

# Agenda

# University of Colorado Staff Council

6/9/2005

10:00 AM to 2:30 PM  
CU - Colorado Springs  
Housing Village  
Breckenridge House  
Room 5113

## Attendees:

## Agenda topics

10:00-10:05	Roll Call	Joyce Holliday
10:05-10:10	Approval of Minutes	Pat Beals Moore
10:10-10:15	Introductions	All
10:15-10:30	Review Goals of 2004-2005	Tim Martinez & All
10:30-10:40	Proposed 05-06 Meeting Schedule and Roster	Pat Beals Moore
10:40-11:00	Report on audit of higher education institutions to exempt state jobs from the state personnel system	Audrey Newman
11:00-11:30	Campus Reports: UCCS, UCB, UCDHSC 9 <sup>th</sup> /Fitz, UCDHSC Downtown, System	Campus Representatives
11:30-12:30	Lunch	
12:30-1:15	Update about HR services on UCCS campus	Vickie Hilty, Director of Personnel
1:15-1:30	Human Relations Update - System Administration	Paul Perales
1:30-1:45	Reports: UBAB, Faculty Council Budget Committee, HRPG	Paul Wyles, Audrey Neuman, Pat Beals Moore
1:45-2:30	UCSC Planning: Purpose, Mission, Vision, Website, guest speakers; Retreat, Conference (responsible campus, date, location, theme)	Pat Beals Moore

# Agenda

# University of Colorado Staff Council

6/09/2005

10:00 AM to 2:00 PM

CU - Colorado Springs

Housing Village

Breckenridge House

Room 5113

## Attendees:

Antonette Martinez, Jay Rodenburg, Pat Beals Moore, Susan Barney Jones, Audrey Newman, Paul Perales, Jim Langstaff, Mary Ulibarri, Velma Parker, Betty Heimansohn, Jennifer Lahlou, Shari Patterson, Debbie Lapioli, John Szyrka, Shari Patterson, Tim Martinez

## Agenda topics

10:00-10:05

Roll Call

Joyce Holliday

10:05-10:10	Minutes	Pat Beals Moore
<p>Discussion: Pat handed out hard copies of minutes from February and March. Paul P suggested a change in the February minutes, that the statement contained in the HRPG report about CU not being very good with employee development sounded incorrect and would suggest language changed “CU is continuing in its efforts to improve employee development”. Shari made a motion to approve minutes from February, Debbie seconded. Paul P proposed change. Motion made to accept with changes by Shari, seconded by Debbie. Discussion followed. Audrey noted that the quote in question was made by Costain in regard to an audit report that included this statement. It was stated as a summary of the audit, not a personal opinion. Jim said he thought the statement should remain; he remembered it being said. He then suggested as a friendly amendment that language be included to clarify that the statement came from the audit report. The amendment was accepted by Shari and Debbie. Vote taken on revised amendment. Motion passed. Regarding unfinished business in February minutes, remove sentence about Larry Drees snow and rescue committee. Pat made a motion to remove, Audrey 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote taken; motion passed. Typos pointed out for February 3<sup>rd</sup>. Vote on February 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes as amended. Amended minutes were approved.</p> <p>March minutes – no discussion, vote taken. Minutes approved.</p> <p>April - Pat proposed tabling until next meeting or moving on to discuss after lunch. The group agreed to postpone action on the April minutes until after lunch.</p>		
<p>After lunch a motion was made by Shari to approve April minutes, seconded by Pat T. Typo on page 5 for S&amp;S to S&amp;G Record.</p> <p>Vote taken. Minutes approved.</p>		
10:10-10:15	Introductions	All

10:15-10:30	Review Goals of 2004-2005	Tim Martinez & All
<p>Discussion: Tim presented that several different action items were required of some members to present information. Pete Wolfe reported to Tim – the CU Peers president reported that they are not interested in working with the staff council on the employee rights. Clarification, they are not NOT interested in the issue, just not in working on it with staff council.</p> <p>Formal recognition of shared governance through a joint resolution in collaboration with Rod Muth. The joint faculty/staff committee on mutual concerns has been working on that, but it is not done, meeting is next week.</p> <p>Promotional re-allocation research? Would be at risk in that position. To re-allocate a currently occupied position. Still working with HR directors on promoting within the GP series. Concept applies to all series, per Paul P.</p> <p>Fostering positive change – Pat BM and Debbie L. A February 15, 2005 letter sent to President Hoffman requesting that staff council participate in any implementation of Task Force recommendations. They have received no formal, written response. Suggested that we request to meet with Hank Brown. Pat had sent the letter by email &amp; cc'd UCSC; she can resend this letter to the council by email and to re-issue to Brown.</p> <p>Langstaff – SLC is working with legislators to repeal/amend SB7. We need to work with legislators individually but not on paid time. Langstaff said they are requesting an audit of the exempt system.</p>		
10:30-10:40	Proposed 2005-2006 Meeting Schedule and Roster	Pat Beals Moore
<p>Discussion: Move to change July meeting to July 14. Paul W seconded. No discussion. Vote taken. Passed. May be some Board of Regent's conflicts in the future scheduling.</p> <p>Tim Martinez is planning the retreat. Shari moved to plan the date for the October retreat. October 5, 6, 7 suggested since the UCSC regular meeting is scheduled for Oct. 6. (Wednesday, Thursday, Friday). Vote taken. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion by Pat to include October Business meeting in the retreat. Debbie 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote taken, and passed, motion carries.</p> <p>Pat and Antonette from UCB will plan the staff council conference. Friday, April 28 suggested and to not have the meeting on May 4. UCB will work on location. No speaker in March meeting due to review of Service Excellence Award nominations. Motion made by Shari to cancel the May 4th meeting. Pat 2<sup>nd</sup> motion. Vote taken. Motion passed.</p> <p>Suggestions for conference, location and speakers, send by email to Antonette <a href="mailto:antonette.martinez@colorado.edu">antonette.martinez@colorado.edu</a></p>		
10:40-11:00	Report on audit of higher education institutions to exempt state jobs from the state personnel system	Audrey Newman
<p>Discussion: Legislative audit committee is meeting next week. No decisions yet as to if they will conduct the audit.</p>		

11:00-11:30

Campus Reports: UCCS, UCB, UCDHSC 9<sup>th</sup>/Fitz, Campus Representatives  
UCSHSC Downtown, System

Discussion: UCCS John S - retreat next week with change of officers, getting a new parking garage and losing some other parking lots. New rec center breaking ground January 11. Putting a 200 seat student auditorium in, doing major renovations on this campus next couple years. Have a new dean and equal opportunity person. Had a spring luncheon, well attended and fun and awards were presented to employees.

UCB – Antonette- Yesterday was the annual supervisor appreciation luncheon, Ceal Barry was the guest speaker, Becky Guerriero retired, Patti Zike took that position. The summer retreat next month at the Arapahoe Country Club in Boulder. DiStefano spoke about search for new president and the chancellor and provost positions at their new officer installation last week. Former senator Hank Brown is currently in as the President designee. They are continuing with the search, and will recommend a search for the chancellor's position.

HSC – Audrey - Retreat next Friday, instead of next meeting. Nothing else to report.

Downtown – Mary – Pleasure to have all of you at our campus, it hasn't happened for many years, it was a big to do for us. The staff luncheon was on May 26, with longevity awards, and excellence awards. A Movie clip theme, with mixed results, theme of Titanic, Lucy in the chocolate factory, Overboard. Sue Sethney and Jim Langstaff are the only nominees for staff council on Tuesday, June 14 election. Betsy Rodriguez is representative for the campus staff council. New "old" leaders are stepping up to lead. This is Mary's last meeting.

System – In our infancy, polled staff on the relocation issue, co-chairs put a web site questionnaire for system employees to answer how they felt about the potential move. 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting we had people come from other than the system came and expressed concern about the move. Paul – possibility of having some get acquainted activities, establishing a flyer, etc. Tossing around ideas. Will establish an employee recognition program for system employees. Extending an invitation for the new president to meet with them.

How many employees will be affected (with the possible move)? Answer: they haven't decided yet, there are 3 groups of people suggested (by the task force): president's offices and board of regents offices (55 people); UMS, Treasurer's Office, Risk Management. Survey answers were all over the board. Don't know if they will vote on proceeding with officially researching this possible move at the June 30<sup>th</sup> regents meeting.

11:30-12:30

Lunch

12:30-1:15

Update on HR services on UCCS campus

Vickie Hilty, Director of  
Personnel

UCCS campus is unique by keeping the PeopleSoft entries centralized in their departments. John works in personnel with Vickie. They try to keep everything being done by the book. Vickie reviews all the personnel changes, reviews exempt status. UCCS has approximately 240 classified staff, 80 exempt staff.. About 300 FT faculty, 800-900 part-time faculty. Everything has to be entered and changed into PeopleSoft which is a very complicated process.

The task force recommendations, meeting with state personnel, so don't have as much restriction on classification for promotions. They don't have any personnel over GP4. Above goes unclassified. GP series goes up to 7.

How many promotions for ITP have there been since implementation of that series? 4 in professional series, and a couple in IT series.

Is there a ceiling being created? Number wise we are doing about the same reclassifications within the classified series and the exempt positions. State personnel have been giving some latitude within the reclassification options. Need to broaden the descriptions within the classification. No pressure here to push staff to go to exempt and go out of classified.

Some committee members have heard from confidential sources that there are people on UCCS who are forced to go exempt. About  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the departments it has been initiated by the dept head,  $\frac{1}{4}$  by the employee.

Is that for a vacancy, or a vacant position? Some of both. Vickie talked to all employees here who have been move from classified to exempt. They have not indicated that they felt pressured, and they have to sign a form stating they are aware they giving up their rights by accepting the reclassification.

Is it a true statement that the supervisor is not to contact the employee about changing their classification; that the employer cannot initiate it? That the employee is supposed to do that? Paul P said there are some people out there who think that he/she cannot object, but they can.

Audrey thought Costain said that you cannot be approached by the employer to suggest becoming exempt. Paul clarified that the policy allows the campuses to implement it in their own ways.

Audrey stated there was supposed to be a review of policies across all the campuses and that Kevin Jacobs said at UCDHSC that the employee can not be approached by the supervisor.

Tim suggested that a designated committee member could meet quarterly with the HR director of their campus. Then committee members can report to the staff council the number of reclassifications and personnel changes on their campus. They have had situations where a classified position wanted an exempt position, and they wanted to remain in classified and they have worked with the department to change the classification. It is a common perception that exempted employees can just be let go over night, but that just isn't the case.

As a personnel director, Vickie has to work on both sides.

If you change a position from classified to exempt, do you lose the position number? Yes, it can be abolished, and you may have to create a new position. Senate Bill 7 leaves room for interpretation of the statute in regards to the University. We have to use managerial discretion; employee wishes etc., any position, occupied or new.

Audrey asked, can a GP7 remain a GP7 once the incumbent is gone? Paul said hypothetically yes.

Potentially it could remain a GP7, or could be lowered. We are in an area where we are determining the law within the best benefits for the position in review. There are no guarantees; it is left to the discretion

of the supervisor and the circumstances. There is no rule; there is flexibility within the system within the constraints of the law.

Are you required to review a position when it comes vacant and see if it can be reclassified? Vickie answered no. We don't have the time to do that. We just ask if there have been any changes in the PDQ in the duties of the position. We might ask if they haven't reviewed it for many years, we might suggest the department does that. This is not automatic; it's up to the department.

Pat BM asked how the council might assist in making her job easier. Vickie said this was a great forum to talk and hear what staff questions are.

When a position is posted, is it too late to ask for a change in the classification? It's after the fact that you often find out about the position. You take your own initiative and you ask for a job directly.

Why aren't professional exempt allowed to roll in their PERA? Part of the PERA statute now. Pat BM is going to research this issue to a better understanding. Find out if there is a way for prof exempt to join PERA instead of TIAA/CREF. There is not a conspiracy to steer away from TIAA/CREF. Suggestion to investigate the history of how this happened. Vickie started classified in 72, went exempt in 85 and stayed in PERA, but new employees do not have that option.

1:15-1:30

Human Relations Update – System Administration Paul Perales

Discussion: Presidents Executive Committee has to review recommendation that interim can exceed one year. Can this be perpetual? No limit, potentially. Because there are sometimes situations where the interim needs to exceed the one year limit given the circumstances. Does President Designee Hank Brown become the 21<sup>st</sup> president and if he gets the position, will he be changed to the 22<sup>nd</sup> position? Technically there cannot be an "interim" president.

2<sup>nd</sup> APS – offer letters reviewed by exempt professional offers to have language to clarify they are at will, and ethics. (Administrative Policy Statement)

Resolution in support of staff – Pat BM has prepared a report.

Report on moving the president's office is on the web site with details. There is currently no proposal, just what ifs.

1:30-1:45

Reports: UBAB, Faculty Council Budget Committee, HRPG

Paul Wyles, Audrey Newman, Pat Beals Moore

Discussion: Pat passed out HRPG motion in Support of the State Personnel System at CU. Last met on May 9, 2005, and talked about optional retirement plan. Currently it has a one year waiting period until they can sign up for an optional retirement plan. There is discussion of removing that one year waiting period. Most peer institutions do not have a waiting period, or have a shorter waiting period. Cost of that change is being investigated before they make a decision. There was another presentation of the evaluation form used by exempt professionals, currently there is no standard form for exempt, possibly put online for use.

Motion was made by VP Sweet and Pat Moore. Sweet essentially said that we (administration) accept that we are part of the state personnel system, and we can move forward to make this system work for everybody. It was taken to the President's Executive committee for approval and she asked everyone take it to their groups and ask if there are any reasons why she should not support it. The Executive Committee meets again on June 24<sup>th</sup>. Where will this document reside? In the President's Office and expect she would inform the Regents. Purpose of this? To have the systems working in cooperation within the perimeters. Let Pat BM know of any comments.

HR directors are meeting with DPA. Based on the UCSC letter sent to President Hoffman requesting staff participation in any implementation of Task Force recommendations, Pat was asked if the involvement meant everything having to do with recommendations. This might be a situation where staff might want to be involved. Yes. The council said the employees should be there representing the best interests of their constituents. Pat can make this request, but can't be assured what the response will be.

Paul P commented on the draft APS about interim administrative appointments in response to a query from Jim, who offered UCSC availability to comment. Paul stated it did not come to this group for review because procedural statements need to be recommended beyond the scope of this group. It is the duration piece that is of concern to Jim's constituents. The policy can be changed, the old policy allowed the same practice, the new policy has an explicit statement, and that the intention is not to be limited to a year. Paul can bring this to the group next time, but in reality our input may not have any impact on the decision. He suggested the policy could be reviewed after it is implemented and the group could make a recommendation for change. Jim commented potentially we can have interims serving in perpetuity. We are in a lot of changes with upper administration. We have a lot of people that would like to see the beast settle down.

Audrey reported on the Faculty Council Budget Committee. She stated there was discussion about when the university switched to the fiscal year benefit plan to follow the state system, it was to make it easier to align with the state system for more ease of enrollment in options. Regarding a presentation made by staff of the system budget office during the meeting, she noted a statement about mandatory expenditures including faculty and exempt staff pay raises. She commented that they are not mandated (like classified staff salaries), and asked why they were referred to as mandated. The response was they are considered mandated in the CCHE's mandated costs model. She said the mandate of salary increases is being used against the classified staff. Audrey informed the faculty about what is mandated and what isn't. She said she supports faculty and exempt raises, and said it may be a good business practice, but it isn't mandated. One faculty member told her that classified staff has been getting larger raises than faculty or exempt for years. He was referring to the step system. They don't understand that 5% salary survey increase was just to get classified staff to job rate, and classified staff hasn't been funded for the pay for performance for years to get increases. He said as faculty he has always blamed the classified staff for taking up all the money. Audrey



said it was interesting to hear the perceptions that faculty has about classified staff; that we are gouging them. She feels that all salaries are breaking the bank, not just classified staff. How much work needs to be done to have a dialog to discuss these perceptions and set them straight? There are no more Faculty Council Budget Committee meetings until September. Audrey expressed concern about the way the budget office relays information. To their (faculty members of the budget committee) credit they are willing to listen and debate. Pat commented that she had talked with Richard Blade, who said he appreciated Audrey's service on the Committee, and that Audrey was surprised to hear she is a voting member of the Committee.

1:45-2:30

UCSC Planning: Purpose, Mission, Vision, Website, guest speakers; Retreat, Conference (responsible campus, date, location, theme)

Pat Beals Moore

Pat expressed appreciation for the service of all on the council, it was an interesting year. She also thanked Susan Barney Jones for keeping constituents informed of UCSC meetings through the *Silver & Gold Record*.

Planning for next year and next month, she hopes to put together a vision statement of where we can see things going with this group. For example, be more proactive, policy reviews. We need to work out a process for this. Next month will be Tanya Kelly-Bowry to inform UCSC more on how we can implement processes. We need to update web site. Joyce will work on updating the website. We will also look at budget to hire a student to do that. Pat will get information on accesses for Joyce to be able to edit the website. Maybe we can get a work study to do the web site?

We will work on scheduling the new president to meet with us.

Jennifer will check on availability of Jerry Davies to come back during our July or August meeting to complete the presentation about conflict resolution that was begun at the conference.

ULDI is working on a web-based program that is an introduction to CU, and there is a plan to include information about staff councils. Jennifer will get more information on ULDI for the group.

Dave Makowski to talk about the new student information system update.

Jeremy Hueth is coming next month to talk about what state employee participation in political activities.

Clarification on claiming mileage to meetings is not from home to meeting, but from work location to meeting, per Shari Patterson.