

Present: David Bagnell, Vicki Bryan, Mark Buckley, Jac Copes, Ted Coussens, Sarita Cox, Jeanette Harrison, Brian Huonker, Melody Palm, Theresa Sanchez, Jan Jolynn Staley, Nancy Spangler, Dave Turner

Absent: Barb Arbogast, Julie Caplinger, Tom Cotton, Kevin Wiand, Pam Burress

Guests: Jan Cook, Judith A. Webster

Council Chair Melody called the meeting to order at 12:06 pm.

-Approved minutes: Approval of Feb 5th Minutes, Theresa/Sarita, motion carried.

Presentation: Human Resources - Issues in Determining CS/AP Positions
Nancy Spangler, HR

A lot of concern at ISU and other state universities is a function of economics and financing – universities are not getting the kind of funding they are accustomed to, receiving less appropriated dollars from the state. This has an effect on hiring practices at ISU and universities across the state.

We are still under a hiring freeze (since 2002). On campus, when hiring for a position, it has to be approved for hiring. There is one group that does not have to go through the hiring freeze: grant-funded positions. There is no delayed period for position approval.

Question that was posed: what determines if a position is hired CS or AP? We need to follow state statutes in hiring; CS positions are not exempt. A/P are exempt basically by two different categories 36E3 and 36E4. E3: positions usually administrative/professional; E4 have an additional component (A/P, teaching component, research components, extension faculty). If their job description states this is what they primarily do for the campus, this determines categories.

It all starts with a well-written position description that reflects and describes what the incumbent would be doing. Hiring managers within the department would perform this, they provide a general summary, organizational relationships, supervisory experience, work environment dynamics, etc. There is a section for time/FTE component for each of the duties of the job. For example, x is an essential function of the job, and 25% of incumbent's time will need to be spent on x.

When HR receives a position description there is discretion exercised by HR – a judgment call based on experience and previous decisions in HR. They read the job description and compare it to the 22 standard titles (standards for A/P) or job classifications for CS (listed on SUCSS webpage, it also has A/P listings too). This is what HR compares the position to, looking for a position that most closely fits. They also look to see when the description was written, and which class specs have the classifications that are needed. There are some job specifications that are being worked on, but for the most part all positions pretty accurate.

The check-and-balances are the audits that occur every two years. State auditors read the position descriptions, what classifications HR has placed them in, and interview the employees as to their job duties. In their last audit there were 7 A/P classifications that the auditors believed could have been classified as CS. So in the future if/when these become vacant, classification will be flagged by HR and transferred over to CS. In the last audit they also recommended that when the campus was going through a great growth period (for example IT), classifications were not as up-to-date with the latest technology, so there is a new pilot program for IT-related positions. Auditors recommended placing them in the pilot program.

Different CS specs: narrative, work description, minimum requirements, personal attributes needed to fill the position. What factors are considered? Strongest factor is the job description written by the department. What about positions that are paid from grant funds? HR struggles with that – there are grant positions that could be CS. Grant-funded positions are funds given to the university that are here today but maybe not tomorrow; grant

usually written for a set period of time. On HR website there are listings for qualifications for grant funds. Job classification titles are very different from CS and A/P, and are not part of the standard 22 job titles and CS titles. The risk for the university involves 'bumping' rights with CS employees. There are some grant funded positions that could be in CS, but HR has decided not to have bumping rights; not only our university but at least two others are also taking this into consideration.

Considering CS position to put grant positions in, so that there are no bumping conflicts, is a very complex situation when it comes to the CS system in terms of what we can and cannot do.

Another question: number of CS and A/P positions seems to be shifting more toward A/P versus CS – any reason why? Cannot name specific factors; we at HR do not have an A/P hiring agenda. It seems to be across universities that where the largest area of growth were (coordinators, assistants-to, and specialist), these positions hired A/P. Dave T. – these were described in the 1990's, it was the opinion of EAC and others that these positions would be misused, descriptions were vague, and that eventually they would erode hiring and opportunities of CS employees, and that has been exactly what has happened. At this point, we have tried to analyze the reasons for the increase, and thinks there are a few reasons: 1) the people in a department with the desire to use these positions seem to think it is easier to hire these people without the testing or top-3/other CS rules, 2) there is a perception it is easier to fire these people (though not necessarily true), 3) can pay them more money, and 4) there is some belief that when you have a situation with A/P (Administrative Professionals) that by some means or another, it does not include CS people, but CS does have professional classifications; Dave T. agrees, there is no obvious single reason, but there is a lot of evidence that these four play a large part. Problems grow with the rising of these three (coordinators, assistants-to, and specialists) and lowering of CS classifications; as a result there are fewer CS employees.

Nancy – many of the CS positions here at ISU, job specifications, can include in the description if the person has a degree, experience, what kind of graduate school training, etc.; when the CS system was written (1955), not as many degree programs as there are today. There are degree programs that we as an institution say they are valuable, if we have people hired in those areas, we value the education because they are working with students themselves. Anyone can apply to the position – A/P, CS, anyone who is qualified can apply.

Last question to be addressed: how does this affect staff members? Don't know exactly the effects, but some CS employees, when they are hired, get their appointment papers with probation, salary, dept., whereas there are contracts for A/P, some are continuous, some are non-continuous, and they really are contracts (for a set period of time). Period of time is not set by kind/amount of funding - they have different kinds of benefits from CS. Vacation has to be used by end of contract, they don't accumulate sick days but rather have a set number and lose it at beginning of next contract, and this is how it might affect CS or others. A/P on non-continuous contract, if for some cause they are not going to be re-hired, they receive a non-renewal notice letter (3month, 6 month, 1 year, depends on circumstances). CS have promotional lines, A/P does not. Depending on what group you are talking about, some CS would like to be A/P, some A/P would like to be CS. A/P can be national searches, CS is Illinois-only searches, but out-of-state individuals can see open positions in Illinois; useful information if one is moving into Illinois. These are some of the differences that can affect our employees in different ways.

Dave T. – the effects go back to eroding the possibilities of CS employees; people are concerned there may be three CS positions in an office and one is turned into A/P – that limits the promotional abilities of the other two lower stations. Many times people in A/P would say they wished they were CS rather than A/P, more opportunities. Nancy – would like to remind the group that Dave T. is working with Ira Schoenwald, these are items he has been working with, she may not be able to answer all of your questions, but there are many individuals who are working on this, ISU is not alone, these are concerns being addressed across the state.

Theresa – concerning money lines – is it coming from the same places? Not for grant-funded, but concerned with: is there a question in wage lines to determine CS versus A/P? Nancy – no, only if it's grant-funded does that matter. It doesn't start in HR, starts in research-sponsored projects, grant has to be written, approved, gather funds, it is all through another department. When HR gets a position, not looking at where the money is coming from (funding part is not HR's responsibility, it's the dept's responsibility). Theresa – would it affect the writing of the job description of the dept based it on funds? Nancy – departments not writing based on funding, writing on job function and what needs to be accomplished. Melody – you will see titles that say CS-exempt – those are salaried positions (versus those with overtime); some are half/half as to funding sources. Nancy – it is not the dept that determines exempt as Melody described – HR determines that based on Fair Payment Act (saying it is not an hourly but a salaried position). There is different criteria for why a position is exempt, there are fines issued by Dept of Labor if these are violated.

Judith Webster – so how do you make that break if you have a CS exempt versus A/P? Have worked with other universities where her same job would be A/P rather than CS. Where is the determination made or is it the dept. saying they want to move it to A/P? Nancy – really is a judgment call. You could have a position classified as A/P and auditors can say they think it should be CS and could go into a different classification, and there it is also a judgment call based on experience in human resources. What may help, if you go to the SUCSS website, the general job descriptions are very vague and broad. Judith Webster - You say it's a judgment call but the judgment has to be based on something. Dave T. – there are differences in terms and hiring situations. Nancy – there is a new financial aid job specs out there that our system would say when the positions become available, maybe at the time the specs were looked at the specs were outdated and just didn't fit what was needed at the campus (as an example). Another example – at the golf course, they have to take an exam that is written for that classification; the classification was a good one for someone working at our campus, but the test no longer applied to the PGA rules, so the task was going to be on the PGA rules that are 10-15 years old. We needed to test people of PGA rules now, who would be effective at the position. They classified the position A/P so that they could bring someone to the campus to fit the needs present – CS couldn't do that in the circumstances at the time. Tom Morlock is doing a great job, but there are positions here that could be CS since now there are tests designed for the needs of the university as it stands now. It's not going to be the same at every university.

Judith Webster – you keep referring to the website (SUCSS), what are the red flags that say I am going to be looking at A/P or CS classifications? Nancy – we would look first at classifications at ISU. If there is a classification that exists in the whole state, HR can put in a request to have a classification moved to the campus. Sometimes the departments say in their mind that the position will need to be one or the other, but HR will have no issues going back to a department and telling them that a job description simply doesn't fit the levels of a standard title. HR can utilize other campuses; if not certain how a position should be classified, have sent the descriptions to other universities to see what they think. Judith Webster – when an existing job becomes open, is it reevaluated? Nancy – academic personnel merged with HR, AP were classified as A/P, HR was for the most part CS, and when they merged, it wasn't like anyone was forced to switch, people were able to retain their classification; A/P positions have become vacant, and are now being rewritten as CS to fulfill the needs of the office. Every time a position becomes vacant, becomes an opportunity for the department to write the job description for what they really need to operate.

Dave T. – Getting the indication that some are being denied a promotion when not allowed to go from CS to A/P. Judith Webster – there is an impression on campus that the hierarchy goes Faculty-A/P-CS. May not be a real thing (on paper), but that CS is not of the caliber of A/P. Dave T. – you are willing to give up bumping rights and promotional opportunities for more money is what he is guessing. CS employees are held to the same professional standards. Judith Webster – gets the feeling that CS is not on the same level of A/P. Nancy – there are individuals that it does not matter to them that they do not get bumping rights or other CS rights and never worry about that; feels that they are an employee by will regardless of classification. There is a promotional line in CS, and when at the top, in general there is nowhere left to go. There are pay ranges for A/P and different ones for CS. A pay range of a 13 in CS, 35-40 in A/P; what happens many times is an A/P comes in at 40 and CS at 13 with a promotional line; 10% to each of two bumps for CS, A/P has only 3% over and over, will never catch up to the 10% bumps of the CS.

Jac – in the briefing, mentioned there were 7 A/P that were reclassified, out of how many? Nancy about 200, so about 3% error-rate. Jac – would like to know % changes in CS and A/P from 2002, how many exempt and non-exempt in '02, and how many currently? Concerned from the hiring-freeze on. Nancy – in '02 without extra help 1,554; in '07 1,219; last report sent to SUCSS, the university just approved 90 positions in campus dining, this summer a large hiring period (as of December '07) we had 1,348 (with 197 extra help – dropped from 270). Jac – A/P at same time? Nancy - also increased – '02, 383; in '04, 237; '07, E3 323/E4 321.

Dave T. – advisory committee – this type of thing has been on our agenda since 1999, our concern not so much with the E3 but E4's and the three vague job titles (coordinator, assistant-to, and specialist). Nancy – in our last quarterly report, the system does ask that on A/P reporting, what kind of funds they are. There were 16 Assistant II's, 9 not funded by state; 66 coordinators, 36 not funded by state; 66 specialists, 36 not funded by the state. Dave T. – there are no provisions in the laws to provide for that, Nancy agrees; Dave thinks there should be some provision added to the law that if someone accepts a grant-funded position bumping rights are not given when the funds run out; the provision is not now there.

Vicki – doesn't remember if it was 99 or 2000, everybody in Financial Dept, everyone was CS, someone made the decision that 5 new positions would be A/P, they were hired, everyone did exactly the same job. In '01, auditors report that the next time the positions open they should revert back to CS; they did not revert back, filled as A/P. Just this year, position came open that was A/P, now will be CS. Doesn't understand why the CS determinations were not filled with CS. Question would be: what happened? Nancy – cannot answer that, does understand what happened, and knows that the positions were made A/P, but she was not part of that situation. Judith Webster – is HR doing anything about it? Nancy – did not look up particular cases prior to this meeting, can go back and investigate.

Sarita – did you say when A/P vacated, position is reviewed; is it up to the dept for the review? Nancy – yes, only way it can be filled is to update the vacant position, take a look at the position and has it changed (job duties, qualifications, etc.), is it the same or has it changed? Even if the job is the same, HR would look at the position, because between it was first filled and the classifications now, they may have changed. This is why some jobs that were hired CS decades ago are now classified A/P and vice versa. Sarita – what is involved when an A/P is classified and given a working title? Nancy – 17 standard titles are working titles, and it could just be that there are so many titles that are not meaningful to a person or depts. They have working titles they prefer to use regardless if its CS or A/P. Working titles are not meaningful to HR, doesn't have effect on their hiring. When advertising for a position, they don't mean anything to people, just the name of the classification. 'Secretary III' doesn't mean as much to the dept as 'secretary to x' or 'assistant to the director of x', etc. Sarita – in one situation, it was suggested working that a working title of associate director be given even though they were hired in advisory capacity, but kept assoc director title for more prestige. Nancy – the working title may sound better but does not give more money, each title placed in a pay range. Just because the working title changes doesn't mean that the pay increases.

Jac – would like for an agenda item for next meeting – retouch issues of job postings and durations, have not been addressed by the council in most recent meetings. Melody – has been reassured they never pull a position until there are at least three applicants. Jac – worried about the perceptions that it is closed so soon and quickly, recent example cited, will provide more information at next meeting.

Ongoing Discussion Topics:

- **Spring Activities** – Reminder for the chili cookoff deadline to register is Feb 21.
- **EAC**- [Due to presentation, no new items provided.]
- **Annuitants Representative** – SUA meeting at Carbondale in March – ConCon and what is the state doing with domestic partner benefits? Tell Jan any questions you might have at or before the next meeting and she will take them with her then.
- **Academic Senate/Campus Info/Foundation** – [Due to presentation, no new items provided.]
- **OpenLine** – Pam not present, no news.
- **Human Resources** – [Due to presentation, no new items provided.]

Theresa/Jan motioned to adjourn, motion carried at 1:29 pm.

Reminders:

- Deadline for next two OpenLines – March 4, April 1
- CSC Meetings – March 4, March 18
- February 21 – RSVP deadline for Chili Cookoff on Feb 28, Brown Ballroom, BSC

Web Sites of interest:

- State Universities Civil Service System: <http://www.sucss.state.il.us>
- SUCSS Classification Status Notices: <http://www.sucss.state.il.us/cpm.asp>
- Annuitants: <http://www.annuitants.ilstu.edu>
- Civil Service Council: <http://www.cscouncil.ilstu.edu>
- A/P Council: <http://www.apcouncil.ilstu.edu>
- Academic Senate: <http://www.academicssenate.ilstu.edu>
- Human Resources: <http://www.hr.ilstu.edu>

The next regular Civil Service Council meeting will be held Tuesday, March 4, 2008 at Noon in the Bone Student Center Spotlight Room.

Illinois State University
Civil Service Council
Campus Box 1830
Normal IL 61790-1830

NON-PROFIT ORG
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
ILLINOIS STATE
UNIVERSITY