

MINUTES

UAF STAFF COUNCIL MEETING #78
Wednesday, February 7, 1996
Wood Center Ballroom

I Marie Scholle called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

MEMBERS PRES9

WHEREAS, The UAF Staff Council strongly believes that staff and faculty issues can best be communicated to the Board of Regents in person, and

WHEREAS, The UAF Staff Council strongly believes that the Board of Regents would greatly benefit from having staff and faculty representation available to express staff and faculty opinions when necessary, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Staff Council strongly encourages the Board of Regents to adopt the recommendation to have a representative from both the faculty and staff governance bodies participate at the table as ex-officio members during Full Board and standing committee meetings. Open lines of communication will only further strengthen the University of Alaska system and this is the first step in the right direction.

DATED THIS 7th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1996.

III Guest Speakers

Question: Currently, until your unit has been specifically targeted to evaluate all its job, then only jobs that have had a change in tasks and responsibility.

Response: If that's the case, then there won't be any problem with that. It will take/require chancellor's sign off. Chancellor's have agreed that they will take the responsibility for reviewing that material and making that decision, so that someone who happens to be in a rich department just does not get the advantage of that. But yes absolutely, we do not intend to freeze people who's jobs have truly changed. And particularly I am not aware of a major reorganization on this campus, but on UAA, they are talking about recombining schools and colleges and there may be some jobs that change significantly but don't require either a promotion or demotion process or a direct hire process, but that are simply jobs changing substantially and there will be provisions for that. We're talking about pay change as a result of just completing this project. I also want to go on record and make it very clear, we are not saying we will not adjust pay at the end of this project. We're going to look at everybody, ok where is everybody, where do they fall in the range, how does this relate to their years of service.

Question: The only difficulty I have with that is at the end of a project, if we go to adjust pay with somebody who is a Fund 2 person, we're unlikely not going to be able to do that unless we fund it out of our own general fund at the institute. So in other words, if we go for 6-8 months and at that end of that time through a routine evaluation we have decided that this position needed to go up a grade, we're going to have a tough time collecting those monies from the funding agencies. We have gone retroactive pays before and for a largely Fund 2 organization, it is a major nightmare. We need to really implement pay changes as they occur so we can reflect those costs.

Response: What I am saying is that's why we're going to take a look at the whole project at the end, the impact, the affordability, the fairness, the equity and we will do it as a whole at the end as it is possible to do. So all those things will be taken into account.

Question: Is there a target date when all these job evaluations will be completed?

Response: We're hoping by early fall, September/October. Jim is meeting with Personnel directors on February 16. They are going to then review the scope of the project, make an assessment, the number of jobs to be done on their campus and develop a plan unit by unit that conforms and allows the units; obviously you are not going to do a grant unit in the middle of the fiscal year change. So they are going to try and give units enough warning and it may be and this has not been decided, and it may be that UAF decides to do some family group, some job groups all together. I don't know exactly what, but it won't be a secret once they have made those determinations. I am sure that Jeanne Freeman will let you know and Jim is working very closely with the campuses and following the lead of the campuses ability to do this and complete this. We are trying to set realistic time frames and goals. It is clearly Vice Chancellor Rice's intent that this occurs in a fairly short time frame. Jobs are not static, they change all the time and the quicker we can do this and put an end to this project the better it is. So we are not intending to drag this out two years.

Question: How about the folks who have been evaluated in the last six months to a year? Do they in fact get increases, correct?

Response: Yes.

Questions: Your holding off the salary increases until a point in the future and yet if someone is hired new in that same position and I have the job evaluated as a new

hire; a new hire could conceivably come in at a higher rate than someone that has been in the job an extended period of time.

Response: You're absolutely right about that. At the end of this project, I would say as a given, we can't have anyone in a job grade that is below step A. I mean, I think that is a self-evident fact. We are not going to take someone who has gone from a 76 to a 78 and leave them in the middle of range 76 and not even at step A of 78. That can't be. But we are going to take a look at the entire project before we make adjustments and those are the kinds of equity issues we absolutely have to look at because that would be manifestly unfair. And this, by the way and I say this in my narrative, has absolutely have nothing to do with your annual step increases that will start on your anniversary date effective July 1. All of those are going forward.

Questions: For those people who have just gotten evaluated this year and have gotten a notification that as of July 1 they were going to go down, are they on hold or are these expected on July 1 to take a step down?

Response: Everyone, up and down, is on hold.

Questions: Could you please clarify that? People who just had gotten evaluated in the past year we're talking about now, did in fact those people get increases or are they on hold as well?

Response: Some have and I cannot and I regret the fact that there are some people whose jobs are exactly the same as they have been doing for two years, who may indeed already received an increase. But as a public employer, we cannot take pay away. They have made plans. I know that creates some discrepancy, but if you look at any pay grade, I can show you the pay rates of people along the pay grade, even before we started this evaluation project and when we look at the new schedule there are people who have been here two years who are in the middle of the schedule and there are people who have been here 10 years who are out at the beginning because we had no order on our pay practice. And so I agree that that's one more sad thing that happened that I think at the end of this there will be some firm rules in place and there will be a sense of equity when we complete the project as a whole.

Question: All the people now who have been evaluated through or since Jim Kessler has come aboard are frozen until the whole project is completed?

Response: We are not going to be releasing the results until we get the whole thing. And I will also tell you that it would not be fair to those being evaluated now, that we would not look at what's been done in the last year. We will look at what's been done in the last year and I am not saying that I think there is anything wrong with what's been done in the last year, but if at the end of the project we have the whole picture and see somebody sore thumbing out here in an 81 whose job really is comparable to a whole group of jobs at grade

Questions: The problem is no body knows what's going on. And in fact, a new person was hired and no body said to do things differently or don't give a pay raise. There just has been no word.

Response: I repeat this evaluation project was not long standing. It was just confirmed last week on Wednesday in the chancellors' meeting. I am not keeping anything from you. This has not been a secret plot. There was no secret about Jim's hiring. That was well publicized and well communicated last summer. The process took quite awhile and he came and I don't remember, early December/November. There were representatives of each of the campus participated in the hiring process. So.

President Scholle thanked Patty Kastelic for speaking at the meeting; and also recommended that staff representatives met with Personnel and Vice Chancellor Rice to increase the flow of communication on the evaluation project.

B. Jim Kessler, Job Evaluation Coordinator, Statewide Human Resources - Did not attend the meeting.

IV Governance Reports

A. Faculty Senate - D. Lynch

The Faculty Senate is looking closely to the proposed changes to Regents Policies. The Senate has an active committee addressing faculty and grade appeals. The dispute resolution has been carefully addressed and policies on patents and copy rights are being addressed.

B. ASUAF - J. Hayes

Joe Hayes is the President of ASUAF and the student Regent. Joe Hayes was thanked for recommending that a staff member serve on the Board committees. There is a 1 1/2% decrease in enrollment and a 4% decrease for the academic year. Ideas are being solicited for increasing recruiting and retention. Joe suggested that each staff member can act as an ambassador for the University. The positive aspects of the University must be communicated to the community and not dwell on the negative. This will assist with the recruiting. The media has a habit of focusing on the negative aspects. Student leaders will be lobbying the legislature while in Juneau. A tuition freeze is a high priority on the students' agenda. Representatives asked Regent Hayes views on the deferred maintenance funding and holding people accountable. Regent Hayes stated the Board is trying to find out who is actually held accountable. UAF has good intentions, but this item should have been brought back before the Board. The whole process needs to be looked at.

Representatives asked for clarification on the 1.6% merit increase for faculty. This is not a merit increase, but a faculty compensation schedule. Staff has a separate compensation schedule. The faculty currently do not like the compensation schedule and there is talk of unionization. Vice President Redman included faculty compensation as a separate appropriation in the University operating budget. The outcome of the University budget will depend on what is approved by the legislature.

V The Council took a five minute break.

VI Committee Reports

A. Rural Affairs - B. Oleson

There was no report. The committee chair was ill and the meeting will be rescheduled.

B. Information Coordinating - R. Pierce

The following information was distributed as a handout for accessing legislative bills via e-mail. Open Netscape. At the location bar, type:
<http://www.legis.state.ak.us/> This will give you a menu of Alaska Statutes, Alaska Information (such as the

constitution), and Current Legislative Information. Click on the: 19th (1995-96) legislature bill tracking and information. Then click on the 'document' box. This will give you access to all the proposed bills on the 19th Legislature. You can then select a bill by number or sort alphabetically by subject. All the bills pertaining to the University are listed under the topic University. President Scholle and President-elect Pierce have a full schedule of meetings with legislators and the Lt. Governor while in Juneau.

2 adayings with6(e scrd)-4-4661(-4withbesident)]TJ T* [s

1 adayings withfe6(billsaymt)-he (C.)-31(iFALL and)-4EMESTERE

Staff Council moves that the Job Evaluation Committee at UAF be reinstated and that all UAF jobs evaluated by the system job evaluation coordinator be reviewed by the UAF Job Evaluation Committee.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: This committee has functioned very well in the past. The review would provide a check on a single person's evaluation of a large number of positions within a short time frame.

MOTION TABLED (unanimous)
=====

The UAF Staff Council moves that procedures be put in place with suspense times to be met when a position is to be evaluated.

EFFECTIVE: Upon UA President's Approval

RATIONALE: Currently a position evaluation is to be accomplished by the job evaluation coordinator at Statewide. There are no established submittal procedures nor suspense times or review processes. These procedures would eliminate confusion, provide a tracking system, and speed up the process.

D. Elections, Membership, & Rules - L. Bender

1. Motion to confirm Staff Council Committees

Representatives were asked if they would like to change committees. Michelle Thomas asked to be on Staff Training. A motion was made and seconded. The vote was unanimous. Representatives were also asked to think about the position of president-elect. If you are interested, contact Marie Scholle at FNMMS or Ron Pierce at rpierce@gi.alaska.edu.

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)
=====

The UAF Staff Council moves to confirm the following committee assignments:

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Tim Bauer
Laura Bender
Barb Oleson
Grant Matheke
Ron Pierce
*Marie Scholle

RURAL AFFAIRS, Continued

Marie Scholle
Sue Wilken
Crystal Wilson
Mari Yates

ELECTIONS, MEMBERSHIP & RULES

*Laura Bender
Kim Fisher
Linda Ilgenfritz
Shawn Jordan
Marty Thomas

STAFF AFFAIRS

Peg Banks
Jay Barr
Kate Barr
Beth Bergeron
Dean Gramling, Jr.
JeRome Johnson
Ruth Kiser
*Grant Matheke

INFORMATION COORDINATING

Sandra Boatwright
Kathy Gruenig
J. Carter Howald
Deborah Mercy
*Ron Pierce
Gabrielle Scalise

Lynn Murphy
Barb Oleson
Jeff Pederson
Ron Pierce
Cheryl Plowman
Cheryl Sullivan
Cindy Wilson

RURAL AFFAIRS

Elaine Bublitz
Dixie Emery
Susan Gal
May Kenworthy

STAFF TRAINING

Peg Banks
Diane Leavy
Julene Lowdermilk
Kathy McGill

Dee McDaniel
*Barb Oleson

Darlette Powell
Elizabeth Ritchie
Pam Sowell
Michelle Thomas

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

E. System Governance Council - M. Scholle

Most of the issues were covered in the President's Report. There will be a convocation of all the faculty,

Submitted by Kathy McGill, Governance Office.