shari is interested, although not in attendance today. Mary nominated Debbie as chair; Debbie declined. Mary nominated Debbie as vice chair; Tim seconded. Debbie accepted. Secretary is hired position; no nominations required. Tim nominated Pete Wolfe for chair, which he declined. Pat commented that she did not want to be elected chair by default. Agena is interested in being treasurer. Pat spoke to her, consider Agena self nominated. Tim made motion to close accepting nominations. Pat T seconded. Mary had question about who is off council, would like a grid on length of positions held from each person and campus, to tell successors. Paul Pereles said he would nominate Pat as chair if he could; members said they already had. Pat did not feel comfortable running the election, and Tanya volunteered to do so. She asked to see by-laws. Vote by secret ballot. Tanya handed out ballots to voting members. Alternate doesn't vote. Treasurer nominations, Agena and Shari. Vice chair nominated was Debbie. Motion to elect Debbie as vice chair by acclamation. Seconded. No discussion. Motion passed. Ballots for treasurer were counted outside the room. By-laws indicate results are to be announced within six days. Does not specify by quorum, or not. Terms commence in July. Shari was elected treasurer. Chair nominated was Pat Beals Moore. Motion to elect Pat as chair, seconded, no discussion. Motion passed.

Tanya reported on the search committee for Vice President for Budget & Finance, and Treasurer: discussion on selection for vacant positions - characteristics, (for combined

UCD and HSC?), attributes, they will see what kind of applicants they will get in the next 6 weeks. The search may be postponed for positions, treasurer, and VP for finance.

April 21 at UCD search consultant dealing with UCDHSC chancellor search to answer questions of what we are looking for in new chancellor. Meetings have been very poorly attended. The day before April 20, at HSC campus, School of Pharmacy, April 20. (in *Silver & Gold Record*). When will they announce the people who have been nominated to be on the search committee? Rod responded Fitz at Research 1 tonight, April 7th (per *Silver & Gold*).

Pat reported that Boulder campus chancellor search has not started; we may hear more in the next executive committee meeting. Rod heard rumor that selection may be very slow. Presidential search committee members nominated will be announced tonight at the meeting. They are – Pete Wolfe, Diane Lenfest, Bill Blankenship, Katie Hester, Karin Hunter; none from the Boulder or UCCS campuses.

Jim – TCT, will defer to Paul because it went to benefits. Back to same thing as of vote yesterday, 3% across the board, no performance pay. Reducing by 1% the cost of medical. Raising the cost, and then backing off 1%. Troy was working to where the medical contribution on par with the rest of the world. Most the rest of the meeting, as of March 15, most campuses had 25% compliance with PPP results in to HR, but that wasn't the deadline. There is a new form, not PPP, now it's PMP, Performance Management Plan. They combined some of the elements of the UCD and HSC campuses on a new form for the combined campus. UCB and UCCS had changes too. One change is the person to contact for a dispute. 13 month evaluation period, March 1 to March 31, 2006. Tried to make all the agencies on the same cycle. Then back to 12 month once everyone is the same. Core competencies, doesn't have personal accountability, customer service, etc. Jim's office is doing a survey of customer service. Decimals used in performance numbers, discussion about not allowing that. Confusion about where it's uniform and where it is not uniform. For this year, a hybrid form.

Jim – faculty-staff committee met March 15. First meeting, majority of time talking about service recognition. To consider whether there should be a service APS (administrative policy statement), to address supervisors who don't allow employees to serve on committees. Continuous reduction of staff, and increased workloads. Tenured faculty up to 20% of what they do is service oriented, but is it acknowledged. A formalization of services. Total compensation – salary compression concerns. People not making money on par with what else is out there. Faculty retention is a problem. Privilege & tenure and employee rights discussed. Rod, it counts in faculty research. 40/40/20 break down. Level where the rewards are, that there is a lack of appreciation for contributions made. Rod is 80% service currently. Pat's dept receives \$8000/year for compensation for her contributions to staff council as chair. If you have any suggestions of items to bring up to committee, let Mike Wolfe, Jim, Rod or Pat Beals Moore know. "Faculty and staff committee issues of mutual concern" name of committee? Lack of consistent policy on leave bank. For Denver it couldn't be extended to 9 month or exempt staff. There is no accrued sick leave for faculty. Other faculty would pick up the slack and cover. They are supposed to earn 1 ½ days per month, or two weeks a year. The way that the sick leave bank works at UCD, you can't donate sick leave, only vacation time. Banking gets

confusing because of the different salary ranges. No transference of dollars occurs between departments. You contribute annual leave, not sick leave time. You submit an application to HR, and they will grant or not.

Lunch break

Silver & Gold funding: Pat was asked if UCSC was going to pass a resolution. Paul commented that the process of going to a governing board, and asking them to say they support the *Silver & Gold*'s budget, then write about it in the paper that the governing boards support them is different than has been done in the past. Budget concerns? Tanya commented that Boulder staff council wrote a resolution 3 years ago. Resolution draft, when do they need it by? Email the resolutions to Mary so she can see them. Whose area is the *Silver & Gold* under? Jim says we should be the appropriate people to advocate for S&G. Jim made draft of resolution. Jim moved, Cheryl 2nd.

Be it resolved that in recognition of their invaluable contribution to the university community the University of Colorado Staff Council supports fully funding the budget request of the Silver & Gold Record.

Voted on the resolution; passed unanimously.

UBAB – Paul – in the paper, still don't know what the rates are; based on the long bill and how it turns out. They know what total premium will be, we have the total rate for the plan, and rates depend on the plan. They can't offer the ultimate plan, removed. Only affects professional exempt. Great West Catastrophic was removed. Health Savings Account qualified, with the new plan, Health savings acct can roll forward balance year by year. The University is not going to offer health saving acct; you have to go to your bank to set one up.

Classified staff – CU is unique, all other higher ed classified are on state plans. Every year CU has to go to the state and ask permission to offer CU benefit plans to staff. Two new plans offered for university plans, one is high deductible health plan, other midlevel PPO, a consumer driven plan, may not be offered to classified staff. Co-pays vary on the health problem the visit to the provider is for. All will be on Great West website. Especially will happen for the exempt, unknown for classified. We didn't now yet what the employer contribution will be yet. When the enrollment plans go out, we won't know the total of employee's responsibility toward the premium; that will go out later in a separate mailing.

Life insurance from the state has gone from \$12,000 to \$33,000. This is a positive enrollment; you have to take action to enroll. It will be a staggered enrollment activity period. The employees may get mixed messages on how to do enrollment the CU way, vs. the state way. Open enrollment begins on April 25 to May 20 (state). The state is going to increase the employer amount. More employer contribution, but won't know the offset of the premium you contribute. Contribution won't go down.

Dental: the \$0 employee contribution was the default, over 3000 employees never used that dental insurance. The State is eliminating the employee freebee. Active enrollment

activity required with a low premium. The state added a 4th tier for pricing, now employee + children is added at lower cost than going to employee + family. Read and be informed before making their choices. Page 7 of *Silver & Gold* shows educational forums scheduled. Be aware that one of the two choices, either the state plan or CU plan is paid in arrears, and the other is paid ahead.

Audrey – Senate Bill 7. Talked to some legislators, and there will be no bill to fix SB 7 this year, however, there will be a bill next session and will be introduced at the beginning of the session. She gave Anne Costain as the contact person; she has already talked to Jo Romero of CFPE, and plans on discussions over the summer to prepare for bill fix at the start of the next session of legislature. Helpful to give a quick overview of how these decisions are made.

Anne is the liaison between this group and the President's office, also is for the professional exempt group; she is also liaison between CU and DPA. DPA has taken the position that they bring everyone together to address these issues. So in terms of going forward, they will not support any changes to SB7 (DPA). They want to remain neutral.

PEERS is a networking group, or are they recognized as representing exempt professionals? The exempt professionals are trying to create their own governing group, in addition to be represented by this group, UCSC. President Hoffman strongly supports UCSC representing the professional exempt staff within its functions. Audrey doesn't understand the professional exempt interest in SB7, because it primarily only affects classified staff. She commented that HSC Staff Council had to keep a seat vacant until they (HSC exempt professionals) decided what they were doing. HSC Staff Council stated they would fill the vacancy if the HSC exempt professional staff didn't. The professional exempt staff appointed a rep temporarily; they still don't have their representative here. Anne said there needs to be more dialogue. Could the president just say you are to join with those already meeting, and not form another group? The HSC council pursued a remedy to include professional exempt. 5 out of 134 HSC exempts wanted to participate. When a request was made, Pat sent the UCSC bylaws, which state that members are selected by individual staff councils, so the exempts could appoint or HSC staff council could fill vacant position.

Pete Wolfe is UCDs prof exempt rep. Jessica was supposed to attend for HSC; she hasn't attended because of other commitments. Dallas was emailed about this meeting, and is not here. Governance is not an issue. Debbie said at the last meeting their campus's new professional exempt representative felt it was a hostile environment and wouldn't return. Audrey responded that it wasn't hostile and the representative took something personally that wasn't intended in that way. Every member of the group has the opportunity to affect this agenda. The professional exempt would have the power to have 1/3 control of this committee.

Pete was asked for his opinion. He is a member of CUPEERS by default. That group was originally intended to serve a networking function. Pete does not feel attacked at all. Some of the issues are different based on classification. Pete reported that PEERS were not interested in exploring the at-will status for exempt staff issues with UCSC.

These meetings should be held without fear of retaliation for what you say in discussions. Anne commented that she heard from professional exempt staff after Pat distributed to them the draft proposing an amendment to SB 007, and they are angry at her, because it is part of her job to communicate issues that would materially affect them.

Audrey commented that months are going by with people not filling this seat, holding it for prof exempt. The difficulty we are in is not knowing who the next president will be, or what the next direction we take will be. Audrey asked what language in SB 7 were they upset about? Anne responded that they supported the change, but are unhappy with removing the language of academic and academic support positions. Research still needs flexibility. Pete should send our notes to PEERS. He has an email that covers his jurisdiction of his area, and sends it out. So Pete is not just a reporter to go back to PEERS. Chris Johnson was on Mary's email, and he responded strongly that her list for sending out email to her constituents should not include exempt professional staff. He was told that he is CUPEERS. Will Pete get to continue with staff council?

Out of article in S&S, brought up by Audrey; (Senator) Sue Windels said she is not going to sponsor a bill. Higher Ed officials expressed concern that they would have to go to classified to increase their pay? If their positions should be returned to classified positions, that would be a difficult process, is a hot issue for the exempt. They thought they would lose their jobs, because they would have to reapply for their jobs if they were returned to the classified system. The language did not say that would NOT be the case, so it could have attached a very large price tag. Paul W said talking to Jo Romero, you cannot apply a law retroactively. Anne noted that CU attorneys felt that the absence of that kind of language, it could be potentially dangerous to the university, cost wise. Audrey responded that no one came back to this group and said this was an issue. There were a number of issues besides this, the decision relative to the bill at a gathering of higher education. Audrey stated we never got that piece represented here. Anne said Leonard told her to send the draft SB 7 language out to the group to see if it gets support. It didn't provide language to protect the incumbents. Audrey said classified people WERE coerced to go into exempt positions. A bill with this level of complexity must be discussed with multiple groups. Audrey expressed her frustration about this information not being shared earlier, and said it wouldn't have gotten to this level had the information been shared. She re-stated that no one came back to UCSC, even though Anne said she did; Audrey stated UCSC didn't know about it. Classified staff are the ones who lose the potential jobs in the future, not the professional exempt.

Paul W asked how Higher Ed chooses to lobby. Anne responded that it is the CEOs of the multiple institutions. Higher Ed is not a very high powered lobby within the state. President Hoffman last year was at the legislature so much last year, she registered as a lobbyist. The General Professional (GP) positions could be exempted. President Hoffman wanted to make more effective use of the GP series to provide advancement opportunities within the classified system. Jeff Wells had discussed it with President Hoffman, that the Program Assistant series is a dead end.

Pat brought the conversation back to HSC's vacant UCSC position.

As to the exempt position that is vacant for the HSC campus, the bylaws say three from each campus and one alternate, representing professional exempt and classified staff. Audrey asked what the number of meetings a person can miss is. If a person misses three meetings a warning may be sent, if they miss the fourth, they may be replaced. If the exempt doesn't show, and the alternate appears, and the alternate is classified, then it changes the whole dynamic. Paul P says it reads that you just have to hold it open to any kind of employee. Not specific types of employees. Was it an administrative directive by President Hoffman to make professional exempt representation on UCSC mandatory? Another thing you are needing to address, is it three consecutive meetings, or within any one year period? In the past, it was by calendar year. Do you need to go back through past to apply this meeting? Yes, you would have to apply it that way. Will have to check through past roll calls. The executive committee MAY excuse the offending party.

Pat asked whether the group wanted to hold the May meeting, since the conference was only one week prior to the scheduled meeting. Cheryl made a motion to not hold the May meeting, Tim seconded. Next meeting would then be June 9th, at downtown, Pat thinks. Motion passed.

Budget information prepared by Agena was handed out by Pat.

Cheryl motioned to adjourn. 2nd Mary. Motion passed.