**Staff Assembly**

**MINUTES**

**MEETING CALLED BY**: Rachelle Strawther  
**TYPE OF MEETING**: Monthly Meeting  
**FACILITATOR**: Stephanie Rockwell  
**NOTE TAKER**: Samantha Scott  
**ATTENDEES**: Stephanie Rockwell, Juanita Jiminez, Cory Kittrell, Jim Sjothun, Jim Simon, Rachel Young, Jennifer Klein, Jeff Geldien, Angela Ruff and Samantha Scott.

**Agenda topics**

**10:00 AM – 10:30 AM**  
**MISSION AWARDS/STAFF RECOGNITION**  
**RACHEL**

**DISCUSSION**  
The nomination period ended on Friday, April 21st with a few notification emails to the staff population as a reminder. The process of “resubmitting” previous semester nominations for those staff members who did not receive a Mission Award went well, we will offer that second chance nomination process for at least 2 semesters following the initial nomination. Are we waiting on the budget for the next fiscal year before we can proceed with our staff recognition? Cory turned in a proposal to Rachelle, but there is probably not much difference. Juanita mentioned that Kirk saw that an HR team member received a Kudos and he wondered if we were emailing that acknowledgement to the staff member as well. Stephanie suggested that we look at a form build and have an automatic email go to each staff member. Angela thinks that this is an opportunity to change the culture and get the community to check the Kudos page more frequently. Jim Sjothun mentioned that the nighttime staff don’t get much time to look at their computers during the day and wondered if these could be saved in a staff member’s HR file. Angela shared that this Kudos program was not meant to be a formality, rather a culture change. Jim Simon presented an idea to allow/invite Faculty members to share Kudos as well based on a discussion of empathy at a recent Wellness Committee Meeting. Jeff thinks that would be a great olive branch to extend to the faculty. A few council members offered their opinion about the amount of work that goes into this program already and the need to accommodate the amount of labor it will take to maintain and review twice the amount of submissions each week/month. Staff Assembly is an organization to promote the needs of the staff population, and the concern is that this will change the objective focus from staff. Angela mentioned that the academic convocation acknowledges faculty members in their respective areas and we also have our Mission Awards, but there is a need to be empathetic and break down the silos between staff and faculty. What is our staff mandate vs. our commitment to campus wide.

**CONCLUSIONS**  
Revisit the budget discussion in May/June since they haven’t published the information yet.

**10:33AM – 10:43 AM**  
**STAFF ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS**  
**JENNIFER**

**DISCUSSION**  
The ballot is complete and now visible online. We have 4 open positions and 5 candidates which include 3 incumbents. Jenn and Kara McGinn worked on this SharePoint process with Rachelle and Stephanie serving as “style consultants”. Jennifer was concerned with the SharePoint logistics and the daunting task of logging into the site if you don’t use the site normally. She recommends using SharePoint for all future elections as well. She received an email notification from each supervisor when an application was approved. Should we add “incumbent” next to the nominees on future ballots? The hope is that this will help when name recognition normally takes over. Angela agreed, saying that it might help display “consistency” for staff who do not know any of the nominees. Jenn
also mentioned that you must review all five candidates before you can vote on the live ballot.

**CONCLUSIONS**
Stephanie will send a marketing email through the Staff-L distribution list to promote the site/election.

### 10:43 AM-11:02 AM

**OPEN MEETING**

**ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**DISCUSSION**
Rachel suggested that we have a stack of notecards on each table at the open meeting and to ask each staff member to write down the top 3 items that they would like to see Staff Assembly address. Jeff said that the elephant in the room is the budget at this point and it might be nice to invite a member of the Finance Department to speak at the Open Meeting. There are many departments that are asked to cut the fat, but there is growth everywhere on campus, but where is the budget as we stand? Jeff suggested Joe Smith as a speaker, because he can get into the mechanics without glazing over the information. Angela said that we are year to year budgeting and is curious if we are admitting based on great need or strictly 18 year olds. When UA campaign money is touted as "scholarship" money, then it eventually becomes budget money. Jeff also suggested that we have an athletes representative speak about the recent success and what that brings to the athletics department and GU as a whole. Speak to the business of athletics, and how the student athletes are performing as students. What is this doing for the school and the data based on the distance we go into the NCAA tournament. How are we harnessing the energy?

**CONCLUSIONS**
We will send more emails to the group for meeting topics.

### 11:02 AM-12:02 PM

**DISCUSSION WITH JOHN SKLUT**

**ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**DISCUSSION**
Stephanie started with a brief discussion of the PCAC and the policy development and approval process, which was shaped by the Policy Discernment Team. John confirmed that the PCAC did finalize the policy process and that was endorsed by the SAEC and Faculty Senate. It was also approved by the Board of Trustees. The policy website will be finalized this summer and there will be an internal website to host the draft policies for the Gonzaga community to comment on. They have a backlog of current draft policies, and they will start the process in late August and we may start the vetting process in September. The PCAC will take that to their constituents to get into draft form for public comment. The public component will be the second part of this process. John is working on communication to the GU community on the board approval and the policy. John would like to have a 2nd SAEC member on the PCAC along with the President. There are only 2 faculty members on the committee, but the remainder of the group is actually staff members.

There is an annual policy review period, but we will continue to look at sponsorship for the next opportunities. Timing of policy review will be evaluated moving forward, but he doesn’t want to set the PCAC up for failure. We need to accommodate all policies and allot adequate time without boxing ourselves in. The budget discussion: The perception is that we are in a perpetual crisis due to enrollment and we feel that the message is consistent each year, that the staff compensation policy may never be prioritized. John cannot provide any more insight than the letter from Thayne. The ideal goal is to move beyond tuition revenues and look for alternative revenue sources.

There are a lot of benefits emanating from the University of Washington partnership, and the potential for prestige due to their #1 medical school ranking in the country. Where are we with the staff compensation in terms of a priority? John cannot speak to that topic necessarily, but Kirk and/or Rachelle would know more about the current process. From a budget perspective, employee payroll is the largest component of the university budget, so it is clearly a priority. The compensation committee hasn’t met in months though. The philosophy statement was approved and the peer group is currently under review by Thayne. It would be a huge win to agree on the policy the problem is not so much with the money but we can’t agree on the philosophy. Clarification on the direction of the policy would be
helpful at this point to help appease the staff population. The University is trying to be diplomatic, and some people feel that their supervisors wouldn’t treat them fairly if they were allowed to decide the percentage of compensation. John said that one of the goals of PeopleAdmin was to set up equal reflection. The two key decisions are the affordability of a compensation package and how we determine that, and what is the baseline vs comparable institutions compensation packages. We obviously have a range and a model in place right now, but where is the transparency? What is the timeline for this policy and decision making? Juanita also mentioned that there really is a lack of transparency and the status of the PCAC and the strategic plan. If the PCAC is developing the transparence with the policy approval, we need to demand more transparency with our administrative level and the other policies (i.e. compensation). The vetting of policy will be a transparency and shared work group with each area sharing the information to their respective areas. The discontinuity between allocating FLSA funds to one area that limited funding to other areas. The “cost” of FLSA to our institution and the transparency of what that affected. Instead of promoting this as our largest expense, maybe approaching compensation as our largest “investment”.

The challenge of projecting the tuition waiver budget, but the fear that maybe that benefit was going away. The tuition waiver is a significant part of service to our employees and the growth of the employees. I hope the expectations you set with the PCAC is rolled out to other committees. Stephanie asked John if there are any other areas that he would like us to focus on? He would like us to get involved in the governance of the University. The Board of Regents bylaws were amended last year to include the president and two members of the SAEC. The ongoing relationship of our governance structure and the involvement of the SAEC. The PCAC represents a responsibility to report back to their constituents. How do we get at the business problem? The waive policy was changed without vetting. And the layers of confidentiality and sharing with our constituents is extremely limited. Is there a strategic plan series of activities in place right now? There are 4 commitment work groups that are each looking at each of the goals under each commitment. Where are we in terms of the progress standpoint? Who knows the big picture? Is it continuing forward and who is housing that? The work groups are working through this year. Jen mentioned that the auditors were concerned that nobody is on the same page, that some people believe that the strategic plan is ready to go and some still think that it is in draft form. John said that the policy was approved, and this is a living document. There is a website available online right now and an opportunity to share the message to the community. Thayne sent an email to the community regarding the Strategic Plan and the steps. Jim Simon is on a work group and he said that they meet every few weeks. We are looking at strategies and if they are measurable and the right ones.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Research if there is a list of commitment members for the strategic plan and reach out to them for updates.