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AGENDA ITEM: Collective Bargaining Agreement with AFSCME Locals 3800 and 3801 Clerical, Unit 6

Review + Action

Purpose & Key Points

The purpose of this presentation is to recommend approval of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Clerical Unit 6, Locals 3800 and 3801. The CBA will provide the terms and conditions of employment for employees between the date of signing and June 30, 2017. A summary of the contract, employees covered, and detailed associated financial impact is included in the docket. The total recurring cost for the 2016-2017 biennium is $3,957,450.

Background Information

Negotiations on this CBA began on June 3, 2015 and concluded with a tentative agreement on December 10, 2015. The Union's contract ratification process was completed on February 3, 2016. Board approval is required before the CBA can be implemented.

President's Recommendation

The President recommends that the Board approve this CBA between the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Clerical Unit 6, Locals 3800 and 3801.
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION RELATED TO

The Proposed Labor Agreement with
AFSCME Locals 3800 and 3801 Clerical Employees

WHEREAS, the parties have met and negotiated over the course of the past several months and have reached agreement regarding terms and conditions of employment regarding the employees of this bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, AFSCME Locals 3800 and 3801 have ratified acceptance of this agreement; and

WHEREAS, according to Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, approval of labor agreements by the Board of Regents is required.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that on the recommendation of the president, the Board of Regents approves this labor agreement as outlined in the docket for February 11, 2016.
AFSCME LOCALS 3800 and 3801
PELRA UNIT 6

This unit is composed of eight (8) separate classifications of Clerical workers including Principal Office and Administrative Specialist, Executive Operations/Student Services Specialist, and Principal Accounts Specialists. The total number of employees in this unit is approximately 1,621.

ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

During Fiscal Year 2016, the following salary adjustment will be made:

Employees in all classifications shall receive a 1.5% salary adjustment effective June 29, 2015;

Employees who are below $15 per hour will be raised to $15 per hour on June 29, 2015;

Eligible employees will receive a salary progression step increase on their anniversary dates.

During Fiscal Year 2017, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Employees in all classifications shall receive a 1.5% salary range adjustment effective June 13, 2016;

Eligible employees will receive a salary progression step increase on their anniversary dates;

Employees at the top of the salary range will get a 2% general increase on June 13, 2016.

BASE ANNUAL PAYROLL

$63,187,792

RECURRING COSTS 2016-2017 BIENNUM

Base Salary Adjustments $1,909,851
Progression Steps $1,945,808
Raising employees under $15 per hour to $15 per hour on June 29, 2015 $ 66,352
Additional .005% for employees at range maximum on June 13, 2016 $ 35,439

TOTAL RECURRING COST $3,957,450

NON ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

Revisions to the Insurance language consistent with the Summary Plan Description for all non-labor represented employees.

Parties will convene a Respectful Workplace Labor-Management Committee by April 30, 2016.

Six week paid parental leave for birth mothers.

Vacation accrual based on years of service, rather than hours.
AGENDA ITEM:  Collective Bargaining Agreement with AFSCME Local 3260 (Health Care Unit 4)

☐ Review  ☒ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☐ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS:  Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
              Patti Dion, Director, Employee Relations

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this presentation is to recommend approval of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Health Care Unit 4, Local 3260. This CBA will provide the terms and conditions of employment for employees between the date of signing and June 30, 2017. A summary of the contract, members covered and detailed associated financial impact is included in the docket. The total recurring cost for the 2016 – 2017 biennium is $503,561.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Negotiations on this contract began on June 15, 2015 and concluded with a tentative agreement on December 11, 2015. The Union’s contract ratification process was completed on February 3, 2016. Board approval is required before the contract can be implemented.

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends that the Board approve this CBA between the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Health Care Unit 4, Local 3260.
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION RELATED TO

The Proposed Labor Agreement with
AFSCME Local 3260 Health Care Employees

WHEREAS, the parties have met and negotiated over the course of the
past several months and have reached agreement regarding terms and
conditions of employment regarding the employees of this bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, AFSCME Local 3260 have ratified acceptance of this
agreement; and

WHEREAS, according to Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and
Delegation of Authority, approval of labor agreements by the Board of
Regents is required.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that on the recommendation
of the president, the Board of Regents approves this labor agreement as
outlined in the docket for February 11, 2016.
AFSCME LOCAL 3260

PELRA UNIT 4

This unit is composed of health care workers located primarily at Boynton Health Services, the Dental School and CUHCC in such classifications as Dental Hygienist, Licensed Practical Nurses, and Nursing Assistants. The total number of employees in this unit is approximately 196.

ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

During Fiscal Year 2016, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Employees in all classifications shall receive a 1.5% salary adjustment effective on June 15, 2015;
Eligible employees will receive a salary progression step on their anniversary dates.

During Fiscal Year 2017, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Employees in all classifications shall receive a 1.5% salary adjustment effective on June 13, 2016;
Eligible employees will receive a salary progression step on their anniversary dates.

BASE ANNUAL PAYROLL

$8,194,640

RECURRING COSTS 2016-2017 BIENNIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>$ 255,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Steps</td>
<td>$ 247,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL RECURRING COST $ 503,561

NON ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

Revisions to Insurance language consistent with the Summary Plan Description for all non-labor represented employees.

Six weeks paid parental leave for birth mothers.

Eligibility for step increases, stability payments, and vacation accruals will be based on months/years worked, rather than hours worked.

A Labor-Management Committee will be convened to discuss time off to attend University sponsored enrichment events, such as the Women of Color Breakfast.
AGENDA ITEM: Collective Bargaining Agreement with AFSCME Local 3937 and 3801 (Technical Unit 7)

☐ Review  ☒ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☐ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Patti Dion, Director, Employee Relations

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this presentation is to recommend approval of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Technical Unit 7, Locals 3837 and 3801. This CBA will provide the terms and conditions of employment for employees between the date of signing and June 30, 2017. A summary of the CBA, members covered and detailed associated financial impact is included in the docket. The total recurring cost for the 2016 – 2017 biennium is $1,887,682.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Negotiations on this CBA began on June 11, 2015 and concluded with a tentative agreement on December 14, 2015. The Union's contract ratification process was completed on February 3, 2016. Board approval is required before the contract can be implemented.

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:

The President recommends that the Board approve this CBA between the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Technical Unit 7, Locals 3937 and 3801.
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION RELATED TO

The Proposed Labor Agreement with
AFSCME Locals 3837 and 3801 Technical Employees

WHEREAS, the parties have met and negotiated over the course of the past several months and have reached agreement regarding terms and conditions of employment regarding the employees of this bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, AFSCME Locals 3927 and 3801 have ratified acceptance of this agreement; and

WHEREAS, according to Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, approval of labor agreements by the Board of regents is required.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that on the recommendation of the president, the Board of Regents approves this labor agreement as outlined in the docket for February 11, 2016.
AFSCME Locals 3937 and 3801

PELRA UNIT 7

This unit is composed of Technical Workers in classifications such as Library Assistants, Principal Lab Technicians, Information Technology Specialists, and Research Plot Technicians. The total number of employees in this unit is approximately 788.

ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

In Fiscal Year 2016, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Employees in all classifications shall receive a 1.5% salary adjustment on June 29, 2015;

Eligible employees will receive a salary progression step increase on October 1, 2015.

In Fiscal Year 2017, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Employees in all classifications shall receive a 1.5% salary adjustment on June 13, 2016;

Employees at the top of the salary range will receive a 2% salary adjustment on June 13, 2016;

Eligible employees will receive a salary progression step increase on October 1, 2016.

BASE ANNUAL PAYROLL

$29,957,737

RECURRING COSTS 2016-2017 BIENNIAL

Base Salary Adjustments $ 905,473
Progression Steps $ 964,598
Additional .005% for employees at range maximum on June 13, 2016 $ 17,611

TOTAL RECURRING COST $ 1,887,682

NON ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

Revisions to the Insurance language consistent with the Summary Plan Description for all non-labor represented employees.

Six week paid parental leave for birth mothers.

Vacation accrual based on years of service, rather than number of hours worked.

The University will meet with the Union in any case where subcontracting is being considered.

Employees will receive 2 steps for working out of class, rather than 4%.

Parties will convene a Respectful Workplace Labor-Management Committee by April 30, 2016.
Parties will meet and confer on issues of general wage adjustment calculations and geographic areas for bumping rights.
AGENDA ITEM: Collective Bargaining Agreement with Teamsters Local 320 PELRA Unit 3

Review + Action

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Patti Dion, Director, Employee Relations

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this presentation is to recommend approval of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Minnesota and Teamsters Local 320. This CBA will provide the terms and conditions of employment for employees between the date of signing and June 30, 2017. A summary of the contract, the members covered, and the associated financial impact is included in the docket.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Negotiations on this contract began on May 8, 2015 and concluded with a tentative agreement on November 23, 2015. The Union’s contract ratification process was completed on December 21, 2015. Board approval is required before the contract can be implemented.

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION:

The President recommends that the Board approve this CBA between the University of Minnesota and Teamsters Local 320.
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION RELATED TO

The Proposed Labor Agreement with
Teamsters Local 320 Service/Maintenance Employees

WHEREAS, the parties have met and negotiated over the course of the past several months and have reached agreement regarding terms and conditions of employment regarding the employees of this bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, Teamsters Local 320 has ratified acceptance of this agreement; and

WHEREAS, according to Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, approval of labor agreements by the Board of Regents is required.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that on the recommendation of the President, the Board of Regents approves this labor agreement as outlined in the docket for February 11, 2016.
TEAMSTERS LOCAL 320

PELRA UNIT 3

This unit is composed of service, maintenance and labor employees at all campuses and research and outreach centers working in such classifications as Building and Grounds Workers, Mechanics, Food Service Workers and Farm Animal Attendants. The total number of employees in this unit is approximately 1,448.

During Fiscal Year 2016, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Effective June 15, 2015, employees in all classifications shall receive a 2% salary range adjustment.

Employees shall advance through step movement in accordance with the language of the agreement.

Maintenance Electrician, Senior Maintenance Electrician, and Laboratory Animal Attendant wage scales adjusted to improve recruiting and retention.

During Fiscal Year 2017, the following salary adjustments will be made:

Effective June 13, 2016, employees in all classifications shall receive a 2% salary range adjustment.

Employees shall advance through step movement in accordance with the language of the agreement.

**Base Annual Payroll**

$54,445,000

**RECURRING COSTS 2016-2017 BIENNIUM**

- Base Salary Adjustments $ 2,199,578
- Progression Steps $ 900,888
- Market Adjustments for Senior Maintenance Electrician, Maintenance Electrician and Laboratory Animal Attendants $ 223,870

**Total Recurring Cost** $ 3,324,336

**NON ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS**

Revisions to the Insurance language consistent with the Summary Plan Description for all non-labor represented employees.

Six week paid parental leave for birth mothers.

Labor-Management Committee will be convened and facilitated by the Bureau of Mediation Services to discuss various issues in University Services on the Twin Cities campus.
AGENDA ITEM: Employee Value Proposition & Total Rewards Strategy

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Kenneth Horstman, Director of Total Rewards
Mary Rohman Kuhl, Director of Compensation

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is a focus on how the Office of Human Resources (OHR) is developing a new, more expansive framework for communicating the University employment experience in a way that connects it to the University's mission.

The Board's guiding principles direct the University to "maintain a compensation structure that, when combined with benefits and other rewards, is competitive...". The presentation will show that mission and pride in purpose, when paired with competitive total rewards, are true marketplace differentiators. In a highly competitive job market, the employee value proposition is essential for several reasons:

- To enhance the University's brand as a great place to work.
- To attract and retain top talent.
- To achieve the University's strategic goals:
  - Building an exceptional University focused on grand challenges.
  - Supporting excellence.
  - Aggressively recruiting and retaining field-shaping researchers and teachers.
  - Establishing a culture of engagement.

The presentation will also outline the steps in creating the employee value proposition.
Employee Value Proposition & Total Rewards Strategy

Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee
Board of Regents

Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Kenneth Horstman, Director of Total Rewards
Mary Rohman Kuhl, Director of Compensation
February 11, 2016
Strategic Direction for OHR

• **Mission:** The Office of Human Resources strategically leads and partners with our community to provide the diverse workforce and organizational capabilities that drive excellence in the University.

• **Vision:** Create the diverse workplace of the future where people are engaged, connected, thriving, and achieving.

• **Values:** Integrity, service, innovation, collaboration, and responsibility.
Strategic Imperatives

• Define
  • Re-imagined, integrated OHR portfolio of services
  • Well-articulated partnership between central OHR and HR work in colleges, units, and campuses in which roles and responsibilities are clear and understood
  • Leader in providing HR professional skills and practice, and encouraging best practices in HR systems and service delivery

• Simplify
  • Simplified employment policies and administrative procedures
  • Streamlined employment processes and management

• Empower
  • Leaders and managers to make strategic decisions about talent
  • Employees to optimize their employment experience
  • Human resource professionals to be proactive, responsible, and responsive

• Deliver
  • Excellent, high-quality service in core OHR business functions
  • Improved business processes that support talent management
  • Strategic organizational development advice and practice
SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES (Abridged)

(a) The University strives to achieve and maintain a compensation structure that, when combined with benefits and other rewards, is competitive...

(b) The University seeks to reward meritorious performance...

(c) ...the University considers the work responsibilities, market, internal equity, experience and expertise, performance, and other criteria as appropriate.

(d) The University adheres to compensation and recognition practices that are fair and equitable in design, application, and delivery.
Employee Value Proposition

• What is it?
• Why is it important?
• Why now?
• What are the next steps?
An Employee Value Proposition is Broader than Total Rewards

“The employee value proposition defines the give and the get between company and worker, encompassing every aspect of the employment experience—from the organization’s mission, purpose, and values, to its jobs, culture, and people, to the full portfolio of its total rewards programs.”

The Employee Value Proposition

True Differentiators—Hard or Impossible to Replicate
Mission, Pride In Purpose, “We Are the Driven”

Environment & Culture—Harder to Replicate
Wellbeing, Life Balance, Relationships

Total Rewards—Must be Competitive—Easy to Replicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational</th>
<th>Performance Based</th>
<th>Career Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Pay</td>
<td>Merit Increases</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Incentives &amp; Bonuses</td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Away</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee Engagement

E²
True Differentiators

“We need to get better at communicating the emotional content about why people should care. Companies focus on this all the time for their consumers but it’s rarely applied to employees.” – Towers Watson
Why Is a Comprehensive Employee Value Proposition Important?

- **Enhances** and **promotes** University employment brand as a great place to work with good work/life balance
  - Creates connection to the U mission
- Results in **powerful, competitive and inspirational** messages that allow us to:
  - Attract
  - Retain
  - Engage
- Defines the total rewards strategy
  - **Limited resources** are directed to programs and tools with the greatest impact
  - Rewards **excellence and success through merit**
  - **Affirms and strengthens** through recognition and wellbeing
  - Provides for an overall quality of life through **health, welfare, and retirement**
Why Is an Employee Value Proposition Important Now?

- To achieve the University’s Twin Cities strategic goals:
  - Build an **exceptional** University where grand societal challenges are addressed
  - **Support excellence** and, with intention, reject complacency
  - Aggressively **recruit, retain, and promote** field-shaping researchers and teachers
  - Establish a culture of reciprocal **engagement**, capitalizing on our unique location
The Employee Value Proposition Process

**Step 1**
Gather Insights
- Senior Leaders
- Current Employees
- “Target” Employees

**Step 2**
Create the Employee Value Proposition
- What do we want employees to think and feel?

**Step 3**
Define and Align Total Rewards Strategy
- Appropriate mix that provides highest perceived value at most reasonable cost

**Step 4**
Implement
- Planned communications always done in context of broad Employee Value Proposition
Questions
AGENDA ITEM: 2015 Employee Engagement Results and Action Steps

☐ Review ☐ Review + Action ☐ Action ☒ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Brandon Sullivan, Director, Leadership and Talent Development,
Office of Human Resources

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to provide an overview of overall results from the 2015 E² Employee Engagement survey.

The presentation will provide an overview of total University results, including key patterns, trends, and findings. It will also cover survey administration, participation rates, the overall engagement process and timeline, and the University's employee engagement model. Key faculty and staff responses and comparisons to 2013 and 2014 results will be shared.

2015 Survey Results

- The survey achieved an overall 67 percent response rate, with 56 percent of faculty and 70 percent of staff responding. This was the highest response rate ever for a system-wide employee survey at the University.
- Survey results found a high level of engagement, with 48 percent of faculty and 51 percent of staff reporting high levels of commitment and dedication as well as effective work environment. These results put the University at or above the norms provided by external vendor the Hay Group for high-performing global firms.
- All deans, chancellors, and vice presidents received in-person executive presentations on the data specific to their college or unit as well as recommended areas for action.
- Online reports were provided to leaders with at least 10 responses to the faculty or staff survey.
- Engagement leads support leaders and human resources staff as they share successes, challenges, and identify best practices in employee engagement.
- Many leaders on campus had been interested in measuring faculty and staff engagement, and the E² Employee Engagement Survey data allowed five colleges/units to suspend planned surveys and use the engagement data from the University instead.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Employee Engagement at the University of Minnesota

In 2013, the University developed a program to support leaders at all levels – including chancellors, deans, department chairs, and front-line supervisors – to address the needs of University faculty and staff through an employee engagement approach.

The University reviewed the work of peer institutions around faculty and staff engagement and opted to create its own approach that connected engagement with the mission of the institution, provided actionable data, was designed to work within a complex and decentralized organization, and enlisted leaders throughout the University to champion and move engagement forward. The result of this work is the E² survey, first administered to faculty and staff in 2013, with a follow-up survey done in 2014.

In October 2015, the third annual E² survey of faculty and staff was administered using the same questions as the two previous surveys.

Research Behind Employee Engagement

- Engagement is “the mental state underlying high degrees of work motivation.”
- Highly engaged people are able to do three things:
  - Remain fully focused (absorption);
  - Be energetic and mentally resilient (vigor); and
  - Stay committed and involved (dedication).
- Strong engagement is created by meaningful challenges with the support, resources, and confidence to address them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Factors That Drive Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Individual characteristics (e.g., personality traits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership behaviors (e.g., concern for wellbeing of others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job resources (e.g., autonomy, positive climate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job hindrance demands (e.g., role ambiguity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job challenge demands (e.g., job complexity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• High levels of engagement have been linked with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Performance</th>
<th>Individual Performance</th>
<th>Work-Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unit-level financial performance, productivity and turnover</td>
<td>• Individual job performance</td>
<td>• Relationship satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workplace safety</td>
<td>• Going above and beyond</td>
<td>• Emotional wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customer / patient / student satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentations to the Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee

• Discussion of Plan for Enhancing Employee Engagement - September 2013.
• Employee Engagement Survey: Review of University-Wide Results - February 2014.
• Update on Employee Engagement - September 2014.
• 2014 Employee Engagement Results - February 2015.
Employee Engagement

Board of Regents
Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee

Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Brandon Sullivan, Director, Leadership and Talent Development
Connie Delaney, Dean, School of Nursing

February 11, 2016
What We Will Cover Today

• 2015 Survey Administration Summary
• Organization Context for Engagement Metrics
• Summary of Results for Faculty and Staff
• Faculty Engagement and Local Action
# 2015 Survey Administration Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>When</strong></th>
<th>October 12 – 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What</strong></td>
<td>Separate faculty and staff surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 36 scored questions in each survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessed commitment and dedication plus effective environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How</strong></td>
<td>Externally managed by Hay Group to ensure confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>All benefits-eligible University of Minnesota faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2,488 faculty responses (56% participation rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 9,907 staff responses (70% participation rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roll-out of Results</strong></td>
<td>• Executive presentations to all Deans, Chancellors, Vice-Presidents, and Vice-Provosts in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manager reports to all leaders with at least 10 survey responses from faculty or staff rolling out immediately following presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Engagement Model

Drivers
- Clear and Promising Direction
- Commitment to Excellence
- Confidence in Leaders
- Development Opportunities
- Respect and Recognition

Key Metrics
- Commitment & Dedication
- Effective Environment

Employee Engagement
Engagement Metrics and Critical Questions

What does three years of E² data tell you about your faculty and staff?

Where can increased employee engagement advance your highest priorities?

How can engagement metrics further align with strategic priorities?
Strategic Priorities

- Recruiting and Retaining Field-Shaping Researchers
- Leadership Development
- Culture Change
Increased Participation, Communication, and Action

Faculty and staff set another record for survey participation.

A majority of faculty and staff participated in a feedback meeting.

More faculty and staff said action was taken on issues raised in the survey.

Participation

- “I participated in a feedback meeting about the previous survey results.”

- “Action was taken on issues raised in the last survey.”
# Summary of Results for Faculty

## Dimension Summary

In Order of Percent Favorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>% Favorable</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Unfavorable</th>
<th>vs. 2014 Results</th>
<th>vs. 2013 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Favorable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Excellence</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority &amp; Empowerment</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately Favorable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment &amp; Dedication</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Expectations &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Environment</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Opportunities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Leaders</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Resources</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work, Structure, &amp; Process</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Follow-Up</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Greatest Change for Faculty

## Most Improved/Declined from 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Most Improved Items</th>
<th>% Fav</th>
<th>vs. 2014</th>
<th>vs. 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Follow-Up</td>
<td>48. I participated in a feedback meeting about the previous survey results.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Follow-Up</td>
<td>49. Action was taken on issues raised in the last survey.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</td>
<td>29. My department has a strategy and goals that address our most important challenges and opportunities.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Excellence</td>
<td>33. The people in my department are committed to delivering high quality service/clinical care.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Excellence</td>
<td>37. Being student-focused (seeking to understand and meet students’ needs and requirements).</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>23. Overall, my department demonstrates a strong commitment to diversity and inclusion.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>20. I receive recognition from my department for my contributions to my field/discipline.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Most Declined Items</th>
<th>% Fav</th>
<th>vs. 2014</th>
<th>vs. 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Dedication</td>
<td>43. I feel proud to work for the University of Minnesota (my campus).</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Opportunities</td>
<td>13. Your opportunities to achieve your personal career objectives at the University of Minnesota (your campus).</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</td>
<td>40. I have the opportunity to set my goals in alignment with the strategic priorities of my college and department.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Resources</td>
<td>12. I have the resources and support I need to deliver high quality service/clinical care.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Summary of Results for Staff

## Dimension Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Favorable</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Unfavorable</th>
<th>vs. 2014 Results</th>
<th>vs. 2013 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Favorable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Excellence</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority &amp; Empowerment</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Expectations &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately Favorable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment &amp; Dedication</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Leaders</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Resources</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Environment</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Opportunities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work, Structure, &amp; Process</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Follow-Up</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Greatest Change for Staff

## Most Improved/Declined from 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Most Improved Items</th>
<th>% Fav</th>
<th>vs. 2014</th>
<th>vs. 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</td>
<td>41. I understand what I can do to support my department’s strategy and goals.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Follow-Up</td>
<td>48. I participated in a feedback meeting about the previous survey results.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Expectations and Feedback</td>
<td>5. My manager/supervisor provides clear and regular feedback on how well I do my job.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Follow-Up</td>
<td>49. Action was taken on issues raised in the last survey.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Most Declined Items</th>
<th>% Fav</th>
<th>vs. 2014</th>
<th>vs. 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Resources</td>
<td>11. New employees receive the training they need to do their jobs well.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>21. I receive recognition when I do a good job.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Dedication</td>
<td>45. I would recommend the University of Minnesota to family or friends as a place to work (my campus).</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Dedication</td>
<td>46. Given your choice, how long would you plan to continue working for the University of Minnesota (your campus)?</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Dedication</td>
<td>43. I feel proud to work for the University of Minnesota (my campus).</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Engagement
Strengths and Opportunities

Drivers
- Clear and Promising Direction
- Commitment to Excellence
  - Confidence in Leaders
  - Development Opportunities
  - Respect and Recognition
- Authority and Empowerment
- Clear Expectations and Feedback
  - Collaboration
  - Support and Resources
  - Work, Structure, and Process

Key Metrics
- Commitment & Dedication
- Effective Environment

Employee Engagement

Very Favorable  Moderately Favorable  Mixed
Faculty Scores Increased Where Action was Taken

Faculty favorability on the item: "How would you rate the trust and confidence you have in your college’s leadership team?"

- 6 High-Action Units
- System-Wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 High-Action Units</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-Wide</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of Action

- Dean Connie Delaney, School of Nursing
Next Steps

• Continue to support local communication and action through leadership consulting and training.
• Designing the next iteration of the engagement survey for 2017 administration.
• Help leaders further incorporate employee engagement into goal-setting, planning, and action.
Discussion
AGENDA ITEM: Hiring Top Talent

PROSPECT & KEY POINTS

Achieving many of the University's strategic goals – including focusing on grand challenges, embracing excellence, and recruiting field-shaping faculty – depend on hiring top talent. This item will provide context on the current job market, outline a strategy for hiring exceptional employees, and discuss the search process for senior leaders.

The University is employing three main strategies in hiring:

1. Improve visibility of internal career paths within the University.
2. Source external candidates by developing the University’s employment brand, using social media, and focusing on diverse candidates.
3. Develop a consistent plan on hiring policies and on assessing and interviewing candidates.

Diversity will be a priority, including training hiring staff to consider implicit bias and to demand diverse applicant pools.

This item includes a detailed process for recruiting, evaluating, and selecting senior leaders.

This is a report required by Board policy.
Hiring Top Talent

Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee
Board of Regents

Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources

February 11, 2016
Hiring Top Talent

- Context
- Overview of the Hiring Process for All University Employees
- Special Considerations
Context

• The vision for the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus is that it will be *preeminent in solving the grand challenges of a diverse and changing world*—to do this, we need top field-shaping faculty and talented leadership and staff in place.

• 61% of the University’s expenditures are allocated toward its workforce.

• Given the significance of this investment, and the need for top talent to help the University achieve our shared vision, “how” we hire and “who” we hire is more important than ever.
### Job Openings By Employee Group/Campus
(FY ’16—7/1/15 to 1/20/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crookston</th>
<th>Duluth</th>
<th>Morris</th>
<th>Rochester</th>
<th>Twin Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamster</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSCME</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Grad Asst.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp/Casual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hiring Process For All University Employees

• Provide a roadmap that supports consistency, equity, and fairness in hiring practices across the University.
• Demonstrate the University’s strong commitment to diversity.
• Incorporate best practices in hiring, including engagement of key stakeholders which reflect the University’s collaborative and consultative culture.
• Four distinct phases—launch, recruit, evaluate, and select
Phase I: Launch

• Determine **unit workforce planning needs** as it relates to creating a diverse, qualified workforce—what talent do we need, what talent do we have, how does this hire contribute to our overall workforce plan?

• **Identify the qualifications and competencies** that will support success of the new hire—e.g., administrative experience in a large, decentralized organization, demonstrated success in collaborative decision-making in a consultative environment, inspires trust and confidence.
Phase I: Launch

• **Develop a position profile** that accurately reflects:
  • Responsibilities, minimum and preferred qualifications, competencies, unit and institutional background, reporting line and other appointment details, input of key stakeholders, and the University’s commitment to diversity.

• **Identify members of a search committee** who
  • Represent diverse perspectives (gender, discipline, ethnicity, experiences), understand the position responsibilities and unit needs, and have or will work closely with the new hire.
Phase 2: Recruit

• Advertise broadly, leveraging the U’s unique employment brand and reaching diverse audiences.

• Source widely, seeking nominations from key stakeholders, reaching out to peers at peer organizations and institutions, and leveraging social media and OHR’s diversity recruiters.

• Recruit highly-qualified and diverse candidates into the candidate pool, maintaining regular communication with candidates formally in the pool while continuing active outreach to other candidates until the position is filled.
Phase 3: Evaluate

- Discuss the diversity, qualifications, and competencies of the candidate pool and narrow pool down to selected candidates for confidential interviews—if the diversity of the pool is not satisfactory, continue recruiting until it is.
- Interview candidates, aligning interview questions with position responsibilities, desired qualifications and competencies, University’s commitment to diversity, and fit with the U’s culture.
- Conduct referencing, background checks, and candidate assessments and use this as a basis to recommend finalists to hiring authority, unranked with strengths and weaknesses of each.
Phase 4: Select

- **Conduct public interviews** with hiring authority and key stakeholders.
- **Gather feedback** on candidates re: qualifications, competencies, and fit with the culture.
- **Offer position** to final candidate, negotiate, announce, and craft onboarding strategy for new hire to the position and U.
Special Considerations: Internal v. External

**Internal Promotion**
- Builds necessary skill sets
- Insures cultural fit
- Helps to retain top talent

**External Hire**
- Can fill gap in skills
- Brings fresh ideas
Special Considerations: Culture

• U has many different cultures within the organization.
  • Overall, we look for people who are visionary, innovative, collaborative, inclusive, transparent, fair, accessible, approachable, and effective at building relationships, empowering, self-aware, energetic, trustworthy, etc.
  • Good fit with culture is as important to the new hire as it is to the University, and is critical to success.
Special Considerations: Faculty

• Faculty play a much greater role in hiring their colleagues, including direct sourcing and recruiting.
• Typically a global or national search is conducted given the area of academic discipline.
Special Considerations: Staff

- Search committee is not required.
- Degree of stakeholder engagement may be less, depending on the reach of the position.
- Typically a local or regional search is conducted specific to the nature of the position and the availability of candidates in the market.
Special Considerations: Senior Leaders

• Visibility and level of responsibility of these positions often require larger search committees to include key stakeholders (i.e., external advisory boards, alumni, donors, peers, faculty, staff, students)

• Often a national search is conducted.

• Best candidates are often those who aren’t looking, which is where a search firm is valuable.

• Confidentiality is a concern to these candidates.
Process

- Provides the roadmap.
- Ensures best practices are utilized.
- Process does not guarantee a great hire, but ensures consistency, equity, and fairness in hiring.
# University of Minnesota
## Senior Leaders / Search Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: LAUNCH</th>
<th>Phase 2: RECRUIT</th>
<th>Phase 3: EVALUATE</th>
<th>Phase 4: SELECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Determine search strategy and timeline</td>
<td>• Advertise position in targeted and diverse publications</td>
<td>• Convene search committee to assess candidate pool and select candidates to invite to off-campus confidential interviews (Meeting 3)</td>
<td>• Conduct off-list reference checks on final candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft job description with qualifications, competencies and characteristics critical for success</td>
<td>• Share position description with the University community, encouraging outreach to colleagues and seeking nominations and applications for the position</td>
<td>• Develop interview questions based on desired qualifications, competencies and characteristics</td>
<td>• Collect and share feedback from the public interview process and off-list referencing with hiring authority and search committee chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seek nominations, identify potential search committee chair(s) and members and confirm willingness to serve</td>
<td>• Search firm collects and follows up on nominations and engages in aggressive candidate sourcing and recruiting efforts</td>
<td>• Convene search committee to conduct confidential interviews and identify candidates who should move forward in the search process (Meeting 4)</td>
<td>• Offer position to the final candidate, negotiate terms, and confirm appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine use of search firm, clarify roles and responsibilities, and confirm contract</td>
<td>• Check-in between search firm and search committee midway through recruiting phase to discuss the quality and diversity of pool to date (Meeting 2)</td>
<td>• Conduct assessments, on-list references, and background checks on selected candidates and share summary with search committee (Meeting 5)</td>
<td>• Announce new senior leader to University community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send announcement to the University community re: the search, anticipated timeline and committee membership</td>
<td>• Continue to source and recruit potential candidates until position is filled, as needed</td>
<td>• Recommend unranked finalist(s) to the hiring authority, including strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>• Bring senior leader appointment to the Board of Regents for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convene search committee to deliver formal charge, seek input on the position description, and discuss the search process (Meeting 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Announce finalist(s) to University community and conduct public interviews on campus with a wide range of stakeholders</td>
<td>• Onboard new senior leader to the position and University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM: Consent Report

Review + Action

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

As required by Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, the administration seeks approval for the conferral of tenure for faculty who have been hired at the University and for the granting of faculty emeritus status to Dr. Daniel Zismer.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority calls for items such as proposed changes to retirement provisions, senior administrative appointments, tenure and/or promotion recommendations, approval of civil service rules, and appointments of certain trustees and board members to be brought before the Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee for action.

Additionally, Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Emeriti uses the following definition: “Faculty emeritus’ shall mean a tenured faculty member who has retired from the University under any circumstances, including a terminal agreement or completion of a phased retirement, after at least five years of employment at the University and at an age where retirement is allowable under University policy. This term does not include a faculty member who was terminated under cause.”

The policy does allow for special circumstances and states that, “On the recommendation of the president, the Board of Regents may award the title of emeritus to a faculty member not meeting the definition or make a promotion in the emeritus rank.”

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends approval of the consent report.
Outside Tenured Hire

The decision of the Board of Regents to confer tenure and rank for any individual faculty hire from outside the University of Minnesota becomes effective on the first day of that faculty member’s academic appointment at the University.

Outside Tenured Hire for February, 2016 Board of Regents meeting – Twin Cities campus
Recommended by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Karen Hanson

Mary Fran Tracy
Associate Professor with tenure
Adult and Gerontological Health Cooperative Unit
School of Nursing

Mary Frances Tracy received her Ph.D. in Nursing from the University of Minnesota in 1999. Currently, she is a Certified Clinical Nurse Specialist at the University of Minnesota Medical Center where she has been practicing in critical care since 1997. Dr. Tracy is also an adjunct clinical professor in the School of Nursing and an adjunct assistant professor in the Medical School. Her research has focused on the role complementary therapies and patient-driven interventions can play in optimizing the experience of ICU patients for short and long term comfort, adjustment, outcomes and recovery. She is a highly sought after mentor and preceptor and brings to the University extensive national leadership experience.
Rationale for Granting of Faculty Emeritus Status – Dr. Daniel Zismer

Dr. Daniel Zismer was a term faculty member in the Division of Health Policy and Management in the School of Public Health; accordingly, he is not automatically conferred this emeritus status. With plans to retire on January 31, 2016, he requested the emeritus status, which was supported by John Finnegan, Dean of the School of the Public Health, and Ira Moscovice, Professor and Head of the Division of Health Policy and Management. The faculty of the School of Public Health approved the granting of faculty emeritus status to Dr. Zismer on January 15, 2016.

Dr. Zismer was hired as an Associate Professor, Division of Health Policy and Management, School of Public Health in 2007. Since 2010, he had an essential role as the Major Chair and Director of the Master’s in Healthcare Administration and Executive Studies Programs for the School. In conjunction with his School of Public Health appointment, Dr. Zismer maintained an Adjunct Associate Professor appointment in the Division of Medicine, Medical School at the University of Minnesota.

In 2013, Dr. Zismer was promoted to full Professor rank and became the Wegmiller Professor (endowed scholar), Division of Health Policy and Management, School of Public Health. His strong leadership of the MHA and Executive MHA programs led the programs to become very visible in the marketplace and each program maintains a high number of matriculated students annually. To enhance the MHA and Executive MHA programs, he developed a new certificate program for clinical executives, participated in research projects and developed a Center for Integrated Health System Performance.

Dr. Zismer has published articles in peer-reviewed and practitioner-oriented journals and is a highly sought after lecturer on issues related to the leadership of integrated delivery systems and has made numerous presentations on this topic. He has also served as a principal investigator on a grant from the Medicare Payment Advisory Committee that assesses physician clinical effort allocation.

Dr. Zismer received his BA from Gustavus Adolphus College and his PhD from the University of Minnesota.

The President recommends the granting of faculty emeritus status to Dr. Daniel Zismer.
AGENDA ITEM: Information Items

☐ Review    ☐ Review + Action    ☐ Action    ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Kathryn F. Brown, Vice President, Office of Human Resources

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

- The Information Report, which informs the Board of noteworthy items, administrative actions, and local, regional, and national policy issues affecting University units and departments. Specific items covered include personnel highlights, University highlights, and faculty and staff activities and awards.
- The updated Workforce Metrics Report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Information Report appears as a regular item on the Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee agenda. The Workforce Metrics Report was last presented to the committee at its February 12, 2015 meeting. The current document updates the metrics with data from the ninth payroll of the 2015-2016 fiscal year.
Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee
Information Report
February 11, 2015

This report does not capture and record a complete listing of the significant awards and activities of the University community but, rather, makes note of unit reported items in these areas. It also highlights reports and activities at the local, regional, and national level in the area of faculty and staff affairs.

University Highlights
The Jean-Nickolaus Tretter Collection in Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies at the University of Minnesota Libraries is the inaugural recipient of the Newlen-Symons Award for Excellence in Serving the GLBT Community by the American Library Association’s Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Round Table. The award was established to honor a library, librarian, library staff member, library board and/or library friends groups who serve the GLBT community. Nominees are judged based on innovation, impact, sustainability and advocacy.

Four Minnesota hospitals are among the best places in the country to have a baby, according to The Women’s Choice Award. The group listed 431 hospitals that are the best in America for obstetrics. The list includes Fairview Northland Hospital in Princeton, Fairview Southdale Hospital in Edina, Cuyuna Regional Medical Center in Crosby and University of Minnesota Hospitals.

The ADEAGies Foundation has named the School of Dentistry, along with the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System (MnSCU) and the Minnesota Board of Dentistry, as recipients of its 2016 Gies Award for Outstanding Vision by a Public or Private Partner for their efforts to advance dental therapy education in Minnesota. The Gies Awards are the dental profession’s preeminent recognition of exceptional contributions that exemplify the highest standards in oral health and dental education, research and leadership.

The University of Minnesota, Morris recently achieved the following rankings:
- Ranked among the 50 Most Technologically Advanced Small Colleges 2015 by The Best Colleges Online
- Named to Kiplinger’s Personal Finance’s list of the Top 300 Best College Values of 2016
- Identified by College Factual ranking as one of the 10 Best Colleges for the Money.

Faculty and Staff Activities and Awards
Lynne Ackerberg, College of Continuing Education English language programs, won the Harold B. Allen Award at the statewide conference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The award recognizes service and contributions to TESOL and the profession.
Alison Aune, UMD art education, has been elected cultural director of The Sons of Norway Nortun Lodge of Duluth to promote, preserve, and celebrate the heritage and culture of Norway. She also serves on the board of directors of the Nordic Center of Duluth.

Iris Borowsky, general pediatrics and adolescent health, has been elected to membership in the American Pediatric Society. This distinction honors Borowsky’s extensive contributions to academic pediatrics and her leadership in advancing the field of child health.

Three U of M faculty and one administrator have been named Fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the world’s largest general scientific society.

- Carla Carlson, Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, for contributions in fostering engagement between academic researchers, policy makers, students and the public on issues of sustainability.
- Jerry David Cohen, horticultural science, for innovative contributions to understanding auxin metabolism in relation to plant growth and for the development of sensitive analytical approaches to elucidating complex biological processes.
- Martin Greven, physics and astronomy, for establishing a stellar record in growth and perfection of high quality crystals of oxide superconductors.
- Philip Gordon Pardey, applied economics, for distinguished contributions to the field of agricultural economics, with particular emphasis on the economics of innovation, agricultural productivity and economic development.

Information/Decision Sciences Assistant Professor Jason Chan’s dissertation, “Internet’s Dirty Secret: Assessing the Impact of Online Intermediaries on HIV Transmission,” received three awards: an AIS Best Information Systems Publications Award, which is given to the top five best information systems papers of 2014; the 2014 MISQ Best Paper Award; and the 2015 INFORMS Information Systems Society Nunamaker-Chen Dissertation Award.

Two College of Design faculty recently received awards from the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ASCA). Renee Cheng received the AIA/ACSA Practice and Leadership Award for the Building Stories class. Building Stories invites practitioners into the classroom to share a cliff-hanger story, leaving students with all the information they had at the time. The next week, they return to hear the students’ solutions to their situation and reveal the actual outcome. Greg Donofrio received the ACSA Diversity Achievement Award for his work with the Goldstein Museum exhibition “A Right to Establish a Home.” His students worked in small teams, and with community collaborators, to conduct oral histories with neighborhood residents, to research the historical events and individuals associated with the property, and to experiment with creative ways to visually represent the information they found.

Jim Collins, Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, will be honored with the 2016 Minnesota Pork Board Distinguished Service Award at the Minnesota Pork Board annual meeting.
Douglas Dunham, UMD computer science, was elected as chair of SIGMAA-ARTS, the Mathematical Association of American (MAA) special interest group consisting of over 300 MAA members who are also interested in the arts. He has served as interim chair for the past two years.

Regents’ Professor R. Lawrence Edwards, earth sciences, was elected as a foreign member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences for his excellence in scientific research studying climate patterns, notably in China. Membership in the Chinese Academy of Sciences is China’s highest academic honor in scientific and technology fields. Edwards is the first member from the U of M.

The Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health appointed School of Public Health Dean John Finnegan as an academic representative on the Council on Education for Public Health’s (CEPH) Board of Councilors for a three-year term. CEPH is an independent agency recognized by the US Department of Education to accredit schools of public health and public health programs offered in settings other than schools of public health.

Andrew Furco, associate vice president for public engagement, has been named to the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities’ 2016 Board of Directors. The Board of Directors provides oversight and direction for APLU’s work and is charged with setting membership and governing policies for the association. Board members work to make public institutions of higher education more effective in delivering high quality and affordable higher education alongside cutting-edge research and robust community and economic engagement.

Interim Athletic Director Beth Goetz, Board of Regents Chair Dean Johnson, and President Eric Kaler are included in the Twin City Business list of 100 People to Know in 2016. According to the publication, although many people on the list “lead major organizations and are influential for other reasons, they are not listed here for that reason alone. Rather, they’re included because of how they have overcome—or are facing, with courage, creativity and gusto—major challenges, while using their influence to grow Minnesota’s economy, and support and even boost its social and cultural attributes.”

IonE director Jessica Hellmann has been named to the first cohort of Public Engagement Fellows of the Leshner Leadership Institute at the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Fellows were chosen based on leadership and excellence in their research careers and interest in promoting meaningful dialogue between science and society in the area of climate change.

The ADEAGies Foundation named Mark Herzberg, diagnostic and biological sciences, as the 2016 recipient of the Gies Award for Outstanding Achievement by a Dental Educator. According to Leon Assael, dean of the University of Minnesota School of Dentistry, “The Gies Award is the Academy Award of dental education.”

The National Jurist has named Joan Howland, Law School, to its annual list of the 25 most influential figures in American legal education. The National Jurist is read by more than
100,000 law students and educators. Its “most influential” list is based on ratings by law school deans and professors nationwide.

Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, history of science and technology, won the 2015 Joseph H. Hazen Education Prize for excellence in education from the History of Science Society. The prize committee recognized Kohlstedt as “an advocate for education” and “a beloved mentor to countless undergraduate and graduate students” who “combines teaching with another area of her outstanding activity: women and science.” The History of Science Society, with more than 3,000 members, is the world’s largest society dedicated to understanding science, technology, medicine, and their interactions with society in historical context.

Jen Koontz, College of Continuing Education student services and academic advising, won the Continuing Education Support Specialist Award at the UPCEA 2015 Central Regional Conference. UPCEA is the leading association for professional, continuing, and online education, serving more than 400 institutions.

History Professor Jean O’Brien’s Journal of Native American and Indigenous Studies (developed with her colleague Robert Warrior, University of Illinois), received the Council of Editors of Learned Journals’ award for best new journal for 2015.

Sarah Parkinson, Humphrey School global policy, has been named to the Project on Middle East Political Science (POMEPS) Steering Committee, which is comprised of leading Middle East specialists from a range of top universities and institutions.

Christopher Phelan, economics, has been elected one of the 13 new Fellows of the Econometric Society, an international society for the advancement of economic theory in its relation to statistics and mathematics.

Shri Ramaswamy, bioproducts and biosystems engineering, was elected Fellow of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers.

Roger Ruan, bioproducts and biosystems engineering, has been elected a Fellow of the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE). The ASABE is an international association for professionals specializing in sustainable solutions to population growth.

Sarah Schweiss, pharmacy practice at UMD, has been appointed to a one-year term as vice-chair of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy Ambulatory Care PRN’s Networking Committee.

Corbin Smyth, associate vice chancellor for student life at UMD, was awarded the Susan Maul Distinguished Service Award at the Association of College Unions International (ACUI) Region V conference. The award is the highest honor presented by ACUI Region V and is given to a person who has participated in the college union and student activities movement as a professional for a minimum of 10 years.
Nathan Winter, McLeod County Extension, was named Extension Educator of the Year by the Minnesota Farm Bureau.
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The Office of Human Resources introduced its Report on Workforce Metrics in 2013 to inform University leaders on key areas of human resource activity aligned with University priorities, such as attracting, retaining and developing top talent in pursuit of its mission. Prior to this edition, the report was provided to the Board’s Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee at its December 2013 and February 2015 meetings.

The metrics framework was developed with support from Towers Watson consulting and the University’s Office of Institutional Research. The data sets for this report are the same ones used for other institutional reporting purposes. This ensures integrity year-over-year and allows for data comparisons.

The data reported shows both the current snapshot and trends over time. This year’s report includes nineteen metrics represented in four dashboards. Each dashboard includes interrelated metrics that provide useful information about the broader topic. The report is organized by dashboard, displaying first the individual component metrics, followed by the related dashboard.

As we move forward, we will continue to evaluate the framework and include and refine metrics as needed to build our analytic capacity, and align with ongoing University priorities.
Workforce Distribution
Average Age by Employee Group
Workforce Flows
Internal Fill Ratio (FY ’15)
Turnover Rate by Key Category (FY ’15)
### Percentage of Employees in Retirement Risk Zone (FY ’15)
Ages 55 and Older by Campus and Job Code Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Academic Administrative</th>
<th>Academic Professional</th>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Labor Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Crookston</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>22.69%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>38.64%</td>
<td>34.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Duluth</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>30.46%</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>34.63%</td>
<td>38.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Morris</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>48.78%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>31.73%</td>
<td>46.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities*</td>
<td>30.53%</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>60.76%</td>
<td>40.04%</td>
<td>28.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University of Minnesota, Rochester data is included in the Twin Cities section.
Workforce Flows Dashboard

Internal Fill Ratio (FY '15)

Turnover Rate by Key Category (FY '15)

Percentage of Employees in Retirement Risk Zone (FY '15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Academic Administrative</th>
<th>Academic Professional</th>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Labor Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Crookston</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>22.69%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>38.64%</td>
<td>34.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Duluth</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>30.46%</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>34.63%</td>
<td>38.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Morris</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>48.78%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>31.73%</td>
<td>46.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities</td>
<td>30.53%</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>60.76%</td>
<td>40.04%</td>
<td>28.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University of Minnesota, Rochester data is included in the Twin Cities section.
Workforce Cost
Trend in Labor Cost by Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>Overtime</th>
<th>Consulting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$1,426,508,352</td>
<td>$492,632,520</td>
<td>$102,577,003</td>
<td>$149,425,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$1,385,993,294</td>
<td>$488,979,004</td>
<td>$107,986,620</td>
<td>$158,064,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$1,324,931,861</td>
<td>$490,270,425</td>
<td>$98,138,590</td>
<td>$133,575,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$1,280,243,022</td>
<td>$490,633,287</td>
<td>$92,844,948</td>
<td>$113,830,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$1,306,501,881</td>
<td>$472,919,089</td>
<td>$91,638,027</td>
<td>$108,123,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$1,263,015,864</td>
<td>$438,707,285</td>
<td>$85,375,401</td>
<td>$123,650,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$1,284,703,683</td>
<td>$410,012,407</td>
<td>$89,130,751</td>
<td>$135,894,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary
Fringe
Overtime
Consulting
Distribution of Labor Cost by Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>Overtime</th>
<th>Consulting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U of M Base Salary Increases Compared to Benchmark

Note: Market data not available for Education FY 2007-2008. UMN budget was used for calculations.
FY15 national data: WorldatWork.org. FY15 Local MSP data: TCCN (Twin Cities Comp Network) 2015/16 Salary Planning Survey. FY15 Education and UMN data: CUPA.
Workforce ROI
Labor Cost as a % of Total Expense

- FY09: 62%
- FY10: 61%
- FY11: 62%
- FY12: 61%
- FY13: 61%
- FY14: 61%
- FY15: 61%
Engagement Results 2015

Office of Human Resources

University of Minnesota
Driven to Discover™

Effective Environment

Commitment & Dedication

- %Favorable
- %Neutral
- %Unfavorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Volume Output Per Employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students/EE</th>
<th>Degrees/EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sponsored Dollars Per Employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,840</td>
<td>$34,166</td>
<td>$39,138</td>
<td>$37,749</td>
<td>$36,826</td>
<td>$36,235</td>
<td>$35,170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duration: FY09 to FY15
Workforce ROI Dashboard

Labor Cost as a % of Total Expense

Engagement Results 2015

Student Volume Output Per Employee

Sponsored Dollars Per Employee