

Administrative Professional Council
Business Meeting Agenda
February 27, 2017 – 8:30-10:30 a.m.
LSC 372-74
MINUTES

Members Present:

Matt Klein (1), Lynn Borngrebe (2), Dawn Nottingham (2), Barb Gustison (3), Shay Webb (4), Ann Bohm-Small (5), Catherine Bens (5), Caitlin Kotnik (6), Mike Katz (6 alternate), Catherine Douras (7), Rick Novak (7), Kimberly Cox-York (8), Shannon Dale (8), Rosanna Bateman (9), Jessie Stewart (9), Gretchen Peterson (10), Jessica Cox (11), Lisa Metz (11), Shaila Parshar (11), David Jones (12), Brian Newell (13), Anita Pattison (13), Tenley French (14), Collette Hageman (14), Lesley Jones (14), Trevor Eyden (15), Ruth Willson (15), Joanna Holliday (At-Large), Edit Szalai (At-Large), Shannon Wagner (At-Large), Toni-Lee Viney (Chair), Deborah Yeung (Vice Chair), Stacey Baumgarn (CPC Chair), Bob Schur (Compliance), Sara Colorosa (alternate)

I. Call to Order: 8:34am

II. Announcements

- New member welcome
- APC Idea Box
- March 3 - MSFN Distinguished Service Award – nominations due by 5 pm
- March 13 – Lynn Johnson, Martín Carcasson, and Dave Bradford – Parking Updates
- April 4 – APC Luncheon, make sure to RSVP using link
- April 10 – Mary Ontiveros, Vice President for Diversity: Campus Climate Survey

III. Guest Speaker: Tony Frank, Chancellor and President of CSU and Lynn Johnson, Vice President of University Operations: Conversation about Employee Issues

- This annual meeting typically serves as a general discussion for at large issues on campus. We have drafted a memo including goals and themes currently of interest to the APC and APs at large to inform the conversation we have. The memo was distributed among the APC prior to this meeting.
- Dr Frank starts by thanking us for our time and efforts for these organizations. One of the challenges is getting supervisors to recognize shared governance and carving out the time to be here so he recognizes that. He reflected that this is his 9th year as president. Over the years, as numbers have shifted from classified personnel to AP positions, the challenges of career ladders and salary compensation continue to be prominent within the conversation. Many of these metrics are hard to track but given AP is the largest employment group, such issues need to be addressed in more than an ad hoc manner. Addressing such difficult issues as those prompted in the memo (such as salary compensation and raises) takes time and dedication and HR has been working to help the campus in their understanding of the process. Dr Frank is optimistic that in the next few years we will make progress. "Thanks for your patience and continuing to push us on this."
 - Compensation remains the biggest concern both in this and the other employee groups. He acknowledges that they continue to hear this as a concern across state classified and faculty as well.
 - Background on the issue: EBC (Executive Budget Committee) has gone through the budget processes throughout the past years. Discretionary spending in the past has gone to compensation (not benefits...). Feedback from that time period brought

General Note:

Bolded committees have requested to provide a verbal report. All others will submit a written report. Every committee is listed on the agenda as a reminder of the committee obligations and relationships of APC.

***Three asterisks indicate that the committee has requested to bring forward an action item within their report.

forth the suggestion that other ancillary issues in the working environment needed attention. Since then, there has been investment in these areas (other benefits with a lower price tag ie. C2C). New programs and new people have been the focus in the past few years. "The pendulum now needs to swing back toward the compensation side of the equation." We can do many positive things but they must be prioritized. So we can now shift our focus back from new people/programs approach (given we are a growing institution of ~35K students, ~7K employees) and can arrive at new themes including first and foremost compensation.

- Other topics on the memo fall under the HR category
- Parking is a hard issue for everyone, but "thank you for your efforts getting involved in this area." We are not going to have a perfect solution toward this mean, but we will compromise for an outcome that hopes to benefit many.
- Questions and comments: Toni-Lee asks about compensation and asks for more clarity on this story of salary increases. How can we communicate with employees on how these issues are handled? Long-term, what are your hopes?
- Dr Frank: "There are 3-4 aspects to bring up with this question." Regarding compensation and benefits, the majority of available data pertains to faculty numbers (comparisons, peer university data) and some of this is germane to our position type (AP). Faculty-wise, in base compensation CSU is pretty much in the same spot as 20 years ago. We match the relative average of entry-level positions (across the national market); at associate professor we are at 97% of national average and full professor we are 93-94% of peer range. Across the overall scope of the country we aren't quite keeping up with the rest of the country. Do we adjust the salary to help with retention? This isn't always the right solution as the it can create a perverse strategy with compression within salary bands / salary inversion? Would we have been better off putting those monies into the salary pool? There isn't a single, simple answer. Directors/heads will take different approaches and this disparity exists partly as a result of these different units.
 - In the benefits category, we have lost ground relative to university peer groups. Even our starting packages aren't on par with the national averages. While central isn't sure why exactly, they are looking into this with the benefits committee and COSFP.
 - Salary pools in the intermediate term: this process involves waiting for the state to release the state classified personnel survey. From there, CSU determines if that raise structure is also appropriate for the AP employee group as well. This differs year to year but they are typically close. A 1% salary increase is roughly equivalent to a ~1.5-2M E&G expense (out of ~20M total). This E&G budget stems from tuition and state funding.
 - Other budgetary considerations include enrollment growth, possible tuition increases and the percentage of state funding to higher education that actually reaches CSU. The questions that arise include: "Is CSU affordable and accessible?" "Should we raise our prices to provide more at CSU?" Tony responds to that by reflecting that as a public research institution, we have to consider both accessibility and what provided. This balance must be considered and it is a difficult knob to turn. Some fraction of monies from enrollment growth goes directly to the academic units. Faculty, staff and APs in these units can benefit from this directly and it can help spare the unit. Local units can then hire more folks, make retention decisions or address the issues presented in our memo. The downside to this structure is that it decreases flexibility at the central level. Another disadvantage is that APs in some units may not benefit from this pass-through. An example is

General Note:

Bolded committees have requested to provide a verbal report. All others will submit a written report. Every committee is listed on the agenda as a reminder of the committee obligations and relationships of APC.

***Three asterisks indicate that the committee has requested to bring forward an action item within their report.

that of facilities. Even though they are affected by the increased enrollment that brought those financial benefits, they do not benefit from the direct unit-funding stream. These are some of the issues considered in the budgeting process. At the end of the day, the biggest line in the expense budget is that of salaries. There either needs to be budget cuts or tuition increases to enable an increase. One avenue for adjustment is that of financial aid. Approximately 20% is invested back into aid from tuition revenue, which allows some flexibility in the tuition and salary increase budget-balancing act.

- Discretionary expenses to consider: financial aid, mandatory costs, salary increases, adding new programs. In recent years, the "new programs line" has been a prominent feature of the budget, so Dr Frank predicts this line will likely be dialed back to help dial up the salary line.
- In surveying the path forward, there is not much hope for an increased investment at the state level. To summarize the perspective of the state, CSU is able to produce more degrees for little money, which helps to keep taxes low. The problems and difficulty inherent in this paradigm haven't been communicated to the extent of prompting a change of approach. Most of the polling on tax revenues suggests there won't be much of a change on this front either. CSU is essentially buying time to increase demand on the student side (via enrollment numbers). This comes with heightened pressure on current jobs. While we have invested and grown in enrollment numbers, the ratio of faculty and staff to students hasn't kept up. As consumer market, we are limited by this so we make intelligent projections regarding tuition numbers without compromising enrollment numbers. There isn't likely to be much change in the next 5-6 years. CSU will continue to recruit non-resident students and will have to be more discriminating regarding new programs. There will be a reduction on the emphasis of offering new programs/fringe benefits (i.e. subsidizing professional development) to benefit salary and compensation.
- Dr Frank believes the higher education contribution paradigm will stabilize. The Funding Formula was debated and CSU was in good shape from every angle/conclusion. Since the market position isn't good, there isn't much likelihood in a tuition increase in the near future. But by being careful and prioritizing, we can get through this and find a balance.
- Dr Frank responded to a question about the salary exercise process and resulting confusion about raises being merit-based only (and subjective) instead of being influenced by inflation or cost of living. Is there any thought to this salary exercise, especially without a standardized evaluation process?
 - Answer: Half the general assembly likes the idea of salary increases being all merit-based. However, in reality, everything a merit-based-only model really only makes sense if there is a proper evaluation process. The other half of the assembly points to the distributed system process and the resulting natural bell curve in raise distribution which involves supervisor discretion and tends to benefit/penalize employees appropriately. This begs the question of how centralized we want this process to be?
 - In Pueblo, they hired experts to perform a salary equity exercise with their equivalent "AP" group. Part of the issue tends to be the heterogeneity of the AP positions; these positions vary greatly. How those compare depends on how we classify those positions. This particular exercise showed they were significantly behind their peers. So we must be smarter about what we ask for and how they fit in the budget lines.

General Note:

Bolded committees have requested to provide a verbal report. All others will submit a written report. Every committee is listed on the agenda as a reminder of the committee obligations and relationships of APC.

***Three asterisks indicate that the committee has requested to bring forward an action item within their report.

- Lynn Johnson: we've been working on getting job descriptions in TMS and passed along to 3-4 firms to help create salary bands based on position classification. There is hope that, over time, CSU can put money toward these gaps to help narrow the more gaping differences in particular areas. HR is turning their attention to the performance management system (same company that provides the TMS) with hopes they can start rolling it out fall. They are starting with CSP as a test case. By December/Jan, hopefully this will extend to AP employee group as well.
- Work-life Balance component of our memo as an area of concern with APs. What do rising levels of students mean for the same numbers of staff? The support on this front varies between units, so how do we manage this balance the support?
 - A member commented about the AP awards and a general acknowledgement that working excess ("doing the work of multiple people") is an ideal to be recognized and rewarded. Can central have a uniform stance to help this?
 - Dr Frank's commiserated: this is, in part, a cultural issue that exists without an obvious solution that has to do with the many different units involved.

IV. Guest Speaker Topic Discussion

- Lynn Johnson addressed the inconsistency of messages from different units across campus. *She requested a list from the APC answering the question, "Where do we feel inconsistencies exist?"* The responses should be grouped by topical area.
 - Work-life balance and sick leave perception (disparaging the ability to take sick leave). There is a disparity across campus regarding this policy and how supervisors approach these issues. These are examples of inconsistent messages across different units that might better inform the policies disseminated from central.
 - Could subtle messaging be disseminated to help supervisors approach this from a different lens?
- PDI is studying onboarding with Business Faculty to better inform this process and given them the knowledge to make decisions.
- Professional Development Piece: different approaches across campus and differences in endorsement by various units. Is there any PD money from APC? Is there a scholarship? This is a common question posed to Toni-Lee and it would be nice to offer that in form of a scholarship from the APC in the future. A message/nudge from central could help employees know what is available. There also isn't an obvious professional development path right now. Could the AP framework help provide this path for employees?
 - Led by Joanna Holliday, the employment committee is going to write a proposal for the professional development piece. This will likely take the form of a one-time fund for a scholarship, comparable to the SC employee fund. For the CPC, this was a former employee that funded the account from payroll deduction. Could the APC seed a similar account?
 - Advancement and mobility is a different issue than personnel development, although they are related and both very important.
- Compensation issue and continue discussion: addressing the faculty benefits gap may stand to benefit APs as well since we are still linked.
 - Retention is another hidden cost that should be acknowledged.
 - The process of salary increase is perceived to be very unfair and unjust. Could there be more accountability?

General Note:

Bolded committees have requested to provide a verbal report. All others will submit a written report. Every committee is listed on the agenda as a reminder of the committee obligations and relationships of APC.

***Three asterisks indicate that the committee has requested to bring forward an action item within their report.

- Campus communication and education about salaries can help in the short-term. For first-time CSU employees, they do not understand the deductions and retirement benefits. Should we think about how to better inform these benefits? Take-home pay versus total compensation package could be a useful piece to include in this message from central?
- One point of interest that Tony Frank brought up involved the determination of salary increases and the role of the state. The state legislature (and current political climate/makeup) is partly responsible for the current emphasis on merit-based salary increases as opposed to cost of living increases.
- AP framework classification will end up having a salary range attributed. So it is important to pay attention to these descriptions and how they are assigned. We should try to advocate for our level, but often times there are mixed messages or a lack of definitive knowledge/understanding on this topic. Also, these classifications will vary considerably by position description and depending on the area.
- Retention and compression issues are also important to consider.
- APs can request a meeting with central HR to better understand this system and their approach for parsing out the different descriptions.

V. Proposed Motions

- PASSED:Approval of January APC meeting minutes
 - Motion: Lisa Metz
 - Second: Dawn Nottingham
- PASSED:Approval of Shannon Dale as APC At Large Member
 - Motion: Shannon Wagner
 - Second: Jessica Cox
- PASSED:Approval of Jr McGrath as the representative to Area 8 (to replace Shannon Dale)
 - Motion: Trevor Eyden
 - Second: Catherine Bens
- PASSED: Approval of Dan Banuelos as APC At Large Member
 - Motion: Joanna Holliday
 - Second: Shay Webb
- PASSED:Approve Revisions to Faculty AP Manual, section I.19
 - Motion: Shannon Wagner
 - Second: Kimberly Cox-York
- PASSED:Approve Revisions to Faculty AP Manual, section F.3.2.1
 - Motion: Joanna Holliday
 - Second: Collette Hageman
- PASSED:APC Elections: Refer to ballot in agenda packet (write-in ballots)
 - Chair: Shannon Wagner
 - VC: Catherine Douras
 - Secretary: two write-in names (Kimberly Cox-York and Jessica Cox)
 - Treasurer: Dan Banuelos

VI. APC Initiatives Discussion

- Employee Voice Survey - 23% response rate
 - Shannon summarized the unofficial top responses so far.

General Note:

Bolded committees have requested to provide a verbal report. All others will submit a written report. Every committee is listed on the agenda as a reminder of the committee obligations and relationships of APC.

***Three asterisks indicate that the committee has requested to bring forward an action item within their report.

- There will be one more communication to push the survey and then closing the survey.
- Exec committee will need help compiling and analyzing data if anyone is interested in joining that effort, it will be appreciated.

VII. Officer Reports

- Chair
 - Meeting with Lynn Johnson, asked for cabinet to attend the supervisory training and they have agreed to attend a 4 hour training in the fall.
 - Re-Envisioning CSU led by Provost Miranda has an effort to create a trail throughout campus as an educational institutional memory
 - Budget request for AP evaluations as a priority, but they are going to hold off on that until they better define this.
 - Bullying policy updates: good conversations and an intent on this committee to get this right. There are small language pieces that need consensus. This final version will be vetted through our P&P committee.
 - Highlights from Faculty Council meeting.
- Vice Chair
 - Chairs retreat: March 30 for next retreat
 - Chair transitions: communicate about this depending on term of service
 - The SOP template is due for your committee by the next chairs retreat
- Secretary: request meeting attendance from your alternate if you need to miss a meeting and don't miss any more than 3 meetings. The APC Constitution and Policies and Procedures will be brought to all the business meetings.
- Treasurer: budget in the packet

VIII. Standing Committee Reports

Executive Committee (Toni-Lee)
 Awards (Kimberly Cox-York & Gretchen Peterson)
 Communications (Shannon Dale)
 Employment (Ann Bohm-Small & Melanie Calderwood)
 *****Nominations & Elections** (Shannon Wagner & Lesley Jones)
 *****Policies & Procedures** (Catherine Douras)
 Service & Outreach (Dawn Nottingham & Dan Banuelos)
 Ad Hoc Budget Committee (Lynn Borngrebe)

IV. University Committee Reports (see next page)

Adjourned - 10:33am

General Note:

Bolded committees have requested to provide a verbal report. All others will submit a written report. Every committee is listed on the agenda as a reminder of the committee obligations and relationships of APC.

***Three asterisks indicate that the committee has requested to bring forward an action item within their report.