

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

University of Montana Staff Senate Meeting  
Minutes

University of Montana Staff Senate

---

12-13-2017

### Documents from the December 13, 2017 meeting of the University of Montana Staff Senate

University of Montana–Missoula. Staff Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/staffsenate\\_minutes](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/staffsenate_minutes)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

University of Montana–Missoula. Staff Senate, "Documents from the December 13, 2017 meeting of the University of Montana Staff Senate" (2017). *University of Montana Staff Senate Meeting Minutes*. 17. [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/staffsenate\\_minutes/17](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/staffsenate_minutes/17)

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Montana Staff Senate at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Montana Staff Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).



## DECEMBER AGENDA

DECEMBER 13, 2017

UC 332/333

- I) Call to Order
- II) Roll Call
- III) Quorum Present
- IV) Public Comment
- V) UM Minute
- VI) Approval of Minutes (# \*November minutes)
- VII) Presentation of Financial Statement (\*Financial Statement)
- VIII) Discussion
  - 1) Academic Program & Administrative Services Prioritization (APASP) [recommendations](#) #\* - Task Force members/Senators Haley & Domitrovich
  - 2) Voluntary Severance Offer (VSO) – VP Alford
  - 3) Staff Senate Survey – Senator Sager
- IX) New Business
  - 1) ASUM Resolution SB27-17/18\*
  - 2) SPCC/ECOS – collaboration on Strategic Vision Blueprint for Operationalization (BfO)\*
- X) Reports of Standing Committees
  - 1) Staff Senate Committee reports (\*) – Committee chair liaison, VP Alford
    - a) Professional Development Committee (PDC)
    - b) Communications and Visibility Committee (CVC)
    - c) Bylaws Committee
    - d) Scholarship Committee
- XI) Adjournment (#)

(#) Designates that a vote is necessary.

(\*) Designates that additional information has been distributed prior to the meeting, followed by a brief description of information.

## **December Meeting Minutes December 13, 2017 10 a.m. UC 330/331**

### **Welcome & Call to Order**

President Mangold called the meeting to order

### **Roll Call**

Present: Alford, Blair, Camp, Chiewphasa, Csorosz, Domitrovich, Haley, Kelley, Laine, Lee, Lyon, Mangold, Maier, McHenry, Morgan, Neal, Ramsdell, Sager, Schroeder, Stan, Wade

Excused: Atteberry, Baldwin, Bigelow, Bowling, Burgad, Crowley, Heath, Hoover, Minnick, Pavlish

Quorum Present

### **Approval of November Meeting Minutes**

- November meeting minutes approved

### **Financial Report**

- Nothing to report

### **New Business**

#### **APASP Discussion**

The grounds crew was not mentioned in the President's recommendations but we have serious concerns about campus safety related to the loss of employees taking VSO.

- Sen Csorosz will draft a motion and circulate via email

APASP next steps:

APASP hasn't done recommendations for any programs except for those in the bottom, due to time constraints

- What about the large numbers of programs that have fallen into category 2?
  - The problem with finding consensus on this is time. Roughly 70-80% of everything on campus in this category. Due to the very short timeframe, we've had to prioritize what we can do.
- The APASP Task Force decision was that we don't have time to make recommendations for category 2, so it was our strong recommendation that all stakeholders have more time to put in responses. Before any substantial modifications occur, we suggest seeking further input.
  - But the input that would be sought would not be more than what we've already defined. Deans, sector heads, authors.

- What's the logic in not addressing the General Fund programs before moving on to non-general fund programs?
  - The deadline was Nov 30. There has been discussion about this but the TF remains committed to this.
  - There is a substantial amount of information about all of these units is now available to cabinet and sector heads to make decisions.
- Invest in the Faculty Development Office (Rec 4) has concerned the PDC. Contrast that with Rec 29 sub point of "continue investment in professional development". This Rec 29 is under A&F. Because this person's old job in HR is under A&F. We have not had a training and development person since June. This continued investment phrase is puzzling. There is zero investment right now. Given the VSO, training is going to be essential.
  - Let's be very clear that we are not at all opposed to development for Faculty. The document now seems that no changes are necessary. Right now they are talking about investing in Faculty Development. Also, Cindy Bois in her position did not just train staff, she trained faculty. Without staff, faculty are going to be doing staff jobs. FDO was in the second category and it is getting more attention, while Staff Development is staying in status quo.
- **Motion: Staff Senate strongly encourages investment in a professional development program for staff, based on the APASP review and categorization. Staff Senate believes professional development is a critical need at this time. Clarify the statement "continued investment", given that there is no staff professional development program currently.**
  - Motion passes (there may be some editorial changes to make stronger/more clear)
- Public comment: Barb Koostra, MMAC Director
  - At no time, was she consulted in terms of recommendations from the Dean, to the Provost, to the President. Not one statement was made to her--this recommendation comes out of nowhere. She has not seen evidence that this change would result in any efficiencies.
  - Senator: Statement of support for MMAC, which is a program that strongly connects UM to the community. We have not had space to display our collections. We have gone from expanding and promoting our art collection, to contracting it.
  - Senator: Whenever there is a point made that sharing services would save resources, we want to make sure that there should be some savings of resources.
  - If you weren't an author, sector head, etc., you have had very limited ability to provide feedback. Probably all of you have conversations about the APASP process. However, some individuals feel that providing anonymous feedback is valuable when people are not fearing retaliation (especially given all the staff leaving with VSO).
    - We will have a feedback form on the Staff Senate website.
  - The data and information about each unit is in the reports they turned in, so the President's recommendations are not the place for it, right?
    - Yes, but some recommendations are very specific, while some are sweeping. And these sweeping recommendations are going to affect many people. We can ask why some are nitpicked and some are broad strokes.
  - One of the largest trends was the merging of different departments, which would allow sharing resources. A lot of this is about being able to minimize the staff in these units. They talk more about opening up silos of faculty, not about reduction of faculty. But it does talk about holding faculty accountable. There are programs that have 3 faculty and 3 students. There are many recommendations about shared services of staff.
    - **Motion: For recommendations for shared services, shared staff support, consolidation, (etc.) there must be a review of the impact on staff that are working on these units, including staff feedback.**
    - No more involuntary staff reductions. We are already at bare bones. (Ex: If we have two schools merged together and then add the Museum, how many staff are actually supporting current programs? What are the roles and responsibilities of these staff and are they being fairly compensated?) (*seconded, passed*)
  - Missoula College (MC) recommendations. The academic recommendations fell into 2 categories 1) those basically in moratorium already, not accepting students 2) some are a misunderstanding of how MC

programs work. There are embedded one year programs that you can get for doing the first year (of a larger two year program) and some of these are recommended for discontinuation. This is going to be especially problematic, given the Dean's upcoming departure. In terms of staff, I have more to say about VSO than the APASP.

- Are you concerned about the VSO?
  - Not at Missoula College, but at the Registrar's office. We are trying to determine which federally mandated essential services to not offer students any longer.
  - One reason I know (anecdotally) that people are taking the VSO is that the Registrar's office has already suffered a loss of people. So the reason many people are taking the VSO is previous reorganizations and rejection of Career ladders for additional duties. If we aren't going to fill positions, we have to add these duties to other people, and then we have to pay them. We can reorganize, that's fine. I think a lot of people would be willing to do more, but they want to be paid more.
- Some Missoula College programs are being pulled out from category 2 and put in 3 (Surgical tech, etc.),
  - Staff impacts have already happened to these programs. We have lost the Admin for Industrial Tech. the Dean's office support has been lost and replaced with a student. They have combined the admin for Nursing and the rest of Health Professions. They are already functioning at a very low level. There are fewer people to meet students where they are.

CVC and Sen Sager have been working to compile the results of the survey sent to staff about their experiences. (losing staff, ability to serve students, etc.)

- 15% of staff reported losing 1 staff member in their offices, 9% lost 2, 3% lost 3, 4% lost 4 or more
- Thank you to everyone who helped with this. An admin associate would really have helped.
- A third said they were not able to maintain equipment and program to do their jobs.
- Many, many staff reported doing work that is outside of their job description.
- 82% of staff said they are not receiving additional compensation for their duties.
- Survey analysis is ongoing and we will have a final report shortly. If you are interested in helping, contact Caitlin.
- This data will not be ready for APASP, but should be for VSO.

Research office recommendations--any comments?

- ORSP is already lacking in staff and with people taking the VSO, things will be stretched thin. Their director is stressed out.
- We are talking about millions of dollars. You need highly trained staff. I'm sure there are people here that would be very able to be trained to fill those roles.
- Should we recommend that we do internal searches to fill these roles? President Mangold will include this in her recommendations.

DSS is already totally maxed out. They are doing amazing things with limited staff. They were placed into the top category so we need to see investment there so we can serve our students.

The Admissions office needs further investment. That office has gone through hectic times over many years. If we talk about growing the University, then this is where it starts. Although we do need better and proven plans.

Maria will have her feedback compiled by 5pm tomorrow. Senators must provide any feedback to her by 5pm Friday.

VSO Discussion:

- Sen Alford is on the team analyzing VSO gaps. Interesting meeting. Many pockets had already been discussed and planned for. It seems like Rosi and her HR team have already addressed many pockets. They have been in conversation for a while.

- It was strange because I didn't have a lot of opportunity to give input. The planning committee will be meeting throughout the spring to see how reorganization happens.
- I had been invited to this team because we are not convinced Directors and VPs have all the information about what is being actually asked of staff.
- I threw out the idea of an "update your role description" campaign. It seems like a good idea given that at least 80% of us are doing things outside our job description (survey results). How would you approach a grievance from someone if you didn't update their job description? We think it's a good idea moving forward to make sure staff know they can work with their supervisors to work out.
- Then there was a request for me to contact budget people to ask if they would donate their time to help those units losing their budget people. If people are trying to add job duties, we need to address whether or not it's a classification jump. More work does not necessarily mean a pay increase. If you're an academic advisor and you're given extra work, it's still in your job description.
- The team has identified sectors where there's opportunity for reorganization. There are people working really hard on this. Everyone is invested in the success of the University. We might disagree about what that means, but we are all concerned about the University post-VSO.
- President Mangold is advocating for transparency and communication moving forward. We need quick and clear communication about the gaps we can expect at the end of the semester. There will not be a release of names, but there may be a release of job titles.
- Question? Who is on the VSO team you described?
  - Dan Jenko, Rosi, Sara Drake, Lucy France, Luke Alford. And it seems that HR is involved and the Provost is in regular communication.
- Job descriptions do have "other duties as assigned". In terms of donations, they will ride on our good graces and then suddenly we are having bake sales. In facilities, they have tried to get volunteers to do our jobs, like community service.
- Is OCHE only to be able to make adjustments to budgetary constraints and requests? This money could also have been offered to those cut as a result of APASP. Maybe we should have made it severance for those impacted by the cuts?
  - This is a timing issue. Staff wanted an option similar to the faculty early retirement option. I didn't hear back until they had already developed the VSO. We did advocate to get the retiree benefits added to the VSO offer. They did have to negotiate with OCHE on this. They used the money left after the faculty early retirement. None of the APASP recommendations will happen overnight.
- The VSO team is SUCH an important committee. Where is the transparency here?
  - Keep in mind that today is the last day to rescind, so the transparency could increase.
- Maria shared a document from Rosi Keller at the Cabinet that states "a moratorium will be placed on career ladders and submission of new role descriptions for the next 6 months".
- There must be transparency. What role does Staff Senate take?
  - There should be a taskforce with a larger distribution of staff to help make those decisions.
  - I find this extraordinarily troubling and support any motion that would ask for a Task Force.
- The idea that staff should work across sectors and not update career ladders are in direct conflict.
- The President should appoint a VSO Task Force, constructed similarly to APASP, with weight and voice and staff representation.
- **Motion: To protect integrity, transparency, and shared governance, add "and a staff representative" to the sector head language to the ad hoc working group.** Motion passes
- Long term, there is no transparency here.
- **Motion: (in regards to compensation and career ladders.) With all decisions related to post-VSO reassignments, employees must be compensated increases in scope of responsibilities and duties (based on HR policies).** Motion passes
- In an effort to find creative solutions to these gaps, we have to reject a moratorium on career ladders. I do not need to be compensated 6 months from now for the changes you are making NOW. I need to be compensated NOW. In light of our efforts to be creative, and to work with that, we need to object strongly to a moratorium on career ladders.

Meeting adjourned  
**NEXT MEETING: January 10, 2018**

DRAFT