UNIVERSITY STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Business Meeting
Minutes
February 23, 2022
Microsoft Teams
8:30 - 10:30 a.m.

In Attendance:
Steven Loborec, Laurel Van Dromme, Debbie Pond, Emily Kelley, Randall McKenzie, Justin Lahmers, Faith Kline, Stacey Houser, Kynthia Droesch, Holly Davis, Sherri Hall, Annie Bingman, Trisha Ritter, Jennifer Elliott, Courtney Gandy, Tina Bogac, Patrick Weeks, Elizabeth Hosket, Drew Miller, AmyJo Baughman, Tracey Boggs, Shelby Dawkins, Casey Henceroth, Jason Homan, Allison Jones, AnnaBell Kinsel, Margaret Nevrekar, Sloane Trusso, Ana Casado, and Brandon Gibbs.

Call to Order 8:31
Adoption of the Agenda
Approval of the Previous Meetings’ Minutes February 9, 2022

Executive Committee Reports
• No executive committee report due to time constraints.

Subcommittee Reports
• No subcommittee report due to time constraints.

OHR Liaison Report
• No OHR Liaison report due to time constraints.

Items for Informational Purposes
HR Updates and Listening Session (8:30 am - 9:00 am) Dr. Jeff Risinger
• Staff ratios – The University Strategic Plan calls for adding 350 more faculty members. How do staff numbers grow alongside faculty numbers? Both numbers need to go up in a corresponding fashion. We need to think about this on the front end before there is a crisis in staff support. USAC can be helpful in how we set the structure for the hiring.
• New HR Advisory Council – Group of 20 members from across the university tasked with advising on HR topics and issues. USAC chair should always have a seat on the council. The group is set to begin in mid-March.
• Career Roadmap – We can’t go live with the project without updated job descriptions. The employee review period is an invitation to give feedback. Nothing negative should come from Career Roadmap. In the worst case scenarios, we have “grandfathering” capabilities that we could use sparingly. Example: If someone has a title that is above the job they are doing, we should try to bring them up to the title, instead of bringing their title down. We have the tools we need to avoid negative outcomes.
  o Tina Bogac commented that there are some employees in her area that are going from A&P to CCS and will lose a week’s worth of vacation every year and have been told there is nothing they can do about it. What is the appropriate way to instigate the grandfathering process? Let Jeff know if there are situations where employees are being told there is nothing that
can be done. Jeff reiterated that there should be no negative consequences from Career Roadmap. Jeff has asked the Compensation team to find every scenario where an employee is pushing back or feels like a negative change is occurring and investigate the scenario.

- Ana Casado presented two questions from a colleague: 1) How can an employee be “reclassified” within the new framework? Is this actually a roadmap if the way to get a promotion is the same as it is now? 2) What kinds of things should employees prepare/provide to their supervisor if they are looking to be promoted?
  - Jeff responded that the first thing that needs to be cleaned up is the position description. Anything about your current job can be brought up during this process. Employees should not feel like they are fighting against a pre-determined outcome. There is no way a handful of people in Compensation could know how to map all of the positions across the organization. That is why there is a feedback process.
  - Tracey Boggs asked if the grandfathering is only for Career Roadmap or applies to positions outside this project. Jeff responded that he was referring to Career Roadmap, but it should certainly be applied, if appropriate, to any situation.

- Unanswered questions from the chat:
  - AnnaBell Kinsel commented: I think this message of “no negative outcomes” really needs to be pushed at our town hall. I have colleagues that are terrified of their career roadmap conversations because they are assuming they will experience a demotion or reduction in pay.
  - Annie Bingman asked: During this process are we only able to appeal the mapping, or are we able to appeal the pay band classification? We have an issue in our department where lower-level positions were given higher pay band than what should be higher level positions.
  - Holly Davis commented: I have heard from a # of managers in different areas, who are upset that their folks (supervisees) are being mapped lower than they should. Would an appeal from an employee really be considered, if HR wouldn't even listen to the person's supervisor?
  - Annie Bingman commented: Our HR representative flat out told us it would be unlikely that anything would change after an appeal because the work has already been done. Faith Kline said she has heard the same thing.
  - Laurel Van Dromme commented: Annie and Holly, given Jeff’s comment to want to help deeply across the institution, it might be helpful for you to share with Steven the HR colleagues or managers that are seeming to have challenges in this process.
  - Faith Kline commented: It sounds like a disconnect between what Jeff is telling us and what we are hearing from HR.
  - Tracey Boggs asked about the best way to contact Dr. Risinger with concerns. Steven responded that as USAC members we should feel comfortable reaching out directly to Jeff. It should also be brought up with Steven and Laurel, so they can bring it up at their 1:1 meetings with Jeff.
Allison Jones commented: I wonder if HR is thinking that people's positions will be mapped certain ways moving forward, but they're not considering that the individual who happens to be in the role right now can be grandfathered in and not be negatively affected. I'd be curious to see how Jeff responds to this.

Faith Kline commented: Based on conversations that I'm having with my HR, I don't feel that Jeff's ideas/goals are being effectively communicated.

Justin Lahmers added that he is reassured by Jeff Risinger's words and approach. Tone gets set from the top and I hope that a culture change will filter down.

Holly Davis asked if there was more context about the HR Advisory Council that Dr. Risinger mentioned. Steven responded that his understanding is that it is related to the business decisions being made. The people in the group will be senior leaders or their designees, they have broad decision-making power. Our USAC group experiences those decisions and can provide feedback.

IE Self-Evaluation Questions Discussion (9:00 - 9:30) Steven, Laurel, and IE Subcommittee

- What does the work our subcommittee does look like at its most equitable and inclusive? How does our subcommittee measure equity?
  - Laurel described the work she is doing with the New Member Task Force. She reached to colleagues in ODI and HR to find out how we can be more inclusive in our recruitment process and our materials. So far, the NMTF has reviewed and revised the application and interview rubrics.
  - Steven noted that he went on a listening tour before transitioning to chair to solicit USAC members’ feedback and concerns. One piece of feedback was not knowing what the executive committee is working on. Executive committee meetings now include representatives from all subcommittees to create more transparency and avenues for feedback and broader input.
  - Shelby Dawkins commented that while we follow Robert’s Rules of Order, how do we want to report out as a subcommittee? What is the expectation? We do not all have the same professional experience with committees. Steven agreed that having a guide or examples of reports would be helpful. Casey Henceroth commented that the Governance subcommittee had a similar conversation recently that aligns with “reporting out” and creating consistency and transparency. Steven commented that the examples could be an appendix in the Operations Manual.
  - Sherri Hall commented that the USAC focus still seems to be mostly on university staff and WMC employees are an afterthought. Steven agreed that he has also felt this way. This motivated him to become more involved. He also commented that the majority of staff work in the medical center. Winter Recess is an example of this, because there is a difference in the way this was rolled out. Steven tried to convey to leaders that there are thousands of WMC employees that don’t work directly with patients and could take advantage of the Winter Recess. There is still a divided culture between the WMC and university. Shelby commented that there are silos amongst WMC leadership between medical center and the James. Sherri reiterated that we have to continue to push for hard change despite the obvious obstacles between the medical center and university. Sherri doesn’t want this committee to be perceived as only for the university staff. It needs
to fall on medical center leadership for why change is not occurring and not on USAC for not trying to advocate for WMC employees because it is too hard. Stacey Houser commented that all USAC initiatives are proposed for both sides, but we don’t make the ultimate decisions. She agrees that there are cultural differences between the WMC and university. Shelby commented that she thinks Laurel’s tour of the ERGs is helping make USAC more accessible to Med Center staff. That is a start to let Med Center staff know we are here, and eventually there may start to be a change as more med center people engage.

- How might some of our constituents feel excluded from our normal processes? What factors may contribute to their feeling excluded?
  - Shelby commented that staff members have tried to attend meetings but are then dismissed from the meetings because of confidential business procedures. Allison Jones asked if we could record the meetings to post later?
  - Sherri Hall suggested we start an ad-hoc marketing committee. Steven agreed and suggested we start a task force to figure out what else we can do to make ourselves known and have more staff engage with us.
  - Courtney Gandy suggested we might need a perception change. Some staff do not want to engage with our town halls because they are too scripted and don’t actually answer the questions of the town. Laurel suggested a USAC town hall in the spring to hold a listening session.
  - Holly Davis asked if we could survey our newsletter subscribers if we can’t survey all of staff. Holly also asked that the anon comment form on the website be moved back to the homepage. It is too hard to find right now. Steven is fully supportive of surveying our newsletter subscribers and moving the comment form to the homepage. Debbie Pond will move the link.
  - Casey Henceroth commented that the whole theme here is more transparency. Is anything being drafted about what we are asking the university for? And then documenting the university’s response. Steven commented that the goal of our annual report is to document our work and give updates on the progress of our initiatives, but that only happens once a year. How do we balance documentation and transparency of what we are doing with sensitive work that is easier to accomplish if not broadcast broadly? Casey Henceroth commented: I think maybe finding a balance between increasing transparency and being strategic. Totally get that it may not be appropriate to get every single initiative/proposal in writing, but we do need to have more to show the staff we represent about what USAC is doing. Shelby commented that we change the conversation by sharing what we are working on and we can’t ask people to not talk about it.
  - Allison asked if we could have the documentation of our meetings in closer to real time?
  - Holly Davis asked if we could make resolutions in writing to put pressure on leadership. Steven commented that USAC’s version of formal recommendations is the annual report. Laurel commented that slimming down the annual report will make our recommendations more impactful.

- This conversation will be continued at the next business meeting.

**Biology & Stretch Break** (9:30 – 9:35)

**USAC Advocacy Discussion** (9:35 - 10:00) Full Committee
• This topic will be discussed at a later business meeting.

**USAC Election process** (10:05 - 10:30) Election Task Force

• Sherri Hall and Faith Kline have agreed to serve on the Election Task Force.
• Nomination period is open now. You can self-nominate or nominate someone else. Nominations can be anonymous. You do not have to run if you are nominated.
• Nominees must submit a written platform statement and a give brief presentation.
• Sherri and Faith will reach out to the nominees on March 1st.

**Items for Group Discussion**

• Staff Career Development Grant application review due by Friday!
• Career Roadmap Town Hall - March 2nd at noon. Register here: [https://usac.osu.edu/career-roadmap-town-hall-for-staff/](https://usac.osu.edu/career-roadmap-town-hall-for-staff/)

**Adjournment** 10:30 a.m.