

Staff Council Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, December 8, 2004
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
W401 PBB

Present: Nadira Ahmad, Christine Annicella, Cheri Arneson, Lori Bassler, David Bergeon, Linda Bergquist, Ella Born, James Bradley, Lori Cranston, Janet Duncan, Charlie Eastham, Nancy Fick, David Fitzgerald, John Forys, Jo Ann Franklin, Julie Gilmore, Mary Greer, Maggie Hogan, Lisa James, Kristy Johnson, Hazel Kerr, Mark Long, David Martin, Mary Lee Neuberger, Sara Nichols, Janette Pettus, Deb Pfab, Cheryl Reardon, Sandra Reed, Julie Sexton, Sheri Sojka, Duncan Stewart, Rachelle Stewart, Jennifer Tucker-Richman, Jeffrey Wasson, Rhonda Weaver, Michelle Wichman, Kathryn Wynes

Absent: Kimberly Chamberlin, Julee Darner, Kathy Klein, Deborah Kohler, Bonnie McIntosh, Helen Rittenmeyer, Heather Schnoebelen, Keri Semrau, Barbara Spence, Rebecca Stamy, Jan Waterhouse, Al Young

Administrative Liaisons: Susan 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. Staff Council President Cheryl Reardon welcomed those guests attending the meeting by invitation of current Councilors.

1. Review and approval of minutes

- a. Staff Council Meeting Minutes, November 2004. No comments/revisions. Approved as presented.
- b. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, November 2004. A few comments and requests for clarification were made.
- c. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with President Skorton, November 2004. No comments/questions.

2. Comments/Regents Report – Sue Buckley

Sue reminded Councilors of the Board of Regents (BOR) meeting next week, December 16 – 17, in Ames. The BOR Human Resources subcommittee will meet. The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity will give their annual reports. It also is expected that discussion on phased retirement will continue. The BOR is interested in learning about the program at each of the regents institutions and what occurred during the last two years as people entered the program, and specifically what happened to the money that was saved.

Sue mentioned that collective bargaining (with all three contracts) continues in closed session. Sue stated that most Councilors probably are aware that SEIU and Teamsters have been contacting University P & S staff. Sue asked Kevin Ward to provide Councilors with information regarding the process.

Kevin said that HR was asked for a list of employee names, with classification titles, home and work phone and mailing addresses (unless restricted) for staff in a potential Research and Academically Related Professionals bargaining unit. In 1977, the Iowa Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) defined the two P & S units at the University of Iowa, including the tertiary healthcare unit (which is now represented by SEIU) and approximately 78 other classifications in Research and Academically Related professions. Certain other classifications are excluded due to supervisory responsibilities. Up to this point, there has not been an occasion for HR to re-examine the specific list of those classes that are supervisory, that have changed or that have been created since 1977. Kevin then described the process that must be followed to certify a union for collective bargaining: at least 30% of eligible staff must petition PERB demonstrating that they are interested in unionizing; PERB would validate the petition and call for an election; a majority of those voting must vote favorably for a union to be certified as the exclusive representative of staff in collective bargaining. The process demands exercise of free will and interest. The employer cannot “tread” on the employees' rights, nor can they coerce, threaten or intimidate employees. On the part of the union or union supporters, campaigning should not happen in work places or during work time.

Councilors raised a number of questions such as: Are P & S members at other BOR institutions being approached? (KW: The P&S units are specific to the University of Iowa, and he was not aware of any similar interest at other BOR institutions.) Are these groups soliciting faculty as well as staff? (KW: He was not aware of other groups being approached at this time.) How and when would HR clarify supervisory roles? (KW: HR anticipates that they would need to define/clarify supervisory roles prior to developing lists of those eligible to vote. PERB has procedures to follow to clarify the definition of the bargaining unit.) Was the original email widely distributed? (KW: From information staff have shared, it appears that it was widely distributed.) Is there any information available via the web? (KW: Not at this point, HR will provide information if staff express an interest/need.) Sue mentioned again that part of the protocol the union follows, is to evaluate and decide how much interest exists for unionizing. If not much, they may walk away. Sue said that certainly they (HR) are willing to discuss this with Staff Councilors as much as we need. Cheryl said that plans are to discuss this at next week's Executive Committee and try to develop a plan. She asked Sue if there was any archived information they could provide us.

3. Recap of CIC meeting – Born, Gilmore, Ahmad, Sojka

Sheri Sojka gave a short power point presentation that included a list of the members of the CIC Association of Professional Staff Councils (APSC), the group's short-term goals, long-term goals, working goals for this year, and upcoming events.

4. Intellectual property policy – Wheaton & Martin

Bruce Wheaton mentioned that this has been a fairly long process to revise/improve the IPP. He reminded Staff Council of the process: General Council along with [then] Vice President Skorton devised a structure to improve the policy; Bruce, along with Grainne Martin, co-chaired the committee that reviewed about 30 peer institutions' policies. One aim was to make the policy clear and contextually, easy to read. It was

also important to include information on how to interpret the policy. The policy must comply with all state and federal laws and allow the University to meet its various contractual obligations. It is hoped the policy would serve to advance research and scholarship. Efforts were made to have the policy equally applicable to faculty, staff, and students.

Bruce said that as the first revision of the policy made its various rounds (Vice President's group, deans/DEOs, governance groups, etc.), a common concern seemed to be that those individuals who invent/develop patent/copyrights should be better compensated. A key consideration became: Where are you going to get more money for authors/inventors? The idea of a "first fruits" bonus to inventors/authors was developed: that is, the first \$100,000 goes to the inventor/author, then 25% of profits thereafter.

Bruce went on to describe other portions of the policy: patterns of ownership is mostly unchanged from the current policy and the copyright portion, in substance, is much the same as the current policy. Bruce believed that of particular interest to P & S staff, would be that the copyrighted material, at the federal level, is owned by the employer. Bruce said that the most controversial part of the last draft was with regard to patents: Even if the University decided not to patent, the University would not waive the right to patent to the individual. Not a single constituent group supported this idea. With this new draft of the policy revisions: If the University decides not to patent, they will waive the right to the individual to patent, with the caution that it might generate conflict of interest.

Bruce asked if there were any questions or comments that he could pass along to the committee. After a brief discussion of some questions and answers, a motion was made to pass the policy as presented. The motion was seconded and approved by the Staff Council.

5. **Staff Council Business.** Cheryl mentioned the statement, developed by the Faculty Senate and supported by Staff Council, regarding the recent vandalism at Seashore Hall and Spence Labs. At the web site provided, after entering your hawk id, it is possible to scroll through the statement to read for content, and then not sign if you don't agree. Cheryl said that over 600 supporters have signed thus far.

- a. **Outreach and Public Engagement – Born**

- Ella mentioned a suggestion she made to the Executive Committee at their November meeting that perhaps Staff Council could come up with some ideas and ways of participating in "outreach and public engagement" as a group. Councilors offered some ideas and suggestions. Cheryl thought that efforts could be made to develop some of the ideas over the next few months.

- b. **Update on MLK Event – Tucker-Richman**

- Jennifer Tucker-Richman, Chair of the Staff Council Diversity Committee, thanked other committee members for their help in developing the upcoming Martin Luther King kickoff event. The Staff Council kickoff will be held from 3:30 until 4:30 on January 12th in the Art Museum Galleria. President Skorton will give a brief introduction and Marcella David will be one speaker. Some

musicians from the Preucil School of Music will perform. A reception will wrap up the hour. The theme this year is: "Injustice anywhere, is a threat to justice everywhere."

c. By-Laws Committee – Gilmore

Julie asked the Council to accept a friendly amendment to the proposal that was presented at the November Staff Council meeting to amend the current Bylaws with regard to the election procedures. Article X, Section 2 will now read: "Nominations for non-officer Executive Committee positions shall be made at the regular March and April Staff Council meetings. Voting for these Executive Committee positions shall take place at the April meeting." There was no further discussion with regard to the friendly amendment or the original proposal to amend the Bylaws. A motion was made "to accept the Bylaws regarding election procedures as proposed at the November 10, 2004 meeting and amended at today's meeting." The motion was seconded and was approved with no dissents and no abstentions.

Julie then discussed the documents that were distributed with regard to current and proposed committee descriptions. She urged Councilors to review the documents and to send her any comments/suggestions.

Julie also mentioned some discrepancies that have been found when reviewing the Staff Council Bylaws and comparing the Bylaws with the information provided in the University Operations Manual. The Bylaws Committee is working to get the information updated in both locations.

d. Committee to Review/Proposal Teaching Awards for P & S Staff

Cheryl mentioned that Marcia Forsys brought a concern to the Executive Committee at its November meeting. Currently, teaching awards recognize faculty but not any staff who teach. Marcia suggested that perhaps a proposal should be developed to recognize staff who teach. Marcia indicated that she would be willing to serve on a committee to develop the proposal. Cheryl passed around a sign-up sheet and asked Councilors to express their interest in joining the committee.

e. Vice President for Research Interviews – Wichman & Nichols

Michelle said there have been two candidates so far and real good turnout for the Staff Council interviews, especially this past Tuesday. The interview with the candidate on Thursday afternoon will be in the Terrace room at the IMU. Sara said there may be two more candidates next week, but certainly at least one more candidate will be on campus after this week. Sara encouraged Councilors to express their comments about the candidates to her or the committee before they meet again on December 20th at 4:30 p.m. The VPR search committee will make its recommendation to President Skorton by defining the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates.

Michelle also mentioned that Jim Torner has asked for a few staff volunteers to sit on the committee to review the VPR office.

6. Holiday Blood Drive - Mitch Overton

Mitch was not able to attend the Staff Council meeting. Cheryl mentioned briefly what she thought would be Mitch's message: It is especially important to donate at this time of year due to a larger than usual demand for blood over the holidays.

7. Parking and Transportation – Proposal to Increase Parking Rates – Dave Ricketts

Dave mentioned the last rate increase was in FY03 for three yrs. There has been a lot of pressure to expand employee parking and to protect patient parking. Recently they have had to deal with moving employees from Hospital Ramp IV. Dave reminded Councilors that new parking structures are quite expensive at a cost of approximately \$15,000-\$20,000 per parking space. He said that currently about 1200 faculty/staff (mostly staff) and about 1200 students are using the bus program; and there are 750 van pool participants. Dave briefly mentioned the new emergency ride home program that was implemented on December 1st. New revenue sources continues to be a concern for Parking and Transportation (P/T). A new Physician's parking program is being considered that would make available a permit at the full cost of parking in a ramp, \$175/month, and allow the permit-holder to park in any of four hospital ramps. Another program is being considered that might be more helpful to staff. It would be a permit in the form of a day tag: P/T would identify if some parking spaces are available in the hospital ramps and other facilities, information would be posted on the P/T web site, faculty/staff could then buy access to a facility for the next day through HRIS, this program would operate on a first come/first serve basis. Dave said they are hoping to have this program up and running for second semester. Dave said that an ongoing question is how much revenue will we have to put into new facilities? He then discussed the need for rates increases and pointed out that they might need to create a different rate class for the Hancher lot because for the most part it is no longer used as a commuter lot, but rather, more people who work in the vicinity are using it as reserved lot. Dave pointed out that the Parking and Transportation Committee has an active interest in finding more alternatives and aggressively looks for ways to not always build more structures.

Dave then opened the floor to questions and comments. There was considerable discussion with several questions, comments, and suggestions from Councilors. Due to the time constraint, it was decided to ask Dave to return to a future Staff Council meeting for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Ella Born