

4-27-2012

Consultative minutes 04/27/2012

Consultative Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 04/27/2012" (2012). *Consultative Committee*. 21.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/21>

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.

Consultative Committee Meeting
April 27, 2012
9:00 am
Moccasin Flower Room

Present: Co-chairs Nic McPhee and Jennifer Zych Herrmann, Chad Braegelmann, LeAnn Dean, Holly Gruntner, Manjari Govada, Nancy Helsper, Dennis Stewart, Bonnie Tipcke

Absent: Troy Goodnough, Brook Miller, Zac Van Cleve, Jim Barbour

Visiting the Consultative Committee was Chancellor Jacquie Johnson, who explained some ideas that will be put into effect during the coming academic year.

Johnson reminded the Committee that we had previously discussed the wisdom/ possibility of moving into talent management tracks, and creating a culture of opportunity tied to recruitment and retention. To clarify, she added that while there are similar needs in collective bargaining unit areas, we're bound by contracts in those areas. So specifically, the opportunities she was going to talk about would relate to P&A, not collective bargaining.

1. Athletics: Create three assistant athletic director positions. This would take some burden off Mark Fohl, in addition to allowing talented head coaches to gain additional experience. Sandy is currently working on position descriptions with Mark. When they are finished, coaches will be able to apply for positions.
2. Promotion in Alumni Relations: from coordinator to assistant director position. This will acknowledge the kind of growth and service we've seen in an individual in that area. The Foundation has a set of guidelines they provide: degrees earned, performance review, etc. UMM is trying to develop similar guidelines.
3. Associate Vice Chancellor: Maddy Maxeiner has been the associate for many years, but people don't know that she has that position. When Johnson first became Chancellor, there were three associate vices. She'd like to see Maxeiner move from associate to vice chancellor.
4. Library: There are currently five people who have the same rank. One of the individuals who has been here for a long time should be moved up in rank.

In short, explained Johnson, if someone wants to be here for four, five, or six years, there should be opportunities to move up in the ranks.

Additionally, there are guidelines associated with some of the promotional opportunities: any P&A promotion has a salary increase of \$1,900.

Thinking about the campus response, we have identified resources that will be added to the pool in both the faculty and P&A areas. We think we have \$120,000 in addition to the 2.5% pool increase. We don't yet have the budget from the Twin Cities, but they'll likely have it for us in the next few weeks; maybe we'll get additional resources there.

Nic McPhee: I think creating opportunities for people to move up is important. It seems like there are two distinct mechanisms: 1) Hiring people into new kinds of positions, and 2) Promotions. I think it will be important to convey to campus that both are happening, and that they'll be handled differently. There is worry on campus about the 'pluck and anoint' thing, however; people need to know that these are fair processes. There has to be a sense that everyone has a chance to apply.

Johnson: I appreciate what you're saying. One of the challenges we have is that there are a few areas where multiple people would be contenders, and some areas where there is only one person. In those cases it's been the nature of the conversation that there needs to be an open application process for people who meet criteria, but in areas where there's one person, we don't want to lose people where we don't have more.

Dennis Stewart: I wonder if we're really creating an illusion of not plucking and anointing. We're going to say that everyone can apply, and then we're going to go ahead and pick that person anyway. It's a waste of time for people to be applying for a job that they can't reasonably get.

McPhee: But if there are criteria, hopefully people who don't meet it will realize and not apply.

LeAnn Dean: Criteria librarians discussed and brought forth were modeled after the Twin Cities. There's no anointing; you've had this amount of years here, this amount of service, and this amount of professional activity. Within a certain amount of years, all of us should be able to move through the ranks unless you're not doing your share of service. It's up to the individual.

McPhee: But there are some things where we only need one person or a few, the library idea is that everyone can move up at some point.

Bonnie Tipcke: I appreciate that this is mainly about faculty and P&A, but the staff contract does not require job openings to be decreased, and that's what's been happening. AFSCME people are unable to get promotions. So on one end it seems like if we value an AFSCME position, they're put into civil service, and then they continually feel like they're not valued. If we think a position should be AFSCME, it's lowered before it's opened up.

Johnson: We've had good conversation about this before. Something else we need to pay attention to is that some entry-level positions are kind of low floor, and there isn't any place for them. There aren't promotional tracks' there isn't any way for them to advance. That's not to say that I'm not sensitive to what you're saying. It's a conversation about the whole workplace, and how we regard/respect the employees who are here.

Tipcke: It does take us well over 27 years to get from bottom to top. I'll get 1% while everyone else is getting 2% because I've reached the plateau.

McPhee: If we want AFSCME people to move through the system over time, we want classifications. Should we look at distribution (more at low end?) to see if it makes sense for the university?

Tipcke: That would be one thing in the contract. If I want to do any more, I have to do a JEQ. It's a horrendous process.

Johnson: JEQ results in people moving into civil service. I have asked Sarah Mattson to plot what the net impact is in terms of AFSCME positions and civil service.

Chad Braegelmann: How many steps are there for your level?

Tipcke: 27 steps. There are people who have been here for 30 years and aren't at the top because some years, steps are frozen.

Braegelmann: We get hired as a head coach and that's it. There aren't steps.

LeAnn: The problem with JEQ is that they're laborious, and they don't pertain to UMM. As you're advocating for it, you get a sense that there's someone there determined to contradict.

Johnson: We've had three successful JEQs this year that have gone through. I've looked at one of them. They're horrendous.

McPhee reminds the group to move on to Johnson's next topic.

Johnson: Phase 2 of resource allocation review process. Three groups have been working; will hopefully disband by end of the semester. The next group forming will be called the Evaluation Team. They'll be applying rubrics to the data we've gathered. Do you have advice about composition of that team? What the role of students should be in application of these units? We've thought that it would a smaller group. Suggestions (consistencies, not names)?

McPhee: Just to clarify, the Evaluation Team takes data and condenses it into something. And then there's a third group that condenses that and makes action recommendations?

Johnson: Hopefully the Evaluation Team will finish early in the Fall Semester.

McPhee: I think students should be on it. Good if at least some people carry over, but some of those people probably need a break.

Manjari Govada: Especially being one of the students, I think it's important to have us in the group, to have that perspective, and who can talk about how things will affect students. Speaking to your other point, I think there's definitely burnout that happens. If you can find people who can put in more time over the summer, that's great, but it may be a challenge to find people to stay.

Johnson: It's the Evaluation Team's job to take the rubric and apply it to the information, and to generate a list of priorities, not to talk about implementation.

McPhee: Given the importance of the work, it can't appear to be whoever is in town that weekend. It has to look like it wasn't just a matter of convenience.

Govada: I can compile a list of interested students.

Johnson: It's an interesting process; it gives the opportunity to look at something broader than just your area of interest.

Jen Herrmann: How does it work if you have a tie to what you're evaluating? Maybe it's fine, but there needs to be a balance. It's hard to be objective when your own future is at stake.

LeAnn: So if there are different areas, maybe don't evaluate the areas you're part of.

Herrmann: We've talked about having more people, and making subcommittees for different areas. I don't know how to avoid bringing bias in. But I can't imagine excluding people who have expertise...in a perfect world, if the rubric is good enough, it shouldn't matter.

We've also talked about doing practice runs; let people see how it works. There have to be people who know the areas.

When this kind of work has happened at other institutions, it's been happening in academic areas alone. I don't know of another institution that's taken on all areas, including direct support for student programs, etc.

It's taking a long time, but it's really important work.

McPhee: (new topic) LeAnn wants to move Jacquie's name from the beginning of the February 24th minutes

Holly Gruntner moves, McPhee seconds, unanimous vote (minus Govada's abstention) strikes Johnson's name. I think this referred to not attributing a comment to me. However, if we put that discussion back in the minutes, with attribution, it's still problematic. Could we just say the minutes, as amended, were approved?

McPhee: Any comments on the April 20th minutes?

Herrmann: Change the bullet to "Nancy suggested sharing the mission of the University"

Herrmann moves, Gruntner seconds, and unanimous vote changes the bullet point.

McPhee: Document from Brook and Troy on Consultative Committee process. Has been shared through Google Docs. Committee may not finish discussion on the document, but that could be continued next year.

McPhee: For Assistant Division Chair in Humanities:

New Division chair came in saying I'll only take the job if I can have an assistant, told Bart they wanted their assistant to be Julie. No one else had the chance to say, well, I'd like a chance to apply for that position. People were interested, but there was no discussion.

Dennis: Seems like we could have had a process, and it still would have been Julie.

Nic: This will be Bart's argument, that they wanted Julie, that that would have been the result regardless.

Chad: You go through the process. What hurts more: not having a chance, or having a chance, going through the process, and then not getting the position.

Dennis: Usually, you look at who will complement me well. I want to pick the person I will work best with.

Nic: I think that Bart will probably say something like that.

Dennis: I understand why people want to be promoted; I would be annoyed too...

Nancy: This also happens at the very highest levels. When a new president comes in, people know he/she'll pick their team.

Bonnie: I think plucking and anointing goes on at all levels...

Nic: Is the position even going to exist? There was one, there wasn't one, there is one. There's no coherence.

Nic: Is there anything people want to change about the email to Bart before I send it?

Jen: Other document in Google Docs, take a look at it.

Adjourned 10:05 am

Minutes Respectfully submitted by Holly Gruntner