

STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ad Hoc Committee Meeting
11:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2022.
Meeting conducted via Zoom video conferencing

Chair Odom called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. on March 10th. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Present: Elizabeth Cheek, Andrea Hoskinson, John Hulseberg, Sheryl Jones-Harper, Jill Odom, Jacqueline Pointer, and Mary Serio

Absent: Michael Pulley, Caryn Riley, and LaVitta (Vee) Steward

Introduction of Guests: Gail Schiesser, Executive Director – SUCSS

Discussion Regarding Request from Merit Board:

Gail Schiesser opened with a brief overview of the proposal for review of promotion processes presented to the full SUCSAC at the January 28, 2022 meeting.

The ad hoc committee, along with Gail Schiesser, had a lengthy and in-depth discussion regarding current promotion processes at our individual universities, processes currently in SUCSS Policies & Procedures, and possible updates to those processes. Most promotions in CS system are backed into by audits.

What is the number of promotions that are had at your university? Are they posted so people can test for it? How do employees know that there is an opportunity available to be promoted into? What proposals does SUCSAC have for getting out of this trap? Opportunities should be based on fitness and merit. Are employers allowing for these opportunities? How were you upgraded? Did you like the process or no? Position control suggests that HR has to have this data for us to ask questions and research with our DERs.

Desk audit – does it warrant a reclassification?

Jobs should be filled by testing. Job audits diminish promotions.

How many jobs have been filled by promotional testing; not by testing via a job audit. There is a provision in the rules for upgrading, which is the function of a desk audit. This is to test whether the job is properly classified. (reclassified or reallocated)

There should be an opportunity to compete for a promotion. Jobs should be posted, when available, for competition.

There is a lot of back-dooring into positions and not enough hiring of the most qualified candidates. Employers need to take into account their org charts when hiring. There is a difference between filling a vacancy and a promotion. Promotion largely happens when someone leaves.

Employees need to know that they have the ability to test for any positions that they meet the MAQ's for. If you meet the MAQ's, you can request to test. It's not testing on demand. It's available testing and has to be conducted within a reasonable amount of time. The System offers open and continuous testing. They must allow the opportunity to compete. Simply stated, a promotion is not based on merit and fitness. There is a terrible limitation on opportunity. You're only competing for the job you're already in.

Promoting someone up the chain via desk audit is based on favoritism and good behavior. There is no competition involved. People are groomed for predetermined positions. Top 3 scores are on the register for 2 years.

One of the main issues at our universities is that managers don't utilize the CS process in order to get rid of bad employees. This is poor management as they would rather pass their problem onto another area and hire someone else instead of addressing the problem head on. SUCSS has nothing to do with staffing levels. That is a decision your university needs to make. This is an HR question.

Employers need to be more forward thinking and plan ahead. Universities lack in planning: 2 year, 5 year, or even a 10 year plan. Filling jobs has to be done in a thoughtful manner.

What so we want to propose? This is not an idea or a set of ideas. Universities and unions are going to have to agree on this too.

The ad hoc committee agreed to continue the discussion at their next ad hoc committee meeting on Thursday, March 24th and present their discussions at the next General Meeting of SUCSAC on April 7th and April 8th.

Establish Meeting Schedule:

The committee agreed to extend the meeting time for the March 24th meeting from 1 hour to 2 hours. Chair Odom will send an updated meeting request.

No other items were presented:

Motion to Adjourn: Mary Serio **Seconded by:** Jill Odom

The meeting was adjourned at 12:22 p.m. by Jill Odom.

Respectfully submitted,



Mary Serio, Secretary



Jill Odom, Chair