

**Staff Council Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, March 9, 2005**  
**2:30 - 4:30 p.m.**  
**Rembolt Room 115 CDD**

**Present:** Chris Annicella, Cheri Arneson, Lori Bassler, David Bergeon, Linda Bergquist, Ella Born, Kimberly Chamberlin, Lori Cranston, Janet Duncan, Charlie Eastham, Nancy Fick, David Fitzgerald, John Forys, JoAnn Franklin, Lisa Marie James, Kristy Johnson, Hazel Kerr, Kathy Klein, Deborah Kohler, Mark Long, David Martin, Sara Nichols, Janette Pettus, Deb Pfab, Cheryl Reardon, Sandra Reed, Helen Rittenmeyer, Heather Schnoebelen, Keri Semrau, Julie Sexton, Sheri Sojka, Barbara Spence, Duncan Stewart, Rachelle Stewart, Jennifer Tucker-Richman, Jeffrey Wasson, Jan Waterhouse, Michelle Wichman, Kathryn Wynes, Al Young

**Absent:** Nadira Ahmad, James Bradley, Julee Darner, Julie Gilmore, Mary Greer, Maggie Hogan, Bonnie McIntosh, Mary Lee Neuberger, Rebecca Stamy, Rhonda Weaver

**Administrative Liaisons:** Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President and Director of Human Resources; Kevin Ward, Senior Associate Director of Human Resources

**The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.**

Cheryl welcomed the newly elected Staff Councilors who are visiting today's meeting. Coffee mugs were presented to each Staff Councilor as a thank you gift for this year's work and as a way to increase Staff Council's visibility on campus.

Informational item: Cheryl shared a thank you letter from Charlotte Westerhaus, Assistant to the President and Director of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, for Staff Council's approval of the new diversity position description initiative for P&S pay grades 12 and above.

**1. Review and approval of minutes**

- a. Staff Council Meeting Minutes, February 9, 2005. Approved as submitted.
- b. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, February 16, 2005. No comments.
- c. Executive Committee Meeting with President Skorton, February 22, 2005. A question was asked about the scope of the proposed Charter Committee on Diversity. Sue Buckley indicated that the Charter Committee would replace the current UI Diversity Committee.

**2. Comments/Regents Report, Sue Buckley**

- a. **The Board of Regents** is meeting next week at ISU. The HR Committee will meet. The agenda includes collective bargaining and the new furlough option.
- b. **Position Expectations.** A draft proposal is included in the meeting packet. The proposal is to include qualifications in all P&S position descriptions in the following categories: 1) Civil and Respectful Interactions, 2) Diversity and Inclusion, 3) Leadership Accountability, and 4) Learning and Professional Development. The

purpose is to infuse in position descriptions those qualifications that are important to the UI in all P&S job classifications. These expectations will also be incorporated into performance evaluations. There are three general levels of expectations within each category. Departments will need to tailor the general expectations to meet the needs of the individual department and position. The following comments/questions were offered:

- Are there similar expectations for faculty? Sue is not aware of any such expectations.
- There was a suggestion to edit the Managerial/Leadership level of Diversity and Inclusion. The commenter was asked to send the suggestion directly to Sue Buckley.
- There was a question about the use of “unquestionable” in the Executive level of Civil and Respectful Interactions. The commenter was asked to send the comment to Sue.
- There was a question about how these expectations would be incorporated in advertisements. These will become part of the job responsibilities. Ads typically list qualifications. Job descriptions are sent to applicants, and the expectations would be in the job descriptions.
- There was a concern about adding more points to a performance evaluation tool when a supervisor has the responsibility to perform many evaluations.
- A comment was made that these expectations will be helpful because such expectations are not always assumed.
- The question was asked whether these same expectations will be included for positions in classification 98 (high level positions). Sue indicated that they will be.
- It was noted that the expectations are aligned with the statement of ethics for staff.
- A concern was expressed about including behaviors in the list of job responsibilities. There could be a very long list of expected behaviors. HR tried to focus on very core, basic behaviors.
- The expectations may strengthen the opportunities for staff to attend professional development activities in these areas.
- There was a concern that education will be needed when these expectations are made effective.

A motion was made and seconded that the proposal be endorsed. The motion carried with 0 opposed.

- c. **P & S Salary Survey.** Last year’s survey looked at FY03 data. This year’s survey looks at current FY05 data. Bob Millsap and Trevor Glanz discussed the results. Copies of the survey were distributed. HR surveyed the Big Ten as well as the University of Arizona, University of North Carolina, and UCLA which are considered peer institutions. The non-Big Ten data is not included in report, but was reviewed to determine if it was consistent with Big Ten results. The UI is different than many Big Ten institutions in that we have a University-owned hospital, and we are not located in major urban area. HR also utilized some specialized surveys for athletics, information technology, libraries, and hospitals. If no specialized survey was available for a classification, then the CUPA survey was used. HR obtained data on 174 UI positions, which includes 2559 UI employees or 58% of the employee population. HR reps were asked what specific classifications they would like to have reviewed and those were included in the survey. HR did not include data for a classification if less than four

institutions had equivalent positions. The survey examines average salaries for the classification, not considering benefits. The UI salaries surveyed averaged .02% above the survey mean. (Last year's survey indicated that UI salaries were 2.4% above the mean.) 5.9% of employees were 20% or more below the mean. For those classifications, departments need to be asked for information as to why those classifications are in that range, and adjustments need to be made if appropriate. Past salary letters have encouraged departments to take advantage of the allowed flexibility to address salaries of research staff, but the overall change has not been significant. The following questions/comments were offered:

- How will the other 42% of employees know how they compare? There are some limitations in that other institutions may not have similar positions against which to compare in some classifications. If a department requested review of a particular classification, HR will make an effort to obtain relevant data in other ways. At the June CIC meeting, UI will propose that CIC make a concerted effort to gather information on research positions so that meaningful comparisons can be made across institutions.
- What is the purpose of the survey? To provide a benchmark so that UI salaries can be evaluated. The survey focuses attention on classifications that are far below the mean to determine why they are so far below.
- How is the information meaningful when UI is competing for staff members against private sector or the non-university public sector arena. UI is required to follow the principle of comparable worth. Salaries are not primarily market-based. If departments can make a strong case that a particular salary needs to be higher based on the market, that information will be considered.
- When will the results be public? It is already public. HR is sharing the results on campus.
- It was suggested that HR review the average salaries for classifications that are not included, to see how they compare with those that are included.
- HR and EOD also perform an annual equity study that looks at differences in salaries based on gender and race. This process has been done for 3 years so far.
- President Skorton's focus on faculty salaries coupled with these survey results may result in P&S salaries being overlooked.

**d. Salary Policy.** It is critical to discuss the principles that will guide this year's salary policy because decisions are made quickly at the end of the year. Sue recommends that Staff Council provide input as soon as possible. A fundamental issue to be considered is how to balance the need for flexibility with the need to insure fairness/equity. Sue asks Staff Council to consider two issues: 1) Historically, the UI philosophy has been to pay employees based on performance, and without regard to funding source, and with the college or division coming in with an overall specific average, and 2) the more recent UI practice of establishing a salary policy based on a range of acceptable increases rather than a specific number. Sue suggests that Staff Council discuss these issues and make recommendations. The following questions/comments were offered:

- A system that limits flexibility reduces the opportunity for favoritism.
- Risk of furlough is much greater for staff on grant funding, even for long-term employees. Higher salaries for these employees are warranted to offset that risk.

- When employees change jobs within the UI, equity issues may result in the new department.
- Many departments may not have understood that they could give higher increases to RA's without taking money away from others. The salary letter should make that clearer to departments.

Cheryl will send out an email to all Staff Councilors tomorrow to ask for input/feedback. The Executive Committee will consider all comments when formulating input on behalf of Staff Council.

### 3. Staff Council Business

- a. **Nominations for Executive Committee.** First call for nominations was made. There are four open positions in addition to the five officers. The following nominations were made: Sheri Sojka, Dave Bergeon, Jeff Wasson, Nancy Fick, Ella Born, Kim Chamberlin, Sandy Reed, Dave Fitzgerald. Nominations will also be taken at the April Staff Council meeting, and the election will follow.
  - i. A motion was made to review the possibility of balancing Executive Committee membership based on the number of Staff Councilors in each category.
- b. **Election of Officers.** Each candidate gave 2 minute presentations.
  - i. Budget officer: Lori Cranston
  - ii. Secretary: Mary Lee Neuberger (statement read by Ella Born)
  - iii. VP/President Elect: Jan Waterhouse

The election was held and the results were reported by Mark Long, Elections Committee Chair. Mark reported that the vote was unanimous for all three officer candidates.

- c. **Peer Support Group Report, Ella Born.** Ella distributed a written report. Ella provided overview of the purpose of the program. The committee not limited to Staff Councilors. The committee has met twice this year, and had only five contacts this year.
- d. **Credentials Statement, Kathryn Wynes.** HR Committee was asked by Executive Committee to discuss the issue of staff credentials being shown in a consistent manner. The HR Committee has provided a written statement of its position, and the statement is included in the meeting packet. The HR Committee suggests that the statement be distributed to HR Reps so that it can be utilized within their departments. The following comments were offered:
  - Should this be a standard practice across the UI? The HR Committee felt it more appropriate for each unit to decide what is appropriate for their area dependent on the standards of their unit.
  - The College of Nursing has indicated that it will list staff credentials on its web site.
  - A suggestion was made that if a publication lists faculty credentials, staff credentials should also be listed. Kathryn Wynes suggests that each unit make that determination.
  - Executive Committee may forward this statement to President Skorton and Provost Hogan and ask them to endorse that this as an important issue. Executive Committee will follow-up to find out what action has been taken.

- HR will forward the statement to HR unit reps as well.

**e. League of Women Voters Open Forum with local legislators, Sara Nichols.** Staff Council and Faculty Senate Government Relations Committees are sponsoring an event on March 26, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. The Committee asks input as to questions to pose at the outset of the event, and invites Councilors to attend. Last week, the Committees traveled to Des Moines to meet with the Johnson County delegation at the state legislature. The legislators asked those who attended to gather volunteers from outside the Iowa City area to write letters to their representatives in support of the Board of Regents Partnership plan and for the cigarette tax.

**4. Year end activities.**

- a. Annual Report to Council, Cheryl Reardon.** Cheryl provided a year-end report. Four goals were established at the Staff Council retreat at the beginning of the year. Cheryl discussed Staff Council's primary accomplishments for the year and the progress toward those goals. Certificates were presented to outgoing Councilors.
- b.** Gifts were given to Cheryl to express Staff Council's appreciation of her leadership this year. The gifts were a plaque and a gift certificate to Iowa City Landscaping.

**The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by  
Jan Waterhouse, Secretary