Minutes of the University Senate Academic Staff Personnel Committee  
December 15, 2015  
2 -3 p.m.  
Mohican Room, Davies Center

Members present: Katie Wilson, Katie Ritland-Clouse, Stephanie Jamelske (ex-officio), Lori Snyder, Odawa White, April Pierson, Heather Pearson, Linda Carlson  
Guest: Barb Hanson

Call to order: 2:02 p.m.

Item 1: Chancellor and Teresa O’Halloran were invited and were present to answer questions on the processes used in recent leadership appointments and reorganization processes, understanding that there are processes laid out in FASRP

Chancellor Schmidt: There was a mass re-organization through the campus, principles were laid out in budget presentations, reorg. Plan was trying to keep existing staff and reduce administration (we have reduced administration by 32%). That was the situation. As reorg was looked at, Chancellor consulted with Affirmative Action office to see what general principles were, what the process should be; the spirit was to open the processes and make them transparent.

( Policy in FASRP for reorg is on page 104)

As far as the recent appointees, specifics will not be discussed, but 2 were appointed:

Jodi Thesing-Ritter was brought over a year ago from the Dean of Students Office while Jesse Dixon was still director. Jesse had a dual reporting role with Jodi and Vice Chancellor Beth Hellwig. Jesse took a VSIP (his position was eliminated) so she was made Executive Director of Diversity and Inclusion, with both OMA and Blugold Beginnings under her. There was no intention to combine OMA and BB. The two programs were cohabiting, they still are, she was made head of both based on recommendations from Vice Chancellor Beth Hellwig.

Durwin Long: The lease on Water Street building had not been renewed, so there was a decision in the offing to move CE to HSS building. Administration started talking about the opportunities that presented, just as the one stop organization was opening, they decided their processes are similar, this was a way to consolidate, the Chancellor consulted and determined Durwin Long was the best for the job, and appointed him.

Internal Searches and how they go:

Teresa O’Halloran: Advising is not a true new opening, which needs an external search, (there is no new FTE created, there had been a director of advising this would slot into as far as FTE goes) so this position has had an internal search process. The goal of the internal posting for
the advising position was to only consider/take people currently working in advising since no new FTE could be created.

McNair has a campus-wide internal search process also because it is grant-based and needs very specific qualifications.

The Chancellor: Advising had a process, invitation was sent out to those on campus who work in advising, not sure who it went out to. The Provost made final decision on McNair process, and decided who to send out invites for the advising position.

Comment from the Committee: The goal of the internal posting for the advising position was to only consider/take people currently working in advising since no new FTE could be created, but those that should have been informed were not because it did not go out to all the people eligible to take it on.

Question from the Committee: If there are concerns such as a process which is not being carried out, is there a way to address problems along the way? Is there recourse?

Chancellor: Address problems to Teresa O’Halloran

Question: In Diversity & Inclusion: people who work there were misinformed about restructure, lines of reporting, things were not clearly defined, they are not sure of the job description of the new director or roles and responsibilities.

Question for the Committee Chair: Can we have a process where we flesh out all of this, get clarity on processes, write a very general policy that allows for communication and consultation?

Chancellor: We were at our darkest hour. I hope we won’t be here again. Could these things have been handled better? Yes. There were opportunities we missed and we have problems in communicating as one does in any large organization.

Item 2: Open forum:
1. The Chancellor didn’t answer the question above about getting some clearer processes and ability to follow through. Should we follow up? The agreement from the committee was yes, we should follow up.
   The committee would like to send an email to the Chancellor which thanks the Chancellor for coming, we would like to reinforce that:
   a. there is a process for internal search and that should be followed
   b. there is a reason to do it that way, communication would help others understand what is happening, why it is happening etc. really helps people buy in – let’s improve both micro and macro level communication

NOTE:
c. there is huge stress across campus because of the lack of good communication to those in affected units has been so bad, promises are not kept, lines of reporting are unclear, people with expertise are not being consulted, we need to build on people’s strengths to get their buy in and that is not happening
Katie Wilson will draft an e-mail from the Committee and run it by the committee before sending.