Members Present: Brendan Andrews, Vice President Renee Berteau, Johanna Brabham, Rodman Cory, Isis Erb, Kate Ford, Mark Hall, Sara Hearne, Laurie Juskiewicz, Troy Krahl, Gwen Landis, Anita Lavoie, Robin Lockerby, Sharon Mone, Joanne Montanye, Karen Orr (for Jacqueline Drouin), Holly Pedrini, Parvin Pothiawala, Judy Riani, Karmen Swim, President Catherine Symans, Marie Tiemann, Lynn Tracy, Floyd Vilmont, Susan Williford Ex-officio: Jeff Bukowski, Staff Council Administrator

Members Absent: Scott Hipko, Noel McCann, Bethany Wolfe

Also Participating: Tom Sullivan - UVM President, Richard Cate - VP for Finance and Treasurer, Alberto Citarella - University Budget Director, Amy Gilman - Staff Council Office Assistant, Jennifer Sheridan, Erin Fitzgerald, Keddy Bharathan, Gioia Thompson, Allen Josey, Florianne Erwin, Shirley Fortier

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:09 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions

Catherine Symans, President of Staff Council, introduced guest speakers: President Tom Sullivan, Richard Cate and Alberto Citeralla who were at this meeting to talk to the group about the Incentive-Based Budget (IBB) process and explain in general terms the guiding principles and purpose behind this model.

President Sullivan’s Address and Presentation to Staff Council

Last fall talks began around the budget challenges, shortfalls, and our current model. This is a continuation of that conversation. A few of the issues with the present budget are the following: it does not offer incentives, and is unclear, complicated, and difficult to predict.

President Sullivan wants to identify 8-12 broad principles that will lead this IBB model planning process and includes input from the UVM Community; students, staff, faculty, alums and the Board of Trustees. These principles will provide guidelines and goals. He suggested that goals give a budget an anchor and a place to go back to check in good fiscal times and bad fiscal times and must be aligned with the institutions mission.

The present budget model is centralized, and very top down. Revenues come in centrally and totaled then distributed to colleges and units.
IBB focuses on four general areas: **revenue, cost, common goods, and investments.**

**Revenue:** This includes the various revenue streams to UVM (i.e. state appropriation, tuition, indirect grants, ancillary services (income/expense) and development money).

**Costs:** From paying for staff and faculty salaries to operating a program as well as costs for utilities, space, etc., costs are managed at the college or unit/division level. This is because the knowledge and expertise is at this level and this is where decisions should and are made. Incentives provide the momentum to increase revenue while decreasing costs. The University must come up with a formula or strategize a fair “bill” for these cost pools.

**Common Goods:** These are items that positively impact the whole UVM community and the costs should be shared.

**Investments:** These are opportunities or areas of focus that the institution must invest in to bring UVM to the next level.

A steering committee will be formed to identify the guiding principles and create a plan. Sub-committees will be formed to research and determine the formulas that will set fair fees or costs in each area.

Alberto mentioned there are at least 15 other institutions that he has been in communication with that use an IBB model, and 21% of public doctoral schools use an incentive based budget model.

The steering and sub-committees work on the particulars and will begin this year and a timeline and process were communicated. There will be an interim report to the President in January 2014 and the final report to the President by June 2014. Administration will run both models side-by-side for FY ‘15. The goal would be to begin with the IBB model in FY ‘16.

**Question and Answer Period for President Sullivan**

A suggestion was given to the President and IBB Steering Committee to review the way University of California-Davis communicates its budget and use it as a model for communicating at UVM. Click [here](#) to access the website.

**Question: Who will ultimately make the decision about the investments and strategic spending?** President Sullivan answered that each unit will make their case for their reasoning behind their investments and strategic plans. Ultimately that will be determined by the President and Provost.

**Question: What are the benefits and incentives for faculty that are tenured, what drives their choices and decisions in this model?** President Sullivan said it will be the trade-off question – the department and faculty needs to decide how to raise the revenue to hire more faculty or build that new lab/space, etc…
Question: How the internal competition aspect of this model will work? How will departments/units play on the same playing field? Especially if one is in a unit with fewer students or perhaps no students, or an environment that isn’t income/expense or has a money-making segment? President Sullivan explained that this will be a multi-year roll-out plan and there will be learning curves. He said this question brought up one of the two pitfalls of this IBB model. This first pitfall is known as “mission or course creep”. The Provost will ultimately have to play referee and determine which unit is the “owner” or expert of certain courses or subject matter. Not every unit will be an expert. He also mentioned not every unit will have a net profit, and those groups will fit into the strategic investment areas. The other pitfall associated the IBB model is that there is the perception it can stifle interdisciplinary teaching or shared work/resource. Units will want to try to keep their funds, so you need to come up with the formulas to cost-share/cost-benefit each unit involved. President Sullivan said as long as we are mindful about it and proportion it properly and incent it properly this will be a successful model.

Question: What about groups that aren’t part of a program – like HR? How do you incentive those groups? Sullivan said you can incentive even further down into the layers of each department for these enterprise-based or service-based offices that support this community. How to allocate these departments such as; IT, HR, Financial units? Either way centralized or decentralized these service-based offices will be utilized by either working with those within each unit or in a cost pool capacity. Both methods can be used and will be practiced. The costs and prices will be determined at the local level and then the units will determine what works best for them and whether to go on their keep the work in their unit or not.

Question: Will each unit hire more people for all of this budgeting work? Sullivan said it will be a “pay for what you use” model. He gave an example of his former law school’s 24/7 law library and the extra above and beyond services needed and paid for out of their own budget, which included security and additional custodial services.

President Sullivan moved on to address a recent Staff Council Recommendation, and to answer, in a summary format, issues and questions from staff that were gathered through an anonymous Staff Council open call survey. These questions are incorporated as an addendum to these minutes.

President Sullivan started by referring to the Staff Council Recommendation on Supervisory Training and Performance Appraisals from June 2013 on supervisory training and performance appraisals. He supports this recommendation.

Sullivan then talked about the specific topics from the open call survey:

UVM Budget – FY14 Shortfalls

This incentive-based budget conversation is separate and parallel to the annual budget. To begin budgeting for FY’15, President Sullivan still needs some data. This is made up of add/drop,
registration, who is here with scholarships and financial aid. When he has the hard data in a few weeks he will know if the available dollars are up or down. That’s the revenue side. On the expense/costs side looking at many expense and inflation factors such as salary and benefits, estimates are that healthcare costs will be up 10% over this current year, utilities costs may be up 5% and determine how much money will it take to recruit the class of Fall ’14. In addition fundraised dollars, state appropriations and the faculty contract negotiations are still pieces that could impact costs.

**Professional Development**

President Sullivan and Wanda Heading-Grant, VP for HR, Diversity and Multicultural Affairs, are behind these recommendations and want to foster the UVM’s Professional Development plan. They want to do what is optimal for all of our colleagues within our means. The UVM Staff Awards Program is ready for this academic year.

**Communication**

President Sullivan also talked about our concerns about University and campus communications from the [Staff Council Annual Update](#). He summarized that we need to make sure information flows down and out, and that units send information up and out. Internal communications still needs work here, and time, and a faster turn-around on campus. They will continue to work towards a stronger communication flow.

**Approve Draft Minutes**

There was a motion to approve the August 6, 2013 meeting minutes, it was seconded. Spelling edits from Catherine, Rodman, Renee and Isis were passed or handed in. A discussion began about meeting minutes and how to get those to representatives earlier to review for more input. The August 6, 2013 minutes were approved. Two abstained.

**Debrief/Discussion of President Sullivan’s Presentation**

Deferred until later in the agenda

**Vote to confirm Standing Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs**

There was a motion to approve the following representatives to lead the following staff council committees. The following nominations were made.

**Compensation, Benefits, & Budget** – Chair: Rodman Cory, Vice Chair: Scott Hipko

**Personal and Professional Development & Occupational Environment** – Laurie Juskiewicz, Vice Chair: Noel McCann
Outreach, Assessment, & University Engagement – Chair: Brendan Andrews, Vice Chair: Bethany Wolfe

Social – Chair: Judy Riani, Vice Chair: Robin Lockerby

Motion was made, seconded, no discussion and the vote was approved.

**Vote to confirm two Staff Council Representatives to the Executive Board**

Two nominations came in Johanna Brabham and Isis Erb. A motion was made to approve these representatives to the Executive Board, it was seconded. No discussion and vote was approved.

**Appoint a Staff Council Representative to be Parliamentarian**

One nomination came in for Rodman Cory to be the Parliamentarian. A motion was made, seconded, no discussion and vote was approved.

**Officer’s Update**

One nomination came in for Rodman Cory to be the Parliamentarian. A motion was made, seconded, no discussion and vote was approved.

**DeBrief of President’s Presentation and Brainstorm Session for Provost Rosowsky at October Meeting**

Catherine asked the group about thoughts on the format for the next meeting in October when Provost Rosowsky would be our guest.

In terms of format, Renee shared with the group that the open call for questions for President Sullivan was the format for this meeting. All of the questions were turned in to the President and he summarized several answers at the end of today’s presentation. Catherine said she had a conversation with the Provost’s office regarding the format for the Provost. If we have specific questions we should go ahead and ask, but otherwise he will present himself and what his plans are in the role of Provost.

There was a comment made that it was disappointing that the President did not identify more of his priorities or vision a year into the position. This time last year President Sullivan was on his “listening tour” and this representative thought there might be more specifics around his presentation but that it would be good to hear about the Provost’s priorities.

Feedback was given on the questions gathered from staff for President Sullivan and suggested it did not portray staff in the best light. The questions was asked, shouldn’t we have edited or “clean up” the comments? Catherine said the President was told that this was an open staff survey and the comments were as is. Renee added how would or could we edit other’s words
and intent. One voice felt like there could be a way, but it would be challenging. Others felt like it was best to leave the comments alone, understanding that it wouldn’t be perfect. What would we use as the precedent, Catherine asked? It was suggested that perhaps a disclaimer on the survey next time that made it clear that how you type your question is how it will be submitted. Another representative made the point that UVM has a diverse community, not everyone might be well-versed with the written language or have the vocabulary to write their question or comment at the level that those that provided the feedback were referring to.

Concerns about submitting more than one question in the survey were raised. A colleague of one representative tried to go back in and add something else and was locked out. Jeff said it was a completely open survey and an individual had the room to ask fifteen questions if they wanted to. If they submitted, they could go back in and submit again.

Another representative remarked that they felt like President Sullivan did not answer all the open call questions. What is the report back for those that asked the questions? Discussion ensued. Jeff indicated that because the survey was anonymous – direct responses to individuals were not possible. And while President Sullivan talked about the issues raised in the questions, he did so at a global level and acknowledged reading and reorganizing the message behind the comment.

A comment about internal communications from UVM leadership was made. If senior leadership has information to share and distribute within our campus or within departments, they need to clearly communicate what message and information they want to go out to colleagues, peers and be shared. The onus cannot be on Staff Council to create their message. We can’t share information we didn’t ever receive.

**Other Business**

Marie indicated that the Socially Responsible Investing Advisory Council’s Open Forum will take place October 22, 2013 at 4pm in Livak Ballroom in the Davis Center.

Jeff also added that the Clean Energy Fund is seeking participation from students, faculty and staff for its annual Call For Ideas. Submit your project ideas—and comment and vote on ideas—by visiting: [http://www.uvm.edu/sustain/clean-energy-fund/share-your-project-ideas](http://www.uvm.edu/sustain/clean-energy-fund/share-your-project-ideas) The deadline for submitting proposals is October 15, 2013; comment and vote on ideas through November 15, 2013. For more information, contact: cef@uvm.edu

With no other business, Renee made a motion to adjourn, it was seconded and approved. Meeting adjourned at 1:31pm.
ADDENDUM

STAFF QUESTIONS / CONCERNS / COMMENTS FOR PRESIDENT SULLIVAN

These statements were gathered by Staff Council from staff through an online survey tool in advance of President Sullivan’s attendance at the September 3, 2013 Staff Council Meeting.

Budget

- Since 2008 we have received several correspondences from senior management describing budget shortfalls and potential impacts. Cost of living raises were not given for employees making over 75000 in FY 2009 and not given to any employees in FY 2010. In 2011 senior management asked departments to further reduce spending by decreasing unnecessary conferences and professional development opportunities implementing methods to streamline workflows and freezing and/or not renewing vacant positions to mention a few. In several departments it seems management fulfilled the request to not fill vacant positions but then went ahead and granted merit raises to specific employees. An examination of data from the Office of Institutional Research reveals that most (if not all) of these raises were granted to management some even approaching close to 10% of their base salary. This seems like a contradiction to the original request to reduce spending. Has this been looked at by senior management?

- Budget deficits = staff layoffs

- I feel that as unrepresented staff we are at an extreme disadvantage in terms of benefits and wages. How are you ensuring that we as staff do not take the brunt of cuts?

- Various indications have been made in meetings I have attended over the past several years that "strategic" reviews and changes will be made to save financial resources across campus but little seems to have actually been accomplished on the topic of how strategic changes on the academic front have actually saved base funding dollars. If this is not correct please clarify. Among other reasons I have heard as reasons for holding back on moving forward include an unexpected exiting President, interim President, inbound new President multiple revolving Deans, New Provost etc. all seem to be partial reasons why movement on finally biting the bullet and pressing the academic side of the house to trim down and get rid of wasteful expenditures - like continuing funding programs that regularly produce very few or zero graduates - has not been made. It is very difficult to hear that more significant cuts are coming next year without a better understanding how the academic side is going to significantly tighten their belts too. I understand that academics comes first no question but it appears to many staff that a large amount of our not so "strategic" expenditures continue to come from under-performing and under-utilized academic departments which are guarded and shielded from impact by resistant tenured faculty and department chairs. What will you and the new Provost commit to getting done with regard to ensuring that all areas inclusive of academics

- How long will UVM continue to support academic programs which graduate five or less students (and in some cases only one) each year? How many more times will only the administrative units (and only those lower ranked) be cut? Clearly the model isn’t working. Why isn’t UVM prepared to follow the national trend of a shrinking student population? And shrinking federal funds?
Salary

- Pay bands need to be looked at and the ability to move up within a band. There is no incentive to take on more responsibility when there is no reward. We are all lumped in the same band. Merit raises also need to be put into place for the same reason.

- While I love my job working at UVM and feel benefits like great healthcare and tuition remission make up some for low administrative staff pay the thing I find most troubling is the rigidity of the class structures and the inability of this should be one of the benefits of being non-unionized. One part of this is that when an employee's work load is significantly increased supervisors to reward employees based on merit. In my opinion even still there is no option increase compensation alongside this increased work. This seems unfair.

- I’m concerned about the fact that administration recently received a 17-26% raise while non-represented staff got 2.9%. After all the talk of cutting costs and expenses how was there enough of a surplus for administration to receive a salary increase at 5-9 times that of staff? How is President Sullivan going to create more equity for the staff that has no union contract?

- Salary rates. I make about 28 300 here which is not enough to get a loan or live locally without getting hardship assistance from the state. It is embarrassing as I have a Masters Degree. Also Sodexo has cut the benefits of their workers. Although I do not work for Sodexo I know the employees and care for them deeply. I want this issue to be addressed because having them on campus should be an embarrassment.

Benefits

- I have heard through the grapevine that the tuition remission benefit for staff and their dependents may be up for elimination - is this true? I hope not as this is one benefit that staff rely on for themselves and their dependents.

- With UVM expected to have another deficit next year. How will this affect current staff positions/benefits?

- I am concerned that our long term disability policy is so difficult to qualify for that employees are at risk for financial ruin and foreclosure if they ever had a injury or recurrent type of illness. (such as cancer) I have seen employees with years of service lose their homes because they could not work ran out of sick time and did not qualify for this plan. One option would be allowing a shared sick leave pool or a self insurance program that everyone paid into.

- Paid maternity/family medical leave  2. Cell phone reimbursement for Extension staff. Extension providers use cell phones because we are in the field so much yet we do not get reimbursed for our cell phone bills so essentially there are many Extension staff who are subsidizing Extension with our personal/family/household funds.

Community / Morale / Hierarchy

- What efforts are you putting towards building connected & intentional community amongst staff? faculty? students?
- Morale among exempt staff is low because this is the first place everyone looks to cut costs how do you plan to address morale and other staff issues in the future?

- Why is the faculty of the University held with greater esteem than staff - greater raises over the past few years better medical leave benefits (6 months) and better maternity leave benefits (a semester) just to name a few?

**Professional Development**

- In my department the Director makes all decisions about professional development and approves professional development courses for favorite employees and denies other employees who request it. If audits were conducted on the spending budgets for professional development you would see great disparities in this employee benefit in my department. Most funds for professional development are spent on training managers and not on non-management employees. This is occurring because the decisions are left with the Directors rather than centralizing them at Human Resources. Does it make sense to centralize those types of employee benefits so that benefits are equalized?

- Please reiterate that professional development for staff remains elusive. While the offerings have improved; [http://www.uvm.edu/hrs/?Page=skills/classesbydate_fy14.html&SM=skills/skillsmenu.html](http://www.uvm.edu/hrs/?Page=skills/classesbydate_fy14.html&SM=skills/skillsmenu.html) I notice they are still only offering upper level training for Excel. No web no Access no Photo Shop Illustrator nothing which really makes us more skilled.

**Other**

- When will we upgrade our email/calendar system?

- The recent reorganization you did is good. Still there are large number (about 500) staff reporting to a VP. Some of the managers with about 200 staff report through associate VP. Why not these managers report directly to VP?

- Climate change and traffic congestion: Encouraging staff and faculty even more to use other means of transportation to cars to work and lobbying the state for better bus services where that is the main issue. Health: Having once a month lunch time walks - all staff invited - to encourage better health. Perhaps have on two places on campus so people wouldn’t have too far to go - time can be a factor especially for tight schedules.