

Staff Council – February 26, 2008

In attendance: Joan Taylor, Dave Reed, Lynda Smith, Matt Reuer, Millie Brence-Austin, Karl Greis, Nancy Luther, David Ziemba, Sarah Withee, Cindy Christensen

Sensitive Data Policy – Randy Stiles

Over the last year, the college has been trying to establish a college wide policy on sensitive data. Increasingly more people on campus have access to sensitive data. There is a reasonable concern about the risk and liability of college for this data being secure, thus conversations have begun at the urging of Legal Counsel and IT as well on how best to manage electronic security of data.

Since the last review of the policy by Staff Council, it has evolved more. Changes that have been made are the consequences of misuse of data has been added as well as the guidelines.

ITAL has reviewed and accepted the policy.

The FEC is in the opinion that faculty will still be reluctant to sign the policy and is something they are going to review. It seems that many faculty will not be asked to sign this policy.

Each Senior Staff member would make a decision of who in their department would sign the policy, as not all staff have access to sensitive data.

There is an idea that every new employee going forward would be asked to sign this as a condition of employment.

Staff Council has asked to look at a final draft in order to give endorsement, however after a quick review everyone agrees with the guidelines. Randy thinks that the sensitive data and cell phone policy will be in place by end of block 6.

Randy also left a copy of the cell phone policy to be reviewed and discussed at a later date.

Proposal for Staff Bonuses – Chad Schonewill

Presented ideas on how to improve the process of rewarding merit pay. The difference in pay raises is insignificant for low, medium and high performing employees.

The average person should get at minimum receive a cost of living increase, and perhaps a needing improvement performer receive nothing. Currently it seems that if a person just shows up and does their job they get 4% and it seem fairly insignificant to do more if

everyone across the board receives the same. It also seems that the perception is that the college does not reward based on performance. Chad suggests an across the board increase, COLA and some amount above that for merit.

Perhaps the college should consider alternative ways to solve the problem. A suggestion would be to have steps within a job. Currently grade increase is the only thing in place and there are about only five grades to describe any job on campus. Any increase in grade would be significant to an employee. Currently this process seems to be used by supervisors as a way to reward employees who are outstanding performers.

When a department hires a student worker, they have 3 levels in which they can achieve, which give great flexibility in rewarding a performing worker. Why not do something similar with staff.

Faculty have a similar step process but staff has nothing like that. We are static. Why not introduce some steps in staff jobs. This could help to address several issues:

- Gives people something to shoot for – this is lacking at CC. Your only hope is for someone to leave so you can move up into their better position
- If there are certain requirements to move to the next level, then a staff will have a goal to better themselves to get the higher level
- Would help to address compression issues – no matter how good you are you are hired on at step 1 and work your way up
- Great for supervisors as a more meaning leverage to help people improve. There is no reward for improvement.

Another thought would be have a similar system and plan that all staff gets COLA every year, and then all merit pay is channeled into one pot that goes toward the level program. Not everyone staff would get it but people could work towards this reward.

It is an important time to consider the various options for the merit and compensation system. CC ought to find a way to improve the process because what we have now is not efficient. If you want to make merit about merit, fewer people would get merit increases, but it would be larger and more meaningful.

Joan added that the Board of Trustees likes the idea of having COLA and merit split out. President Celeste suggested that CC should take money from contingency to cover this year's merit since it would be so minute.

This is a very important issue that we should continue to voice concerns for.

Bonuses – there have been bonuses at CC that have been in specific department budgets and not in salary compensation pool.

Cindy is going to work with Chad to document this issue and make a presentation to the Compensation Committee and Senior Staff.

Bonuses, allows a way to reward an employee for something specific without increasing their bottom line pay and the salary pool. To the employee it might feel like meaningful recognition.

Merit Compensation – Chris Melcher

Chris does not speak for the college but these are his opinions and thoughts. The salary pool for this year seems to have been decided and it is likely that staff and faculty will use 4.08% as a measure for inflation.

If this is the case, how do we think about merit and compensation as we go forward in 2009-2010. Staff council has an important role, leadership and voice for the college. It may be well worth it to research other schools and even private sectors to find out measures that are used or what process they utilize.

CC should think going forward if we should move away from the term COLA and not on how to calculate it. Over the last 30 years the inflation rate has been fairly consistent and it all roughly evens out.

The concept of COLA is much more relevant for government and faculty. The Government bases their idea that you get paid less than private sector, so it is more relevant to be used in that manner. Private sector tends to pay more based on his experience so COLA is not a factor to be used.

All faculty are equally smart and valuable and should be paid the same. But in real world it would vary greatly. The only way they can attract good professors is to have a reward system in pay scale.

Staff is in between and do not get compensated like faculty. Tenure is academic freedom, not job security. We should look at whether to have COLA, lock step or merit based pay increases.

Perhaps we should pick a percentage increase and have that number picked in large part based on inflation and COLA, not rigidly and exclusively, then have the entire amount distributed as a mix of inflation and merit.

If the current rate of 4.08% is used for COLA that will leave .17% for merit. The disadvantages are if everyone is satisfactory and most people are good and everyone is getting the same what is left for people who out perform?

In the private sector raises are based on individual performance, team performance and company performance. This may not be appropriate for the college but something to consider.

The current system is not set up to reward star performers. And we should start thinking about moving away from COLA to a different model.

Matt asked the question that he doesn't understand the size of the pie and budget line for the staff at CC. In a perfect world COLA plus 2 – 3 % for merit would be idea. What determines the size of the budget for staff and faculty salaries

Chris stated the college has made two significant benchmark moves, faculty are paid less compared to other colleges and we have to compete against other schools. This is why we are in the process of catching up on the faculty salaries. That pool is based on COLA progression rank and merit.

The question was asked what is magic about 4.25% however Chris did not know. He felt that the college is catching up to its means as we can only collect so much tuition without raising it drastically. If CC uses too much of its endowment, it robs future students of monies. The Board of Trustees along with other trends thinks 5% is the right number for keeping the endowment pot.

The Board of Trustees want the endowment to go down to 5% in the next 2 – 3 years, thus salaries are set at what we can afford.

Faculty-Staff Mentoring Program – Joan Taylor

The Faculty-Staff mentoring program has taken off; however Senior Staff seems to think it has not. There have been positive interactions between faculty and administration side.

It seems that staff in administrative positions could be paired with a faculty person could help to mend those relationships. This could provide a much closer relationship on campus.

Staff Voices Spring Edition agenda – Dave Reed

Bemis has been reserved, along with preparations for the physical set up. We need to start talking about the agenda and what we want to do at staff voices.

Dave suggests we all make a personal appeal to members of Senior Staff to attend and submit any issues they recommend to have discussed at staff voices.

In addition Dave asked for everyone to submit any agenda item for the meeting.

Next, we need to put out the call for agenda items from campus community.

Staff Council Elections – Nancy Luther

There has been a good response for nominations from the community. So far nine candidates are interested in the five open positions and Nancy will be collecting their bios by the end of the day.

Nancy will put together the bios for voting and open it up to campus for 2 weeks of voting.

Campus Committees – Cindy Christensen

April 1st will start the Campus Committees campaign.

Recently a request was received to fill two newly created positions on Compensation Committee. This subcommittee will deal with health care issues and review data provided from HR.

Rick Specht and Kent Clawson have been chosen for this committee.

The process to fill these positions was rushed and Staff Council felt like we were strong armed into making this decision too quickly. There is a process outlined in the FEC guidelines and Staff Council feels that we need stay within those boundaries per the charter.

Joan moved that we select a time frame in which we will make committee recommendations in a timely but thoughtful manner.

Motion – Sarah

Second – Dave

Discussion – a time period of 2 weeks seems fair. It is unfair to campus to find the best people to serve on these important committees in a limited turn around time. It was suggested that perhaps a one year interim committee assignment could be designated, and then the following year a formal election process will be held.

It was noted that a great deal of important work is being done in the next three months for this committee, and was one of the main reasons for the rush.

Another suggestion was that perhaps a Staff Council member could sit on the committee until the position can go through the normal elections process.

We will have a larger discussion at the next meeting.

The committee approved the requirement of a two weeks notice.

Staff Council Participation/Attendance Policy – Dave Reed

We seem to be missing people on a regular basis. Committee members need to commit to this important work and be here regularly. Participation is needed for all members to be effective to the community.

Perhaps we should address individuals and if they cannot commit to the work of the group, then you should perhaps they step down and let someone else take their place. Staff Council needs people who can participate and do the work load.

We are asked to think about what the criteria should be send Dave commentary for a policy to be drafted. This will also serve to set a good precedent for the new members of the committee.

Lastly, Staff Council would like to give Kudos to Joan for her report to the Board of Trustees and their positive reactions!!!

The following agenda items were not discussed at this meeting but will be discussed at the next Staff Council meeting:

Supervisor Training – Joan Taylor

Board of Trustees Update – Joan Taylor/Dave Reed

New Business