

Engineering Staff Advisory Council
May 22, 2008
IIHR
8:30am – 10:30am

Present: Susan Beckett, Deborah Hampton, Diana Harris, Peter Haug, Phil Jordan, Craig Just, Dawn Marshall, Andy Veit
Liaisons: Marian Muste, Janann Schiele
Visitors: Theresa Gaffey, Carmen Langel, Twila Meder

I. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. A motion was made and passed without dissent to include the discussion of the FRIC proposal under Janann's HR report.

II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April meeting were approved with a minor correction.

III. Liaison Committee Reports

a. University Staff Council, Marian Muste

Liaisons. Marian Muste evoked the need to make sure that good lines of communication remained open between the UI Staff Council and the College of Engineering Staff Council. It was suggested that he and John Forys, also a member of the UI Staff Council and Librarian of the Engineering Library, split the responsibilities of reporting to ESAC, with Marian perhaps reporting on issues related to research and John reporting on issues related to administration.

Research Faculty Track. The group discussed the role that ESAC should play in relation to the newly proposed research faculty track. It was decided that a meeting of all the research engineers in the College of Engineering should be held later to inform them about the proposal and decide what actions should be taken. As intermediary steps to this meeting,

--Janann will send Andy a current list of research engineers and send updates as the roster changes.

--Marian will pass along all of the documents relating to the new research faculty track and to the position of research engineers to Andy, who will send them out to the CoE research engineers.

--Marian, Craig, Andy, and Richard will take the lead on planning a discussion to be hosted by ESAC about the proposed research track and will let ESAC know when they want to get on the agenda to talk about more specifics related to the meeting.

b. Human Resources, Janann Schiele

FRIC proposal. The Council members, liaisons and visitors discussed what questions they would like Janann to bring to the Senior HR Representative meeting would be taking place later that day. These questions were noted by the secretary and passed along to Janann before her meeting:

1. What is the University's stance on child care? Does it intend to make other options available since flex benefits will likely not cover a significant portion of day care for pre-school aged children?
2. What will be the exact effects on each demographic (single/married/one employee/two employees/with kids/no kids)? Can the University or the FRIC committee develop a table that shows explicitly what these changes and their impacts will be for each demographic will be? Additionally, employees need to be able to understand, under the new plan, exactly what benefits employees will be receiving at no cost.
3. What is the net financial impact of the proposed changes—that is, show the **number** of employees affected in each demographic category and the net impact for them.
4. What are the breakdowns of the changes when you consider actual employee salary levels—that is—what happens when you look at the impact of the changes in terms of salary level (\$25,000 to \$35,000, \$36,000 to \$45,000, etc.)?
5. What were the criteria used in restructuring the benefit plan?
6. What is the expected impact on recruitment of new employees?
7. What are the University's obligations to people who received offer letters in which flex credits were explicitly cited as part of the offer?
8. How will the University restate its salary letters to reflect the fact that benefits are no longer considered part of the salary package?
9. How can family that's taking a \$400/month hit plan for the implementation date of January 1st?
10. Why hasn't the campus been more informed of the proposed changes as they were being developed? Did FRIC use focus groups? Why wasn't the input of the Faculty Senate and Staff Council solicited?

To question 10, Janann added: "Why weren't the various collegiate shared governance advisory boards consulted?"

Other concerns and issues raised were as follows:

--Janann noted that Sue Buckley had stated that the FRIC proposal would not actually result in any cost savings for the University.

--The communication, outreach, and solicitation of commentary surrounding FRIC has been poor and appear to undermine the role of shared governance by both staff and faculty.

--Members of the group discussed the fact they had been attracted to positions at the University of Iowa by benefits that will no longer be in existence, and that their offer letters had stressed those benefits.

--Members of the group would like to see the FRIC develop an explicit transition plan for families that would be losing benefits.

Salary increases. For faculty, the University has mandated a 3.75% average salary increase, although it has only increased its funding by 1.91%. The University has mandated a 4% average salary increase for P&S, which it has fully funded, and 4.3 average salary increase for Merit staff, which it has fully funded, and has fully funded TA salaries. P&S staff not funded by general funds will see an average increase between 4.5% and 5%.

Contribute. Janann authorized Staff Council to buy a Contribute license for its web site.

IV. By Laws Amendment

Proposal: Move elections from February to May following the May staff appreciation luncheon. Move operating year from April 1-March 31 to August 1-July 31.

After discussion, the group decided to adjust the operating year to July 1-June 30. The complete amended text of the bylaws can be found as an appendix to these minutes.

V. Old Business

- a. Staff web profile template. Susan reported that the University is adopting an electronic CV program, the licenses for which are being fully funded by the Provost. The College of Business has already ordered enough licenses to be able to create electronic CVs for its entire staff. Doug Elthoft has requested that Ryan order enough licenses to be able to create a database of electronic CV's for staff as well, a request upon which Susan followed up earlier in the week. In the absence of a response from the Dean's office, the Council decided to make a formal request to acquire enough licenses to create on-line CV's for the staff to the Dean. Phil will write to the Dean on this subject in the very near future.
- b. Shared Governance. Since shared governance was an explicit theme running through the course of this day's discussion, Phil suggested putting off more discussion until the June meeting. In June, the Council will explicitly take up the possibility of restructuring the organization of the ESAC Committees.
- c. May 19 Staff Appreciation Luncheon. The May 19th Staff Appreciation was deemed a success. It was suggested that ESAC take a more active role in planning and advertising the event, so that staff members would know that it was not just something that came from the Dean's Office. A survey of NADS staff members attending the luncheon revealed that the lemonade and macaroni and cheese that had been served in previous years were sorely missed.

VI. New Business

- a. Service. Diana introduced the idea of creating an award to recognize staff service to be presented at the annual Staff and Faculty Awards luncheon. Phil asked that Diana create a text that would outline the exact differences between this award and the Mary Sheedy award. The Council will take up the question of a Staff Service Leave at the June meeting or at the next meeting at which Diana will be present.
- b. Meeting dates for the year (including summer). The group agreed to continue meeting every 4th Thursday from 8:30 to 10:30 and that the Executive Council will meet every 2nd Thursday from 8:30 to 9:30. The next meeting will be on June 26th, at CCAD.
- c. More bike racks for staff. ESAC will ask John Millsap if it is feasible to add more bike racks around the building. Craig will invite a student liaison from Engineers for a Sustainable World to come to our June meeting to discuss ways their bicycling promotion. It would be nice to do a before and after biking survey of staff, faculty, and students, to see if the bicycling campaign had a measurable impact on them.
- d. The use of Sharepoint versus the web came up as an issue to be discussed at the June meeting.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31.

NEXT MEETING: June 26, at CCAD.

Proposed By Laws Change

Article V
Operational Year

The operational year of this Council shall be from July 1 to the following June 30.

Article VI

SECTION 1. In May, Council shall advertise upcoming nominations for Council membership. Nominations shall be sent to the Elections Committee of the Engineering Staff Advisory Council no later than the last business day of the third week of May.

Article VII

SECTION 1. The names of all eligible nominees shall be placed on the ballot. Ballots shall be prepared and approved by the Elections Committee. Ballots will be distributed to all employees no later than the end of the last business day of May. The deadline for election of councilors will be one week after the distribution date.

SECTION 4. All newly elected Council members will begin their terms July 1.

Article VIII

SECTION 2. Nominations for the officers of ESAC shall be made at the June meeting. The President must have served the immediately preceding year on the Council prior to the time he or she will hold office. The Officers shall be elected by the Council at the June meeting.

SECTION 3. All officers of the Council shall assume their duties July 1.

Article X

SECTION 1. Voting members shall include the President, Vice President/President Elect, and Secretary and one other member elected at the June meeting.

SECTION 2. Nominations and voting for non-officer Executive Committee positions shall be made at regular ESAC meetings.