

2-6-2014

## Consultative minutes 02/06/2014

Consultative Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult>

---

### Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 02/06/2014" (2014). *Consultative Committee*. 54.  
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/54>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consultative Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

## CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES 6 Feb. 2014

Members present: Ray Schultz, Joey Daniewicz, Jim Hall, Jim Barbour, LeAnn Dean, Nancy Helsper, Molly Donovan, Heather Wayne, Chad Braegelmann, Jean Rohloff, Allison Wolf, Janet Ericksen (taking minutes)

Guest: Chancellor Johnson

### I. VCAA/Dean position

Background: The chancellor stressed that when Dean Contant left, the campus had a definite need for stability in the position and the situation led to an internal search, from which Bart Finzel emerged as candidate recommended by committee. After Dean Finzel's initial, interim service in the position, the chancellor asked for extension of Finzel's appt. for 2 more years, with the idea that at the end of the 4 year (total) term there would be a national search. Dean Finzel is in his 3<sup>rd</sup> year now, so a search would be next year with the goal of an appointment during 2014-15.

Chancellor Johnson outlined two possible search schedules, one that would begin this semester and one that would begin early in the fall semester. The chancellor's and the Consultative Committee's preference is for the earlier of the two schedules. The basic steps:

1. Chancellor Johnson's consultation with President Kaler about process and preferences (such as for a particular search firm). She can do this at her next monthly meeting with President Kaler, and then we can begin the RFP process to hire a search firm. Chancellor Johnson noted that using a search firm is expensive, but she believes it the right approach to such a hire. Cost will be covered by the chancellor's budget and will not affect other hiring on campus.
2. Consultative and Membership should develop criteria for search committee membership (what kind of make-up, qualifications for chair, and so on). This could happen in March.
3. Consultative meet again and review procedural suggestions (perhaps after discussion with the Membership Committee). Search committee appointed (this could happen in April). Staff support for search committee determined (may have to be purpose-hired).
4. Once a search firm is determined, the first visit from the firm will help us form position description/proposal/calendar. (This might happen in May.)
5. 2<sup>nd</sup> visit of search firm consultant to further refine process. This might come over summer on the earlier schedule, which isn't ideal but might be workable; we wouldn't select cmtte members based on their summer availability, however.
6. Position posting (on first schedule, this would probably occur in Sept.), then proceed as normal (pool > neutral site interviews > campus visits, with possibility of actually being finished in fall semester or early spring).

NOTE: we may not be successful, and going on the earlier schedule would give us a little cushion. If we were to go with the later schedule, we'd choose the search firm in October, which would move us toward end of fall semester in terms of earliest we could bring candidates in. This timeline is a little riskier since if search fails first time, we'd probably be pushed into the following fall.

What can we do in addition to search firm's efforts to recruit candidates? As much as we can think of, including running an ad in *The Chronicle* and sending the posting to any contacts we might have.

II. Civil Service and P&A job family review update regarding its impact on our campus. Chancellor Johnson noted that she had "deep concerns about the whole process," in part because all of the consulting focus groups are at UMTC. While she believes she understands what prompted the review—including perceptions regarding the number of high-level administrators at the U, with too much money going there instead of to direct support of instruction/ mission—the review process is less clear. We have to put information into the evaluation system, and it's then analyzed, but UMM is not at all involved in that analysis. When the results of analysis come back to us, the problems include such things as directors reclassified as managers, leaving us with the option of "working titles" rather than actual titles, but that's not a great solution. Another problem: classifications coming back with salary benchmarks, without clarity as to how that benchmark is being set—is it by UMTC standards? (UMM sets salary benchmarks using CUPA data, which is what the *Chronicle* uses—organized in relation to institutional budget.) The chancellor wonders if money will follow to help with meeting the new benchmarks. This makes projecting or even predicting the effect on our budget is nearly impossible—and all this comes alongside our already established salary goals (re: FacStaff cmte report on salaries), and with no strategic correspondence possible so far. All this could have a significant impact on budget, particularly when the model in operation seems to be set for large campus, tied to numbers in ways that might disadvantage us. Management ladder is tied to our size, and yet our campus much more than UMTC involves individuals wearing multiple hats, doing multiple jobs.

Can we become more involved in this process? We could, perhaps, and there is a process for appeal after a re-classification has been sent to us. Chancellor Johnson is inquiring about the expectations, mandates, and "how come we're not more involved?" The U chancellors group hasn't revisited this topic since they first were informed about it by VP Kathy Brown, and Chancellor Johnson believes it is time to revisit it, so that she in turn can bring some clearer information to UMM (Assembly).