

**CPAC Monthly Meeting**  
**Student Union Room 335 | 3:00pm-4:30pm | November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

**Attendees:** Anne Bruno, Jeanette Carson, Will Cole, Anthony Colucci, Stephanie Kiba, Alma Olson, David Parry, and Kristin Foy Samson

**Excused:** Barb Caillet, Carly DeBord, Abbey Shiban, Autumn Frampton, Dorothy Gruich, Lynn Lucas, Meghan Meeker, and Alan Parker

**Absent:** Misty Franklin

**1. Open Meeting:**

- a. Anthony Colucci, Chair of CPAC, opened the meeting at 3:06pm

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

- a. Approval of Meeting Minutes for September and October: (Motion) Will Cole, (Second) Alma Olson, no opposed.

**3. Treasurer Report**

- a. No updates from last meeting with regard to the Treasurer's Report.

**4. Updates:**

**a. Presidential Search**

- i. University Council (UC) was approached to represent the campus in the upcoming presidential search. The proposed change would allow the UC Chairperson to represent all of the constituents (CPAC, SEAC, and UC). In response, CPAC and SEAC executive committee met and prepared a joint statement, which was read by Jeanette Carson at the University Council meeting. See attachment for full statement.
- ii. The statement expressed concern over a closed presidential search and the need to include all constituent groups in the search process.
- iii. To change the search process, a board rule change will have to occur. A revised board rule is in the process of being drafted.
- iv. As a result of the statement and concerns brought forward at University Council, the Board of Trustees will be adding a representative from the following groups to the search process: CPAC, SEAC, AAUP, UC, Faculty Senate, and USG. The representatives will not have a final vote but will be able to provide guidance and feedback on candidates. Anthony Colucci will represent CPAC as Chair.
- v. A timeline for the search process will be announced tentatively in February.

**b. Strategic Plan**

- i. The purpose of the Strategic Planning (3-Year Action Planning) Committee was to help create a timeline and parameters for all university units to evaluate their services and functions and set

## CPAC Monthly Meeting

Student Union Room 335 | 3:00pm-4:30pm | November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018

measurable priorities for the next 3 years. Interim President Green wanted to create a process that could be completed yearly to evaluate our priorities, measure goals, reflect, evaluate resources, and plan ahead to help facilitate the budget planning process. The plan will also help the upcoming presidential search, as the plan can be used to market the university and help candidates see university strengths.

- ii. The committee met frequently during October and November and communicated to the campus once the planning timeline and parameters were finalized. The goal was to ensure a unified message was sent to all university constituents as the meeting schedules for CPAC, SEAC, University Council, etc vary greatly.
- iii. The Draft University Strategic Plan has been submitted to University Council for review and will be voted on. The final plan will be submitted for vote to the Board of Trustees at the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### 5. Guest Speaker, Sarah Kelly, Associate Vice President Human Resources

- a. Sarah Kelly reviewed changes and updates in Human Resources. During summer, Human Resources lost one third of their staff and has moved to replace the lost positions.
- b. Currently, areas of focus for Human Resources are training and process efficiency, e.g., new training programs, shifting training to Brightspace (online), Title IX training for employees, rebuilding the office, and completing strategic planning.
- c. Questions for Kelly:
  - i. **What stage is the Sick Leave Bank Policy at?**
    1. Kelly recently met with John Reilly within the last week. The policy will not be ready for the December Board of Trustees meeting, as there are questions and items that need to be defined before submitting it.
    2. Specifically, Kelly be working to define catastrophic illnesses and benchmarking the definition with other institutions.
    3. Kelly anticipates the policy could be ready for the February Board of Trustees meeting.
  - ii. **Is the University considering implementing any “do the right thing” employee advantages for health and wellness?**
    1. HR is moving away from such programs as there are ADA/EEOC concerns—this is a trend nationwide.
  - iii. **To what degree will Contract Professionals be engaged in their redeployment as a result of personnel shifts with the Strategic Plan?**
    1. All measures will be taken to not let people go. With

**CPAC Monthly Meeting**  
**Student Union Room 335 | 3:00pm-4:30pm | November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

regard to giving voice to those who might be redeployed to another unit, it is unclear that an employee would have a voice.

- iv. **Does the ListServ of current contract professionals include those who have left or transitioned to a new position (staff)?**
  - 1. The list does not contain that information, but it could be provided by request.
- v. **Does our Employee Vision coverage include Lasik or could it cover Lasik?**
  - 1. Under the current plan, employees receive a percentage discount on services like Lasik. There are plans that do have more coverage, but we do not currently offer them.
- vi. **How do you feel we stack up in benchmarking? Where is our biggest gap?**
  - 1. We are in the middle of the pack of health benefits; institutions that have medical centers tend to run their benefits like an HMO.
  - 2. With compensation, we are lacking. We are struggling to recruit and retain employees, in some areas more than others.
  - 3. Completing a market analysis is in the 3-year action plan for Human Resources. Completing the study is not costly, however, correcting salaries and discrepancies found gets costly. The institution could choose to do it all at once, but it would be more feasible to target the most needed area, e.g. Student Services.
- vii. **Do we measure the cost of losing and replacing employees?**
  - 1. No, the cost varies greatly; the only fixed cost is advertising and most positions are not advertised.
- viii. **What retirement programs are available?**
  - 1. Retire and Rehire: An employee rehires for one year at 80% of their former salary.
  - 2. VRIP: An employee transitions from full-time to part-time; 75% of their salary is converted to an hourly rate up to 3 years at 26 hours per week.
- ix. **What is Voluntary Reduction in Hours?**
  - 1. Voluntary Reduction occurs when an employee opts to work 32 hours per week with supervisor/HR/Board Approval. The employee is treated like full-time for benefits but works 32 hours.
  - 2. The reduction is permanent. When the employee leaves the salary line is reduced permanently.
- x. **Is HR looking at potentially partnering with other institutions to**

**CPAC Monthly Meeting**  
**Student Union Room 335 | 3:00pm-4:30pm | November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

**lower the employee cost of insurance?**

1. Inter-University Council is planning to look at insurance, particularly ancillary insurance.
2. One healthcare selection for the entire state is difficult to implement as regional access issues with providers could make it cumbersome.
3. Additionally, unions also have stipulations in their contracts for insurance.

**6. New Business:**

**a. Procedural Manual:**

- i. The CPAC Procedural Manual needs to be updated yearly. Anthony will resend an electronic copy to the listserv.

**b. Process to Request Treasury Funds:**

- i. Anne suggested the creation of a process to request treasury funds.
- ii. Process could be added to the Procedural Manual.

**c. Future Committee Updates:**

- i. Anthony will send a qualtrics survey to have more uniform approach to collect Committee Updates.

**7. Adjournment from CPAC**

- a. Anthony Colucci, Chair of CPAC, adjourned the meeting at 4:22pm: (Motion) Jeanette Carson, (Second) Kristin Foy Samson, no opposed.

**CPAC Member: Abbey Shiban**  
**Committee: Advancement Committee**  
**Update:**

The Institutional Advancement committee met on November 2. The main agenda idea was to review the goals for the year. Since the October meeting was not well attended, the November meeting raised lots of questions and additional conversation regarding the goals. The main topic of discussion was a Brightspace portal for Scholarships. Last year's committee had started the project and was hoping this year's committee would continue it. This year's committee was more concerned about the work included with this project and who would maintain it. Thus, the number one goal this year was changed to promoting scholarships on campus and hoping to work with Institutional Marketing to assist in the promotion of scholarships to students. The goals are being finalized via email to go to UC in December.

**CPAC Member: Meghan Meeker**  
**Committee: Information Technology**  
**Update:**

UC-IT is currently conducting an audit of university owned laptops and what type of faculty/staff are using them.

We were also charged by Nathan Mortimer and Jolene Lane to come up with a solution for the problem of homeless folks using campus computers for less than savory practices. We don't have a solution yet, but I can say that our last meeting was quite interesting.

**CPAC Member: Will Cole**  
**Committee: Budget & Finance**  
**Update:**

The UC Budget and Finance Committee was presented with the most recent version of The University of Akron Continuous Planning and Budgetary Process. The committee was pleased with the progress on the flow chart. After an initial review, minor edits were suggested that would clarify the UC Budget and Finance Committee's role in recommending to University Council future budgets. A final version is expected by the next meeting.

**CPAC Member: Kristin Foy Samson**  
**Committee: Communications**  
**SEPTEMBER Update:**

1. Julie Cajigas reviewed the SEFA campaign survey being created by students in the School of Communication. Campaign objectives, goals, tactics were discussed. The committee considered the following:
  - a. Including traditional demographic prompt
  - b. Add landing page details at the end of the survey

- c. Adding question about finances
- d. Making portions of the survey required
2. IRB has conditionally approved the survey.
3. Students will present three campaigns to the committee, and the chosen team will execute their campaign and create content.
4. Julie will contact Bob Kropff to discuss survey distribution.
5. Committee will review a list of tactics and send ideas to Julie in preparation for a mid-month, ad hoc meeting.
6. Tiffany Schmidt offered to create a Google Team Drive for use with the campaign.

**OCTOBER Update:**

1. October meeting was moved to Thursday, Nov. 1 to accommodate the students in the School of Communication Advanced Strategic Social Media course to present their SEFA campaigns to our committee and ZipAssist staff.
2. Three student teams presented their best ideas to increase the number of eligible students who can use the SEFA grant. Their goal is to build awareness and support the use of the SEFA grant.
3. Winning team/ideas will work with Meghan Meeker to produce a campaign to be shared across campus.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 30.

**CPAC Member: Jeanette Carson**  
**University Council**  
**Update:**  
**November 20, 2018**  
**University Council Meeting Minutes**

- **Presidential Search Process**  
UC was asked by BOT to decide whether we support the UC Chairperson representing UC in the upcoming search for a new University President. Specifically, a “committee of the whole” as well as the Chairperson of Faculty Senate and the USG President would form the subcommittee. While this subcommittee would not vote directly, we would have unprecedented participation in the search of the new UA President. However, this search would be confidential in the sense that the UA community would not know the outcome until after the final vote from the Board of Trustees and the confirmed contract with the candidate. In addition, board rule 3359-1-05 would be changed. Jeanette Carson read a prepared statement prepared by SEAC/CPAC Exec. Membership (*The letter is attached*)  
It was requested that a public forum with the presidential search committee be scheduled for the university committee to communicate what qualifications the new president should possess.  
There was a lengthy discussion on all points of this new presidential search process. It was decided to table discussion and ask BOT to provide more detail in writing as to what items in rule 3359-1-05 were being considered to be changed.
- UC next meeting is Tues. Nov. 27 Agenda: *Three-Year Action Plan Discussion (first reading)* Everyone is welcome to attend this meeting at 3:00pm in Zook 108.

(See next page for attachment)

After careful consideration of the request from the Provost and a review of the appropriate board rules, the executive members of SEAC and CPAC respectfully oppose the representation of UC solely by the chair in regard to the subcommittee advising the Board of Trustees in the forthcoming presidential search.

Rather than represent “unprecedented participation”, this course of action is against board rule 3359-1-05 and would be a step backwards in terms of representation and shared governance.

The strength of the University Council lies in the representation of the many constituency groups across campus that come together to pool their ideas and concerns for the greater good of the institution and our students. To be effective, the Council elects an executive team to manage the business of the group and run the meetings, however, this responsibility does not extend to representation.

While a small committee can sometimes be more effective, efficiency should not come at the cost of representation. Rather than a subcommittee made up the UC Chair (a faculty member) the chair of faculty senate (also a faculty member) and the USG president, we recommend that the subcommittee be made up of members pulled from all the constituency groups represented in University Council.

This larger committee would better reflect the perspectives and concerns of the entire campus community - and should have little impact on the workings with the board since they would remain in an advisory role.

The executive members of SEAC and CPAC also respectfully oppose the proposal of a closed search. While we certainly understand and appreciate the logic behind the idea that a closed search could yield more qualified candidates, it is likely to exacerbate our already tenuous relationship with community stakeholders. In a time when our institution has taken much negative press for closed-door decisions and lack of transparency; and when our HLC accreditation focused so heavily on shared governance, we believe it would be detrimental to proceed with a closed search.