

CUSS Meeting
 University of Maryland University College
 1616 McCormick Drive
 Largo, MD
 January 24, 2012

Members

Marie Meehan	BSU
Cynthia Coleman	BSU
Absent	FSU
Jackie Eberts	SU
Absent	TU
Ron Butler	TU
Mary Hickey	TU
Absent	UB, CUSS Co-Secretary
Giordana Segneri	UB
Bill Crockett	UMB
Gynene Sullivan	UMB, CUSS Vice Chair
Kathy Miller	UMBC
Brian Souders	UMBC, CUSS Co-Secretary
Absent	UMCES
Willie Brown	UMCP, CUSS Chair
Sister Maureen Schrimpe	UMCP
Absent	UMES
Anthony Scorcone	UMUC
Debby Mathis	UMUC
Mary E. Reed	USMO

Alternates/Guests

Karen Tyler	BSU
Mi'Shaun Stevenson	BSU
Brenda Der	UB
Colette Becker	UMB
Nancy Bowers	UMB
Joel DeWyer	UMBC
Leslie Tinker	UMBC
Mike Pasziewicz	UMCP
Noelle Nelson	UMUC

Welcome:

Dr. Susan Aldridge UMUC

Chancellor's Liaison to CUSS:

Rosario I. van Daalen USMO-HR

1. Welcome And Introductions
2. Approval Of Minutes with minor typographical errors
3. Chairs Report

Chancellors Conference Call

A. 2012 Legislative Session

- No present talk of furloughs or layoffs
- Intend to submit Public Corporation legislation
- Governor to cut structural deficit in half, challenges may appear later in session, was \$1.16 billion. May be mid-year adjustment of 2%, but we will not know anything until the middle of 2012.
- There is discussion of a mid-year COLA, but it will not happen until January 2013.
- State wages are going up \$75 million
- Andy Monday Conference calls. All CUSS members are invited to participate.

- Emmanuel Welsh is a finalist for Student Regent (from Towson). Willie sent letter of support for his recommendation.
- B. Board of Regents Awards Packets – will be distributed electronically to committee members for review. Will need to determine which categories will go
- Exceptional Contribution to Institution/Unit – Communications
 - Outstanding Contribution to Students in Academic/Residential Environment – Benefits and Compensation
 - Extraordinary Public Service to Campus Community – Community Outreach
 - Effectiveness and Efficiency - Legislative Affairs

Executive Committee will take overflow if there is any one category that has large number of applicants.

Need to have conversation (preferably by e-mail) about finalists for our various committees.

4. Vice Chair's Report

Complete inventory completed on web site, communications committee will work on site map, and then redesign.

5. Chancellor's Liaison Report

6. Annapolis Visit Logistics

We will be recognized on the floor of the houses of the State Assembly. We can meet at USM offices or UMB office on the morning. We need to be on the floor by 10 am, so we should plan to meet by either 8:30 or 9. (44 West Street in Annapolis). Roy says that USM offices are too small, so we'll meet at 44 West at 8:30 am. Parking is at Navy/Marine Corps Stadium parking lot, then take shuttle downtown. Parking is \$5, but the shuttle is free.

Giordana Sengeri: Will the shuttle take us straight the office, and how long does it take?

Brenda Yarema: It stops on the circle, and it takes about 10 minutes. Also requests that everyone who wants nametags send names to Brenda. Willie and Gynene Sullivan will pay for up to 10 apiece.

Willie Brown: Asking for recommended changes to letter to be sent to both houses of State Assembly.

Giordana Segneri: Is there nothing about raises for faculty and staff retention?

Roy Ross: Faculty will have raises, but not staff. Staff was for one year only.

Willie will contact will contact BJ and Andy regarding faculty and respectfully request that any time faculty retention raises are discussed that staff be automatically included.

Sister Marie: Add the CUSS web info at the very bottom, of this and for all correspondence.

Willie Brown: Motion to include web information in all correspondence approved.

Roy Ross: Suggestion to center 20-year seal, but include CUSS heading on the left-hand side.

Meredith Levesque: Perhaps put seal on bottom-left hand side.

Gynene will send out 2-3 different versions for comments.

Giordana Segneri: When shall we have revised letter out?

Willie Brown: In time for the legislative session.

Willie agreed to take a first stab at editing the first two paragraphs, and request feedback.

Giordana Segneri: Shall we thank them for adding staff into retention?

Willie Brown: Yes.

Willie summarizes the acts of last year's session and thanks them for adding staff retention in. Will finalize it before coming to Annapolis. For those not

Roy Ross: Do we want to do the tour again? If so, Roy will need to set it up in advance.

At least nine raised hands to participate.

Roy also will distribute a list of when will be the best times to meet with legislators. Also has information as to how to contact them, as well as helpful. Once session is over, need to get over to offices as soon as possible.

Giordana Segneri: Do we go to the home address legislator or school's address?

Willie Brown: Home address. Do we want to invite faculty and students?

Joel DeWyer: It can't hurt.

Willie will send invitation to faculty and staff.

Sister Marie: They will not be included in our letter, right?

Willie: Correct, they will not.

Gynene Sullivan: We should also bring CUSS newsletters.

Jackie Levesque: How long will we be there?

Willie Brown: Probably 12:00 to 12:30.

7. Performance Reviews Process Review

Why? Who? What? When? How?

- What is purpose of PRD/PMP?
- What are expected time frame?
- What are the categories?
- Uniformity is missing from the process.
- There is a great deal of disparity among supervisors.
- What is the purpose of the PMD/PMP itself?

Jackie Eberts: These issues came up with new evaluation systems.

Roy Ross: Schools have been giving bonuses regardless of PMP, they have fallen by the wayside with the budget crunch.

Willie Brown: Merit receipt is not necessarily based on PMP. There is also tremendous inconsistency across the system.

Meredith Levesque: Arbitrary percentages of categories – cap on excellence.

Nancy Bowers: Where are these quotas for categories (the excellence cap) coming from? At UMB, they come down from UMB's HR. Are they coming from presidents, USM, or wherever?

Roy Ross: That's institutional independence.

Mi'Shaun Stevenson: Understands what COLA and merit are, but due to stagnant career paths at UMES, only those getting outstanding get 3%.

Willie Brown: Tremendous inconsistency internally and among Institutions.

Bill Crockett: Not all exempt staff are treated the same across the Institutions. PMP/PDP was designed originally as a goal-setting utility. It has morphed into a COLA/merit tool. Development aspect has dropped off.

Willie Brown: Transparency is missing from equation.

Delores Jackson: Lost all aspects of staff development, due to budget cuts. There is a baseline of work that has to get done, but there is no time for staff to get additional work done. Does it make sense to have development aspect when there is no time for development, especially among non-exempt employees

Ron Butler: Setting measureable goals in tangible ways. Measures are highly subjective. There is ambiguity of measurements. Managers are not being trained properly to implement PMPs/PMDs.

Giordana Segneri: UB just revised process. It is completely goal based that are set with supervisors, with a mandatory six-month review process. It has taken a lot of the arbitrary aspects of previous system. There is a lack of consistency between units as to distributing merit increases.

Brenda Yarema: That there is no merit and that the discussions of performance reviews are two very different things. What will we do with this information that we gather?

Willie Brown: Staff does not feel empowered in the evaluation process. It is supposed to be a two-way street.

Meredith Levesque: Lack of standardization of measures for evaluation.

Mi'Shaun Stevenson: There is a lack of a coherent path for promotion and career development or a career path.

Noelle Nelson: Desire to give a higher ranking, but a supervisor's supervisor may think supervisor is being over-generous. Capricious auditing of review reviewing process.

Willie Brown: Goal is to break down issues, document practices, and practices as implemented, obtain best practices from Institutions. Start a dialogue.

Delores Jackson: Thinks it may be interesting to hear what USM thinks is happening versus what is actually happening.

Willie Brown: Andy Foster would probably be a better person to answer these questions as he is more involved with strategic planning aspects. What did the system envision when they set up this process? We can also talk to him about staff development. We can also go to our own Institutions to find out what should happen and what does happen. We also need to keep in mind the differing missions of our Institutions.

Nancy Bowers: Each campus has the requirement to be consistent internally, but it depends entirely upon the individual manager.

Delores Jackson: What about the unions? What impact has the introduction of unions done to the PMP process?

Willie Brown: What are the actual documented practices? Is there training for supervisors and employees? Is it required?

Brian Souders: How will we find out what really happens, especially if we are not in a supervisory role?

Willie Brown: Survey our constituents. Forums. Interview managers. Find out what managers are told. Find out from all different levels.

Gus Mercanti: is there an advantage to ask our HR office what official policies are?

Willie Brown: Shall we ask each Staff Senate at each Institution?

Ron Butler: We need to flesh it out before we ask our PSS to take on this task.

Brenda Yarema: Need to introduce it as a statewide staff initiative so that it's not sounding as if we're just being cranky.

Meredith Levesque: Go to staff senates with a set of five questions or so , so that we have internal consistency of questioning.

Willie Brown: We will create our plan first before we approach anyone on our campuses. We need the blessing, as it were, of the upper-level leadership before we start asking our HR offices. They may have questions, comments or concerns.

Dolores Jackson: Uniformity in questionnaires that go out. Suggestion that we need to make certain it is absolutely anonymous so that people.

Willie Brown: Must be seen as an initiative from CUSS.

Mi'Shaun Stevenson: Implementation – must be anonymous, have a uniform look and feel.

Gynene Sullivan: Perhaps use CapWiz

Willie Brown: Or Survey Monkey. We need to assure survey takers that they have the protection of anonymity.

Joel DeWyer: Is it not more useful to get feedback from individual Senates?

Willie Brown: Just having a conversation now, will firm up our plans of implementation over the next few meetings.

Rosario van Daalen: Anthony Foster would have no idea. For history, she would be ideal.

Willie Brown: We have not fully discussed the issue, what is our end goal of writing a report for it?

Ron Ross: What is the proposal as it stands?

Willie Brown: There is no discussion at the system level thus far. It was simply brought up that people are unhappy with the process thus far.

Brenda Yarema: At Towson, they have been told that performance reviews will go to a two-tiered system, and they are not tied to merit. Go to essentially a pass/fail system.

Meredith Levesque: What then determines merit?

Brenda Yarema: Need to clarify process.

Willie Brown: We need to define what the issues are, and how we will proceed.

Mi'Shaun Stevenson: What is the true purpose of evaluating my performance if it is not tied to merit?

Welcome from UMUC President Dr. Susan Aldridge

At UMUC, the Staff Council works with tremendous dedication on projects that contribute to the morale of the university. Given the challenging times, we rely on our staff to get our students through even more, and she is grateful for our service. UMUC has more than 96,000 students over the world, has contracts to teach in 28

countries, and 24 countries on military bases throughout the world. Have students in every state as well.

UMUC's students are incredibly diverse, and they come from hugely different academic and cultural backgrounds.

Recipient of largest number of community college transfer students.

First on-line courses in 1994, and always have been groundbreaking in distance education.

If you want a label, think of UMUC as the traditional campus for working professionals.

Systems and staff must be able to support them 24/7.

Challenges are the same in many regards – making sure the support systems for our students work.

Willie Brown: Anything specific we should be asking General Assembly regarding having a bigger voice?

Dr. Aldridge: Smaller campuses that may not be able to afford higher salaries may be quieter. Autonomy in salary setting may be something to consider.

Sister Marie: How is tuition calculated?

Dr. Aldridge: Both in-state and out-of-state, usually something like an in-state tuition plus system. They are the lowest in the state, and are under market for tuition and fees.

Sister Marie: What is faculty compensation?

Dr. Aldridge: Salary plus currency adjustment.

Chancellor's Liaison Report - Rosario van Daalen

CUSS Members asked Rosario to provide HR PMP history (Performance Evaluations) – she had been at VPs meeting earlier and just arrived to CUSS mtg.

Rosario provided the following: At the time the USM was created in 1988 discussions were started to address all HR policies and programs in place. Historically Institutions had been under State's salary structure and performance evaluation. The performance evaluation process was inefficient and no one gave it much importance. In developing the USM Pay Program, all USM Staff employees were surveyed and asked what their expectations, recommendations and needs were related to a new program. The Performance Management Process (PMP) was developed and shared with Staff employees at the time. Process was thoroughly vetted from lowest paid Staff to upper-level management. Open forums were held at each Institution to discuss this new process. The PMP was implemented in 1992. As discussions continued for the development of the USM Pay Program, it was approved by the BOR that it would be a "Pay for Performance" program and that **one of the uses of the PMP was to provide a basis and reason for the merit increases.**

PMP Form was designed as a tool to facilitate communication between supervisor and

employee. The BOR Policy requires Performance Evaluations to take place annually, with a review at the sixth month into review year cycle. If necessary, revisions are made to the goals, objectives and development established at the beginning of the review cycle.

Willie: What are the present system requirements regarding reporting accountability and tracking?

Rosario: Training sessions were created for managers. It was supposed to be an on-going training for all new hires; not just a one time shot in 1992 when it was first created.

It was a five-tier system originally – Unsatisfactory, Below Standards, Meet Standards, Above Standards and Outstanding. Through the years Institutions have been permitted by the USM to change the PMP Form (the tool) and the name of the process to meet their own needs and culture. Review period is April 1 to March 31. This timing facilitates the designation and processing of merit increases by July, for years when it is provided in the budget.

There are concerns of how through the years the interpretation of outstanding throughout the USM has eroded the original intent. Meet Standards is intended to reflect that the employee is performing the job she/he was hired to do – “fulfilling the contract”. To receive an Outstanding evaluation the employee must be a super star that shines above and beyond the majority of employees at that Institution. If they are that good, then they should also be nominated for the BOR awards. Documentation is required for individuals ranked as Outstanding.

Willie: What is required at System Office from the individual Institutions?

Rosario: In 1998 System office established a monitoring report required under the Chancellor’s Salary Guidelines to provide accountability of Nonexempt Staff employees evaluation ratings and distribution of additional merit increases. There are no other reporting requirements to USMO; everything else is internal to each Institution.

Rosario: In 1998 System office established a monitoring report required under the Chancellor’s Salary Guidelines to provide accountability of Nonexempt Staff employees evaluation ratings and distribution of additional merit increases. There are no other reporting requirements to USMO; everything else is internal to each Institution.

Willie: With issues and history, we have not decided about what we want the actual goal to be. What do we want to take to Chancellor/presidents and say what we want to do?

Joel DeWyer: It’s not that they are being done, but rather that there is no cultural support for feedback as a tool. If it is reinforced at every level, then we are getting somewhere.

Mi’Shaun Stevenson: Lots of internal and external disconnect in the PMP process. It should be a set of measurable objectives.

Meredith Levesque: As well as some sort of internal consistence.

Giordana Segneri: Not really across institutions, but definitely internal consistency.

Rosario van Daalen: The BOR policy on Performance Evaluations can be found in Section VII-5.20 of USM-BOR policies.

Willie Brown: Will get copies of the original PMP documents, training booklet and other information from Rosario at USMO-HR.

Willie Brown: Will come to get the information and get it.

Giordana Segneri: Professional development is a big piece of it, but we are not getting it.

Bill Crockett: Get all HR leadership together and discuss what the purpose of the tool is. Tool's value is for improving excellence of the organizations, but fear coming in is that there has been no merit in ages, no performance tied to pay.

Willie Brown: Managers trying to use pay for performance to resolve pay inequities. Increase the communication between employees and supervisors.

Willie Brown: Giordana/Brian will summarize notes for review in March so that we can finalize action plan.

(Continuation of...) -Chancellor's Liaison Report - Rosario van Daalen

Draft of Biennial Exempt Market Salary Survey. Conduct survey and analysis of data between September and December; presentation of proposal today to the AdmVPs, then next to Chancellor's counsel, next to Finance-BOR, then to full BOR for final decision by April meeting. No adjustment to structure in four years. Proposed a very aggressive 15% full structure adjustment increase (minimum and maximum of each Pay Range) for Option 1; proposed 13% for Option 2.

It means largely nothing to staff employees. Per BOR policy, Staff employees salaries must be paid no less than the Pay Range for their job classification. When salary structure pay range minimums are increased, employees salaries that fall below are increased to the new minimum.

The sense is that there is a commitment to do this adjustment for this year, and make the same commitment for the Nonexempt next year.

At some point, we need to take responsibility to keep our pay program up to date. We are supposed to be paying at market rates; if we don't, we get mediocre quality as we recruit new employees. We want to retain good Staff, and we are having trouble doing it.

AdmVPs seem to be in agreement in adjusting the Exempt salary structure. Seems to

have been a positive discussion.

-As per our discussion last month regarding enrollment in health insurance, Rosario has been assured DBM-EBD Director that, after hiring changes and training at that office, there has been a huge improvement in processing health benefits enrollment for new hires. Backlog should be eliminated now since enrollment forms are being processed on the same day they arrive at DBM-EBD.

-Tuition remission for Retirees/Spouse/Dependents and Spouse/Dependents of Deceased employees – USM is developing a process now to tax these individuals who are in a taxable status according to the Affidavit they have signed. Institution HR Offices are committed to educate users up front as to the new tax burden and consequences of non-payment of taxes. Additionally, information has been posted on the web along with the required forms.

Draft of biennial exempt market salary survey. Conduct survey analysis data between September and December, so today was the VPs, then next to Chancellor's counsel, then to full board for decision by April meeting. No adjustment to structure in four years.

15% structural shift from minimum to maximum for option one, second is 13% for option two.

It means largely nothing to staff employees, but when we increase minimums of each pay range, anyone's salary gets adjusted to the minimum.

Rosario believes that they will support option one. There is a strong commitment to do this adjustment for this year, and make the same commitment for next year.

At some point, we need to take responsibility to keep our pay program up to date. We are supposed to be paying at market rates; if we don't, we get mediocre quality. We want to retain good staff, and we are having trouble doing it.

VPs seem to be in agreement in adjusting the exempt structure. Seems to have been a positive discussion.

As per discussion last month regarding enrollment in health insurance, RvD has been assured from HR Director that, after hiring changes, new hires should be enrolled on Day 1 of employment. Backlog should be eliminated.

Tuition remission: Now to be taxed for retirees, dependents of retirees and dependents of deceased members. Need to educate users up front as to the new tax burden and consequences of non-payment of taxes.

8. Old/New Business. Given the hour, no new or old business was raised.

9. Confirm Next Meeting Date and Place:

Annapolis, 44 West Street, 8:30 am – Tuesday, February 21st.