

Marshall University

Marshall Digital Scholar

Staff Council Minutes

Staff Council

2-19-2009

The Minutes of the Marshall University Staff Council Meeting, February 2009

Marshall University Staff Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://mds.marshall.edu/staffcouncil_minutes



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Marshall University Classified Staff Council

February 19, 2009, Drinko Library 138

Members Present: Nina Barrett, Amber Bentley, Barbara Black, Teresa Bolt, Bernice Bullock, Tootie Carter, Darlene Colegrove, Betty Cook, Mike Dunn, Toni Ferguson, Carol Hurula, Jennifer Jimison, Darrell Kendrick, Kimberly Lawson-Murphy, Leonard Lovely, Okey Napier, Sherri Noble, Cynthia Obregon, Shirley Oden, Jan Parker, Patsy Stephenson, Joe Wortham

Members Absent: Virgil Crockett, Ronnie Hicks, Kris Standifur

Guests: Ms. Michelle Douglas, Ms. Trish Gallagher, Mr. Tommie Kelley, Mr. Jim Stephens

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chair Mike Dunn.

Mr. Jim Stephens – Human Resources

Mr. Stephens updated Council on the following:

- Catastrophic Leave Report was sent to Council members by e-mail earlier in the week. Balance at the end of December 2008: 2,470.286 hours/329.375 days. No donations were received nor disbursements made from the General Leave Bank through January 2009. Balance at the end of January: 2,470.286 hours/329.371 days. There were, however, three catastrophic leave applications active during January 2009. These all involved donations made specifically in behalf of the authorized individual, so no hours were provided from the General Leave Bank.
- PIQ Routing Sheet is being reviewed by Financial Affairs/Personnel Committee and has been sent to the President as an alternate form for Council's recommendation (CSR-08-09-02 FAPC). Handout is on file in Staff Council Office.
- MU-HR-40 – Timeline for Completion and Processing of PIQ – Handout is on file in Staff Council Office. Policy includes two options: (Option A) employee can submit PIQ on his/her own and it will make its way through the system without assistance from HR, or (Option B) HR will attach the aforementioned cover sheet, forward the PIQ to the employing department, advise said department of policy requirements and help the employee get the PIQ back on time. If President signs it, the recommendation will come back to Council as an alternate recommendation.
- Limited Compensatory Time Available for January 27 and 28, 2009 Inclement Weather Closings. This handout is on file in the Staff Council Office. Compensatory time (equal to time value) will be provided for the inclement weather closings to leave-accruing regular status employees who were required to be at work. Mr. Stephens will propose an agenda item to open the Board policy (GA-9) for review to add mechanisms for compensatory time for those required to be on site.

Approval of Minutes:

The January 15, 2009 minutes were approved as written.

Minutes Review Process – Joe Wortham

After some discussion, a show of hands vote approved Charlene's practice of sending for their review and comments, their portions of the minutes to individuals who speak before Council so she may revise their section.

ACCE Report – Mike Dunn

At Mike's request, a copy of his ACCE report is attached to these minutes.

Committee Reports:

Elections/Communications Committee – Joe Wortham – Nominations for the General Elections will be accepted until Friday, February 27. Paper ballot voting will be available on April 7 and electronic voting will be available on April 9-12. Votes will be counted on April 13.

Financial Affairs/Personnel – Kimberly Lawson-Murphy The Committee will review the PIQ Routing Sheet provided by Mr. Stephens.

Legislative Affairs Committee – Carol Hurula – Carol presented the Committee's recommendation which requests full funding of the 2001 Classified Staff Salary Schedule no later than July 1, 2009 and the establishment and maintenance of a centralized fair and equitable statewide HR system which would include legislative rules to govern personnel issues. Carol made a motion, which was seconded by Betty Cook, that Council accept the recommendation. Motion approved.

Physical Environment – Tootie Carter – No report. Tootie requested that Information/questions/issues concerning the physical environment be sent to him.

Staff Development/Service Committee – Betty Cook – No report. Amber Bentley updated her GED presentation from last month. Discussion concerning release time to prepare and to take the GED test continues.

Faculty Senate Committees Reports:

Budget and Academic Policy Committee – Carol Hurula – Carol discussed the committee's actions concerning grade appeals and policies approved or under review by the committee. Her notes are on file in the Staff Council Office.

Announcements – Mike Dunn

Mike has not received a response concerning last month's motion to invite the Board of Governors to a question-and-answer session with members of the classified staff and Marshall community.

There being no more business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Minutes taken & prepared by: _____
Charlene R. Hawkins, Program Assistant, Staff Council

Minutes approved by: _____
Michael Dunn, Chair, Staff Council

Minutes read by: _____
Stephen J. Kopp, University President

ACCE Response to FINAL REPORT, dated February 10, 2009

RECOMMENDATION #1: OK

RECOMMEDATION #2: ACCE recommends that if it is the intention of the Legislature to allow the Commission/Council to continue to study the area of reduction in force, all recommendations in the report referring to reduction in force should be part of that study and not acted upon at this time. If the legislature doesn't allow for additional "study" then we recommend that all agencies comply with the current statute regarding reduction in force, given all currently are not in compliance.

There should be a new recommendation from this language requiring each institution to develop and implement a human resources plan outlining those programs the institution will implement to accomplish the mission, goals, objectives and priorities of the institution.

RECOMMENDATION #3: Institutional personnel rules should be given scrutiny beyond mere compliance—they should AT A MINIMUM:

- a) meet technical legal requirement
- b) be consistent with the intent of the law or Commission/Council rule
- c) consider best practices
- d) identify how an institutional personnel policy will align with the institutional human resources plan
- e) require input from those constituencies affected

RECOMMENDATION #4: Concerned that institutions won't want to develop comprehensive rules, they would rather implement "procedures" which require less or no scrutiny. With procedures, the employees usually have NO input. Series 4 of the HEPC outlines when a "rule" is necessary but some institutions interpret "campus wide effect" to mean ALL employees and students.

RECOMMENDATION #5: We believe there should be a full-time auditor hired to insure the integrity of the system. The auditor should report twice annually to the Commission/Council and LOCEA for the first five years and then every five years thereafter. Each institution should be audited every other year or in staggered years until such time that they receive three consecutive outstanding audit reports. We also believe that in addition to withholding presidential salary increases, there should be a notation in the president's annual written performance evaluation by the Board of Governors. We also believe that at a minimum, a portion of any approved tuition and fee increases should be mandated for those institutions that have not yet fully funded the 2001 schedule or for those that make no progress on the new approved institutional schedule.

RECOMMENDATION #6: Concerns (for good reason) about the lack of trust in HR to fulfill their obligations/responsibilities within the proposal. The integrity of the system almost hinges on the HR community doing what they are supposed to do. It isn't clear

who will make the determination if the institutional HR's are "highly qualified" in the area of classification and compensation. All certifications must be kept current and continuing education according to industry standard should be required training for all HRs. All employees in HR can benefit from additional, regular, recurring training. All should have CUPA-HR memberships at a minimum, but World at Work memberships preferred. There is invaluable information and some training provided by these organizations FREE to members.

RECOMMENDATION #7: The annual human resources report should also include salary information—not exclude it. In addition to the information already requested in the recommendation, ACCE recommends that the following, at a minimum, should be included in that report:

- a) number of positions slotted at each institution
- b) number of new titles/jobs created/by institution/justification
- c) number of upgrades/downgrades/promotions/demotions
- d) number of employees affected by recommendation #11
- e) number of grievances/cost/topic
- f) track initial movement (and for first five years) of non-classified employees into classified system/effects
- g) number of employees receiving increases based on performance
- h) number of employees receiving step increases
- i) number of employees receiving other types of increases not relative to step or performance
- j) track movement of institutions relative to the market salary schedule
- k) provide comparable data relative to the annual market progress for classified, non-classified and faculty groups and to each other

RECOMMENDATION #8: ACCE believes that ALL institutions should use the same human resources technology platform for position management, hiring, classification, compensation, and performance management, among others. PeopleAdmin, interfaces with Banner HR and Oracle. WVU doesn't currently have a structure already in place, however, it is our understanding that they are in process.

ACCE does not feel WVU should be exempted. Having all institutions participate in PeopleAdmin would allow for the HEPC to run reports whenever they feel the need and to keep a closer watch on HR functions. The legislature may want to consider supplementing the budget of the Commission/Council to pay for the maintenance of PeopleAdmin. (FISCAL NOTE).

RECOMMENDATION #9: Should limit the promotional increases to the ranks:

Instructor to Assistant Professor

Asst. Professor to Associate Processor

Associate Professor to Professor

for a total of 30% for rank promotions. There should not be an automatic increase for any faculty ranks above professor or below instructor as some institutions have created. (Professor Sr. or Instructional Technologist)

RECOMMENDATION #10: ACCE suggests that the recommendation include the monitoring of part-time classified employees/positions given that the current statute says these positions should not exist solely for the purpose of denying benefits. Institutional and program accreditation requirements should address to some degree the staffing issues relative to faculty.

RECOMMENDATION #11: Mandate that any employee hired on or after July 1, 2009 have a letter placed in his/her official personnel file notifying the employee that if they are hired through a grant or temporary funding source, they are employed only for the term of that funding and are not eligible to bump. The legislature should also take into consideration the ability of the institutions to change the source of funding salaries without notice to the employee and for no apparent reason other than to meet payroll at certain times throughout the year. Any currently employed grant funded (but not temporary) are grandfathered, so as not to be retroactive. All non-state part-time, and contract workers should be considered for reduction in force BEFORE a full-time state employee is considered. Define how seniority would be defined and occur for reduction in force at Potomac State, WVU-Tech, MUGC, Health Sciences Centers, etc. Many institutions are not following state code directives now for bumping, including WVU, so why should we allow them flexibility in this area? SWVCTC makes employees either fill a vacancy if there is one or go on a recall list—they are not permitted to bump. WVU utilizes a placement program, again not permitting employees to bump. Classified employees want a uniform RIF policy in state statute and agree that this area needs further study and that ALL recommendations relative to bumping be taken off the table until the study is complete. (By June 2010)

RECOMMENDATION #12: Should NOT permit flexibility to WVU/MU or any other institution prior to the completion of further study on the issue of bumping.

RECOMMENDATION #13: Again, all recommendations relative to bumping/RIF should be taken off the table until the study has been completed.

RECOMMENDATION #14: All recommendations relative to outsourcing should be taken off the table until the study has been completed. LOCEA should identify key individuals to serve on study group and mandate information necessary from each institution to appropriately study this topic. Study should include ALL public higher education institutions. The committee should develop training for institutions to evaluate and assess the feasibility of outsourcing based on a cost-benefit analysis rather than “train institutions on how to evaluate outsourcing opportunities.”

RECOMMENDATION #15: OK

RECOMMENDATION #16: If the legislature agrees that the system should phase in recommendations over time, specific dates should be noted for each component(s) to be phased in. ACCE recommends the following order:

- a) classification
- b) performance management

- c) compensation
- d) professional development

ACCE also recommends that “best practices” be implemented with each component. And following proper completion of the outsourcing and reduction in force areas, best practices also accompany implementation of any recommendations arising from the study with consensus.

RECOMMENDATIONS #17-#24 are OK. #18, should read that the point factor methodology, should be retained with improvements recommended by the classification committee.

RECOMMENDATION #25: ACCE recommends that the words “regularly” and “periodically” be given more specificity. Job family reviews should take place so that every job family has been reviewed at least every five years so that when new market studies are completed, all job descriptions have been reviewed at least once.

RECOMMENDATION #26: ACCE objects to employees not having salary adjustments if it is known that they have been improperly classified (and for some time). This speaks to the importance of having all positions reviewed for proper classification at time of implementation. It is a well-known fact that some employees, some supervisors, and some human resources representatives have used classification in order to address the inadequate compensation structure and give certain employees a salary increase. This has caused PIQ inflation and this needs to be fixed in the new system. ACCE believes all employees should complete the new PIQ form, be properly classified and then properly compensated within the range for that pay grade or rounded up to the closest step if it is not within the range.

RECOMMENDATION #27: OK, however ACCE recommends that a position description should exist for ALL classified and non-classified positions.

RECOMMENDATION #28: ACCE does not trust the HRAs to slot. That equates to the system we had in the 1980's called “whole job comparison” and ACCE considers that to be a step backward. If institutions have to determine if 70%-80% or more of the duties and responsibilities match, they may as well point factor the PIQ anyway. If job descriptions are not properly maintained, then we have integrity issues. ACCE also feels that if the legislature grants this flexibility, it should be earned, monitored and audited, and taken away if found to be lacking. This recommendation, as was presented to LOCEA, was contrary to the classification committee recommendation and did not have consensus.

RECOMMENDATION #29: ACCE is not sure what the presumptions will be so we cannot comment at this time.

RECOMMENDATION #30: ACCE recommends removal of the language following the semi colon. We should not allow HRAs who are not “highly qualified” to create a job or job title. This makes the system weak. Creation of jobs and job titles should be

controlled and monitored through the Job Classification Committee with the advice and assistance of the Classification and Compensation Coordinator who would speak for those institutions not having highly qualified classification and compensation professionals.

RECOMMENDATION #31: Highly qualified human resources professional should read “highly qualified classification and compensation professional.”

RECOMMENDATION #32 – 33: OK

RECOMMENDATION #34: ALL institutions should use the same PIQ form. If we use PeopleAdmin, that would not be an issue.

RECOMMENDATION #35: OK, but ACCE prefers we use the number of working days instead of two months.

RECOMMENDATION #36: The classification committee recommended an on-campus appeals process prior to an employee being able to grieve his/her classification. ACCE believes the appeals process should be the same for all institutions.

RECOMMENDATION #37: ACCE believes this committee should also have the authority to review the compensation of non-classified employees to ensure proper analyses are performed and used in determination of those salaries as well. See also recommendation #38. Presidents should be held accountable for how non-classified compensation is determined and that written evaluations of non-classified employees are performed annually and used in determining salary increases.

RECOMMENDATION #38: Strongly agree.

RECOMMENDATION #39: Strongly agree.

RECOMMENDATION #40: ACCE thinks it should be a joint effort among the Job Classification Committee, the Job Compensation Committee, and the Classification and Compensation Coordinator.

RECOMMENDATION #41: First it is important that it be understood that while the 2001 salary schedule for classified employees was a “years of service” salary schedule, that is true in theory only. No employee moved a step based on another year of service, but rather employees moved by a percentage determined by the institution toward closing the gap to where the employee should have been for his/her years of service. It should also be noted that all faculty pay policies currently include a years of service component, though many go to extremes to hide it. And most institutions can point to no defined way of determining non-classified compensation. It certainly isn’t “merit” if all get the same percentage raise year after year, after year. Classified Employees and ACCE want the minimum salary schedule to be placed in statute as a percentage of “current market” which causes all institutions to aspire to reach, and to give the

Commission/Council the authority to update a market schedule annually based on appropriate data, and that institutions have to publish their institutional salary schedule in an institutional rule and HR plan which details in a meaningful way, their plan for progressing toward current market.

RECOMMENDATION #42: ACCE recommends that it be mandated that all classes of employees must be at an equal percentage of their respective markets. In other words, you can't pay non-classified at 95% of market and faculty at 90% of market and classified at 80% of market.

The legislature should consider lifting the tuition and fee caps or some other way of freeing up institutional funds to be used for maintaining adequate salaries and benefits for employees. Institutions should have the flexibility in the lower pay grades of the classified system to enact measures that provide for a "living wage."

RECOMMENDATION #43: Institutions should have the flexibility in the lower pay grades of the classified system to enact measures that provide for a "living wage." The method in the recommendation is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION #43-45: OK

RECOMMENDATION #46: Institutions should have to show they did valid searches by listing where advertised and for how long, the number of applicants, number of minimally qualified applicants, the affirmative action determination regarding the applicant pool, the reason for not being able to fill the position, etc.

RECOMMENDATION #47: ACCE opposes the delineation in the recommendation on the grounds that more experienced employees are being under-valued in favor of less senior employees. Instead, ACCE recommends that the years of experience per each tertile be modified to reflect the following: move one step across the salary schedule for each two years of experience in the first tertile, for each one and one-half years of experience in the second tertile, and for each year of experience in the third tertile.

In the proposed structure, employee movement through the salary schedule is predicated on the theory that new employees reach the market salary (midpoint on the salary schedule) more quickly than veteran employees move from market salary to the top of the salary range. This conclusion was derived from the assessment of labor market compensation patterns (likely factors influencing the development of the above model are loyalty, commitment, seniority, longevity, etc.) that occurred during the last century. Such employment profiles may have been the norm of the twentieth century market place, but we question their continuation in the information and technology economy of the twenty-first century. A more mobile population combined with a differing mindset of the prospective employees of the twenty-first century as compared to the twentieth century employees necessitate that a differing configuration model (thinking outside the box) may need to be instituted. The proposed modification to the above structure is to adjust the length of experience in moving through the steps. An inversion

would be instituted with more time needed to move through the steps within the first tertile but decreased at each subsequent tertile.

Factors in support for change:

Current matrix of classified employees in the system-40 plus percent of employees are currently at Step 15.

Based on data compiled by HEPC from institutional submission, there are 5,079 classified employees (FALL 2008 DATA)

Of those 5,079 classified employees, 1,122 or 22.1 percent are over age 56

Of those 5,079 classified employees, 2,265 or 44.6 percent are over age 50

Of those 5,079 classified employees 802 or 15.8 percent are below age 35

Average years of service of classified employees at their institution are 13.2 years

Current number/percent of classified employees will fall in the third tertile of the proposed plan. The over-weighted in the third tertile will be a short-term phenomena that will be resolved within the next ten years as the baby boom generation leave the work force.

Highly unlikely future tertile pattern will ever be similar to the current matrix should the employee profiles of the Xers and Millennials be the norm for the twenty-first century (unlikely to remain with same organization for more than 10 years)

Major employee attrition takes place during the first five years of employment. Thus why reward the short-timers at the expense of more senior employees who are dedicated and loyal to the organization?

Highly likely the first tertile will replace the third tertile where the major portion of employees will fall during this century.

Current employees with over fifteen years of service have a "major" reason to stay and that is to bank sick leave to pay for health care premiums whereas such incentive will not be available to the "new" employees.

The proposed plan compensates "new" employees at the expense of more experienced employees and secondly, will be a disincentive for employees to stay beyond the first tertile. More experienced employees will be disgruntled which is likely to result in a morale problem.

The current plan appears similar to the "zero step" issue wherein entry-level salaries were increased to attract and retained qualified staff at the expense of more experienced employees. Funding constraints resulted in experienced employees accepting smaller salary increases to allow funds to be used to bring both "new" and recent hires to the "zero step" at the expense of more senior employees. We perceive a similar pattern with the current allocation.

The Legislature should consider granting authority to the Commission and Council to develop a rule that allows institutions to adopt a structure that allows salary increases to moderately escalate as employees' years of service increase. The Commission and Council should adopt a modified version of the step system proposed by the Compensation Committee which provides for a gradual escalation of salary increases as employees' years of service increase.

RECOMMENDATION #48: OK

RECOMMENDATION #49: Again, ACCE feels the more senior employees are devalued somewhat by the percentages in this recommendation when they are translated into dollars.

RECOMMENDATION #50: Seems to discriminate against more senior classified employees. Is it the intention to slower the rate at which more senior non-classified and faculty salaries increase as well? If not, then why would this be fair for classified employees?

RECOMMENDATION #51: We've been advised that the theory is that once you learn the job, you are not gaining any more knowledge in that area, devaluing seniority while at the same time requiring these same employees to EXCEED performance expectations while the newer employees only have to MEET performance expectations and move more quickly through the salary range than more senior employees do. We want a definition of "exceed" performance expectations and "meet" performance expectations in the rule. Many institutions include in their current performance management training modules that "no one exceeds expectations" stating that we can always do better. This system not only requires that more senior employees exceed expectations, but that we exceed for three consecutive years before being allowed to move one step. ACCE feels this is unfair and discriminatory to the more senior employees AND institutions can use this as a loophole to hold back on salary increases for more senior employees. No employee should lose salary due to the implementation of this plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS #52 & 53: Look at the public education model. Either we value education above requirements or we don't. Why would one be base building and the other not? A code change would be required to allow for a "bonus."

RECOMMENDATION #54 & 55: Required certifications are taken care of on the classification side of the house and ACCE feels that additional compensation for those required certifications would be double-dipping. However, if an employee attains a certification valued by the institution in any way that may not be a requirement of the position, then the institutions should be asked to compensate for that milestone. Gaining more knowledge should always be valued.

RECOMMENDATION #56: The recommendation should be revised to read "...or taking advantage of any of the flexibility provisions provided in these recommendations or existing already in statute." Institutions should come to realize that funding the 2001 schedule is a priority NOT a mere suggestion. Any institution not able to move to the new system by July 1, 2011 will lose ALL current or future flexibilities afforded until such time they are compensating their employees at no less than 95% (or some agreed upon fair percentage) of current market. And the president of any such institution will have all salary enhancements ceased and this deficiency will be noted in the president's written evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION #57: See #51 above. Also ACCE feels that some employees may possibly be punished for “meeting” expectations by only being allowed to move if there is a market salary schedule movement.

RECOMMENDATIONS #58 & 59: ACCE feels these recommendations devalue classified employees. Classified employees believe we are equal partners with faculty and non-classified employees in the success of students, and in running the institution. One group is as essential as the other and cannot function without the other. ACCE does not want classified employees to be made to feel or judged by other groups to be a lower class of employee. This recommendation “cheapens” us with the offer of a T-shirt or some other trinket being offered to us, while faculty and non-classified employees are given only monetary rewards. This recommendation should be given careful thought.

RECOMMENDATION #60: Strongly agree. Should be someone with the appropriate background and knowledge of higher education PEIA requirements/problems/complaints.

RECOMMENDATION #61: Strike the word “some.” Including “some” allows for preferential treatment of some employees over others. If the institutions decide to provide additional benefits, they should be available to all employees who chose to participate.

RECOMMENDATION #62: The job classification committee or the classification and compensation coordinator at the central office should determine which non-classified positions are to be brought back into the classified system. Employees should not lose in annual days already accrued, but should then, from the date moved to the classified system, accrue leave at the appropriate rates for other classified employees based on the years of service to the institution. Or the institution could “buy out” their leave above the accrual rate they would fall into under the classified system to bring them in line.

RECOMMENDATION #63: OK

RECOMMENDATION #64: All institutions should have to be required to have an up-to-date handbook for each class of employee.

RECOMMENDATION #65: This seems a little vague. ACCE wants stronger requirements for training. The training should be provided by the Commission/Council to assure all get the same training and the training should be mandatory for all supervisory personnel. The method of delivery could be on-line or in person, but something similar to the p-card training or the driving training might work best.

RECOMMENDATION #66: Eliminate “some type” of performance review and replace with a written evaluation of strengths and weaknesses at 3 months and add to be filed

in the personnel file. In the last sentence, the word “them” should be replaced with “new employees” for clarity.

RECOMMENDATION #67: The only disciplinary procedure that exists is in the old 1987 classified employee handbook. ACCE recommends that the disciplinary policy be another item for further study and that whatever policy results from the recommendations be applicable to ALL employees, not just classified. Reasons for disciplinary action and the process for taking action should be the same at all institutions.

RECOMMENDATION #68: Strongly agree.

RECOMMENDATION #69: The training should be “worthy” training. It should be noted that many institutions are not currently providing training and development opportunities to employees due to funding concerns.

RECOMMENDATION #70: OK if all supervisory employees are required to participate.

RECOMMENDATION #71: Most institutions do not currently have any new employee orientation program. They usually just go over benefits with new employees. ACCE recommends each HR department develop a new employee orientation program with the advice and assistance of staff council and faculty senate.

RECOMMENDATION #72: Who will ensure this is done? Institutions should lose flexibilities in the recommendations if this isn’t done.

RECOMMENDATION #73: OK. Track and report annually in the HR Report.

RECOMMENDATION #74: Agree to continue to study.

ACCE ADDITIONAL ISSUES NOT ADDRESSED IN THESE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

- 9=12 months fairness issue with faculty isn’t addressed.
- Faculty PEIA premiums are based on base pay and do not include other income sources such as income one may receive for administering a grant. Also, faculty hired after July 1, 2000 did not lose their ability to pay for insurance premiums at retirement using their years of service but classified employees did.
- Percentage of non-classified should be capped at 10% and clarified that it is 10% of classified employees eligible to participate in the higher education retirement plans instead of 10% of ALL employees.

- Need clarification as to how “years of service” are to be calculated for less than full-time (1.0 FTE) employees. Institutions are calculating in various ways, some in harmful ways to the part-timers.
- For purposes of the statute and rule relative to the personnel study, the definition of “institution(s)” should be redefined to include the employees of the HEPC and CCTCE.
- Detail the role and authority of the Commission and Council and the Legislature with regard to compensation and personnel.
- Address the contradictory language in statute regarding the status of campus police officers. They are currently covered under the classification system and paid on the classified salary schedule, but the code says they work at the “will and pleasure” of the BOG. Some institutions have denied their right to grieve as a result. ACCE feels these employees should retain the right to grieve so that administrators won’t interfere with the officer’s ability to uphold the law and report accurately student right-to-know issues.
- Continue the “Rules and Statutes” committee until such time all rules required by the legislature for implementation of any personnel system adopted by the Commission and Council.

There may be additional issues that arise as we work through the legislation.

Thank you for the opportunity for input.

Amy Pitzer, Chair
Advisory Council of Classified Employees