

University of Baltimore Staff Senate

MINUTES

Monday, August 3, 2015

12:15-1:30 p.m.

BC 135

Meeting Called to Order at 12:15pm

1. Logistical items

- a. Approval of agenda
Motion by MC; approved.

- b. Approval of May's minutes

KT: John, has President Schmoke reviewed this?

JB: It has been forwarded to his office

KT: I motion to table the approval of the May minutes until he's been able to review, especially in light of everything that's happened since.

BS: Motion Seconded

2. Chair's report

- a. **Employee Picnic—JB**

Scheduled: Tuesday, Aug. 11 | 11:30 a.m.-2:30 p.m. | Plaza

Rain Date: Thursday, Aug. 13 | 11:30-2:30 p.m. | Lyric (rain or shine)

Call for Volunteers

Games/Senate Booth/Dunk Tank: JB & KT volunteered

RH will create a sign-up sheet and senators will also ask for volunteers

JB: Details are still being finalized; will have finalized schedule/volunteer needs by the end of the week

- b. **HR Benefits Email—JB**

Senators asked to help spread the word about Sept. 30 deadline

KJ will present at the Business Administrative Meeting for Managers; managers will then take back to offices

Mark Emmel: This is not new information, so it shouldn't be a surprise.

JB: Can we put it on Facebook?

RH: How many Facebook likes do we have?

KT: 52

[Discussion about communication]

JB: Our action plan from the June Retreat will be on the website soon. Kristen will send the Excel template from last year's action plan to the new secretary. All of this via T:Drive access.

RH: I can set that up if I have a list

JB: There's an updated list of senators on the website

c. **Secretary Discussion—JB**

KT has decided to step down from her position as secretary, we need to elect a new one from the remaining non-exec board senators

JB: We could discuss separating the responsibilities of the secretary between two people: one to handle the duties as outlined in the bi-laws, and another to handle the auxiliary items, or the auxiliary items could be spread among several people.

[brief discussion of responsibilities]

JB: We can continue this conversation over email.

d. **New Employee Orientation—JB**

JB attended orientation for new employees on July 23, 2015; 8 people were there

RH [directed to HR staff]: Do you get a report?

Mary Maher/Mark Emmel: We get copied as an office on all new staff hires

JB: We're out of time for this section. Can we add 10 minutes?

Approved

e. **President's Response to Staff Senate Letter—JB**

JB: A letter was sent to President Schmoke in early July via the proper channels to the GSC. The GSC endorsed and forwarded the letter on our behalf.

Quick Backstory: The original intention was for the GSC to send a letter to the president's office. The letter that was drafted did not convey the exact sentiment of the staff and student senates. As a result, the Faculty Senate sent the letter as such, the students met with President Schmoke, and the Staff Senate sent the letter.

[Discussion of both letters]

Mary Maher: I'm hearing a need for a relationship between the president and the staff senate moving forward.

KT: Mary's statement reflects a need from the retreat's action plan

KJ: I think staff senate needs meetings with the president separate from the GSC

JB: We are working on getting on his schedule

KJ: John, I would like to address concerns about the letter [from the staff senate to the president]. Is now the appropriate time?

JB: We have a bylaws discussion later on the agenda, but I think we can discuss this now.

KJ: I have a problem with the letter going out without the staff senate formally approving it. There are parts I don't necessarily agree with. I didn't see the other [GSC] letters, so I don't know how/if I can support those. Also, the language "non-student facing" concerns me, because we didn't define this, and I have constituents that wouldn't necessarily fall under this category.

[KJ continued]: I know with the bylaws it can go out in an emergency, but I don't know if this is an emergency. We're all on email and can communicate, and I cannot think of an instance where an email couldn't first go out to the Staff Senate. We have to amend the bylaws anyway due to the EMSA division split, so we could review this as well.

JB: Two things

1.

Let's discuss next steps with the president regarding these quarterly meetings—how do we want to respond to the letter?

What should be the ongoing conversation?

2.

I agree that the student-facing needs to be communicated/clarified further. In this case, the emergency was that the faculty and student senates had already communicated to/with the president's office, and the staff senate wanted to be heard and represented in a timely way.

RH: I think part of the issue was that this was an agenda item for our July meeting, and when the meeting didn't happen, we weren't aware this was going forward. Maybe a communication saying, "because we didn't meet, please review so we can send this forward..."

JB: I note that miscommunication and take responsibility for it. I will be better about that communication in the future.

[further discussion about ongoing conversations with the president]

BS: If the GSC is not in agreement at this time, it's important to get more face time with the president for better communication.

f. **GSC Report—MM**

The GSC met on July 7th to discuss future meetings and the concerns surrounding the lay-offs that occurred in early June. At that time Faculty Senate had forwarded a letter to K. Schmoke outlining their concerns surrounding what felt like a lack of transparency

surrounding the process, particularly the rationale behind laying off the University Registrar. During this meeting we introduced a draft of the Staff Senate's response to the layoffs—which was later sent to President Schmoke through the GSC. President Schmoke then responded to our letter on 7/15/15. The tone of the letter from UBSS stressed open communication between the Office of the President and the general UB constituency as well as the position that student-facing resources be preserved to the same extent as possible if future layoffs are to occur.

In his response, President Schmoke shared that the need for base budget reductions necessitated the layoffs that did occur and that his office would work with shared governance to strengthen communications across the board.

Other issues discussed in our meeting was a proposed student bereavement policy drafted by the Student Government Association that asks for 5 academic days off for a student to mourn, with 2 additional days for travel to and fro funeral location. The proposal suggests that students be allowed a reasonable amount of time to make up missed academic work and the proposal outlines the amount of time allowed. Much of this policy is borrowed from Towson University's student bereavement policy. More to come of this later.

Additionally, the GSC followed up with President Schmoke on the Strategic Enrollment Planning report and the proposed planning retreat that would occur in the fall. The GSC inquired as to whether this group would be convened and the composition of said group. President Schmoke responded and indicated that his office was currently identifying an outside consultant through the RFP process. Once the consultant is selected, he will share more details with GSC as they become available.

The GSC has established meeting dates for the remainder of the fall semester: September 10, October 8, November 12th and December 10th. Additionally, we are working with the President's Office to have Kurt in attendance, whenever possible, at those meetings.

Mary Maher: Megan, are the GSC meetings open to the public?

KJ/BS: Bylaws say yes.

3. **Action Item: Election of new secretary**

JB: According to bylaws, the secretary should be elected from the remaining senators. We can do this now or via email, but it does need to happen immediately.

[brief discussion]

MC: My schedule in the fall really doesn't allow enough time to dedicate the appropriate amount of effort this role takes

MP: Can we take the remaining days of this week to look over the duties?

JB: Sure. I'll look for a decision to be made by Friday, COB. The non-exec board senators can

elect among yourselves, and the executive board will approve. If no one is elected, we'll need to find out from the bylaws what happens. We could possibly try co-secretaries like CUSS, and split up the other duties. We'll consult other shared governance bodies. The goal is to have someone in place a few weeks before the next meeting to prep.

4. **Action Item: Formation of UB Staff Awards Committee**

JB: Because we're running out of time, this next agenda item could be accomplished via email. The Staff Awards Committee doesn't have to be staff senate; the charges haven't been determined (September meeting agenda item). I will share all the materials from the ad hoc committee to give to the standing committee. For now, please collect nominees.

MP: John, did you mean to skip item 4: assignment of constituencies?

JB: no, let's do that now

5. **Action Item: Assignment of Constituencies for Senators**

Rod Harris (RH)	OTS
Kristen Tull (KT)	Academic Affairs (Provost/Colleges)
Bill Schnirel (BS)	Institutional Advancement
Michael Campetelli (MC)	EM and SA
Keiver Jordan (KJ)	Administration and Finance
Michael Palmer (MP)	President's Office

JB: I'll update the website. Kristen will bring her camera to take pictures for the website at the next meeting.

RH: How do we know who's in each group?

KT: In the past, we've emailed our constituencies about monthly meetings, HR, etc. You can make the emails more personalized; you could also solicit questions/problems they'd like you to bring up. There are distribution lists built into the senate document lists in the T-Drive.

RH: Does anyone know how the lists are generated?

KT: They were set up three years ago.

KJ: I think Rod is asking about the data source.

RH: Yes, for example: EM vs. SA

KJ: I'm guessing PeopleSoft employee types

JB: We're running out of time. Let's talk about goals and next steps concerning bylaws.

6. **Discussion: Possible bylaws review**

KJ: I think we should each take a look at current documents and past documents. Everyone

should do this individually, and then set up a separate meeting to discuss.

KT: I agree. Maybe everyone could review by COB, Monday August 10 to review and give feedback.

KJ: Is there any way to get old minutes/documents into a word format rather than an HTML format to be able to track changes?

JB: Is that how you want to communicate these changes or suggestions?

BS: We could have a small workgroup and then bring it to the senate.

JB: Let's have a small committee on behalf of the senate who can report back: Eric Jones, Keiver Jordan (lead/chair), and Bill Schnirel. Vote to approve?

Approved

Individual reviews can be forwarded to Keiver

7. **New Business:**

PMP Process—Led by RH

RH: I want to add an official discussion to the September meeting concerning the PMP process.

Mary Maher presented PMP numbers:

485 = non-faculty regular workforce

318 = PMPs received by HR = **(66%)**

167 = PMPs NOT received by HR = **(34%)**

Of those received:

44% = highest rating (3)

53% = met expectation and completed all goals (2)

3% = requires improvement and/or did not meet standards (1 or 0)

JB: Mary, what's the Staff Senate's role?

Mary: Professional Development. It's not just number compliant, but also poorly worded goals—PMPs that were simply checked boxes with very little communicated from the supervisor to the employee. Perhaps you could conduct a survey for staff satisfaction surrounding PMPs—what's the value added? It's not just about the compliance with the deadline.

JB: Is there a process for employees who have not received—

RH: I want to add to that. How can we empower HR?

Mary: HR does not have authority over the process; we simply manage the process. Leadership

has the authority.

RH: I'm shocked.

KJ: I think Mary's point is valid.

JB: We'll add to September and continue the conversation then.

8. Floor open to constituents

Judith McDonald: I want to personally invite the senators to the Employee Picnic and ask for volunteers. [Judith shared additional volunteer opportunities for the employee picnic]

JB: Motion to adjourn?

KT: Motion—

RH: Wait. I have one more piece of new business: work from home certification

Mary: There is a policy in place with guidelines and an application for this opportunity. It's on the policy website.

JB: Would HR be up for making a presentation at one of our next meetings?

Mark: Sure, I can do that

JB Motion to adjourn?

MC: Motion; EJ: Second

Adjourned 1:30pm