Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Council
Minutes for February 11, 2016

Members Present:
Tracee Davis (co-chair), Nora Drake (co-chair), Viena Zeitler, Alejandra Greene, Brett Beisecker, Alma Villa, Mayra Magana, JudyAnn Dutcher, David Whitman, Mia Weber, Jennifer Ramirez, Monica Solorzano, Nicole McCoy, Tom Kenna

Non-Voting Members Present:
Diane O’Brien, Amanda Kritzberg, Julie Luera

Absent:
Barb Beainy, Nancy Emerson, Carolyn Meisner, Rocio Torres, Erica Diaz (maternity leave), Carol Sauceda

Meeting called to order at 10:05 a.m. in the Chancellor’s Conference Room

I. Welcome and January Minutes
   a. Motion by JudyAnn Dutcher to accept with minor changes, seconded by Viena Zeitler; unanimous approval

II. Staff Engagement Survey Results
   a. Discussion of concerns with the categorization of survey results, particularly the “favorable” designation and how that classification may skew the overall results. Discussion of what the results actually mean, e.g., the survey was administered randomly, which means the results depend on who responded, and may not accurately represent all staff; union employees were not included; not all staff who received the survey completed it. These issues were not discussed during the Town Hall.
   b. Viena Zeitler reported that the Staff Engagement Survey Committee has not yet addressed these issues, but she will bring CSAC questions to their next meeting.
   c. Tracee Davis put forward the goal of 2-3 CSAC proposal papers for the 2015-16 academic year, using the survey results to help shape our priorities.
   d. David Whitman brought up the need for a full-time CAPS position. UCSB doesn’t have any applicants, and the position has been open for 7 months. Discussion of high staff turnover for CAPS and CARE, due in part to the Santa Barbara area’s lack of resources for LGTBQ and underrepresented communities.

III. Staff Engagement Survey Workgroup Report
   a. Viena Zeitler reported on the workgroup’s 02/09 meeting. The main takeaways from the survey are the problem areas of career development, working relationships, and performance management. Proposals from the committee included a new full-time HR employee to handle these issues.
b. Other items of discussion at committee meeting:
   i. staff recognition
   ii. mentorship programming
   iii. the need for a full time wellness staffer in HR
   iv. the desire to bring back staff cross-training
   v. volunteer release time
   vi. legacy issues
   vii. need for mandatory training for supervisors.

c. Discussion of Greta Halle’s meeting with Chancellor Yang; he expressed most concern with employees who are strongly considering leaving UCSB, since this is a higher number at UCSB than other campuses. He also focused on the issue of performance management.

d. Nora Drake suggested that CSAC write a position paper to support the committee’s requests.

IV. Committee Reports
   a. Events Committee
      i. Discussion of the date for the staff luncheon; do we want it at the beginning or end of staff celebration week? Campus conflicts include an advisor conference, PWA’s conference, and the All-Gaucho Reunion. Consensus was for the luncheon to be on the last week of April, but there was discussion of possibly moving it in the future, perhaps to late August? Diane O’Brien offered to check with the Chancellor’s schedule.
      ii. Discussion of whether we want to change the food choices for the luncheon, e.g., BBQ, burgers, sandwiches, tacos. The consensus was to stick with tacos.
      iii. Questions about the staff breakfast option – when and where will it be this year?

   b. Staff Issues Committee
      i. Discussion of the possibility of a professional development fair for staff, the status of the “welcome wagon,” OP’s volunteer release time program and whether that might be implemented here at UCSB, and the need for diversity training.
      ii. David Whitman reported on the HR staff retreat and shared that they had their first LGBTQ training. Further discussion of diversity training options such as using the Learn at Lunch series to publicize identity-based services.
      iii. Discussion on how to make employee orientation stronger – perhaps have it be an all-day event? Importance of bringing “insider” knowledge to the welcome wagon.

   c. Marketing Committee
      i. Committee has been posting on Facebook and Twitter and the Gaucho Voice Staff Edition newsletter has been going out regularly. There has been some positive feedback. Discussion of problems with the sign-up process when it goes through the S-List.
ii. Discussion of ideas for what we can do differently with marketing, e.g., possibly using Google calendar to add SCW to staff calendars, putting a Gaucho Voice link up on the CSAC website, publicizing specific events.

iii. Discussion of what to promote next on social media, e.g., the next Safe Zone trainings.

d. Nominations Report
   i. Discussion of current committee positions; there are still open slots awaiting additional nominations.

e. Gaucho Mentor Connection Committee
   i. There was a mixer about a week ago with good turnout. There will be an event in June at the end of the program, and possibly another mixer in March. The program is looking successful, and there are a lot of repeat mentors.

V. Staff Assembly Report
   a. Staff Engagement Survey results are on the Staff Assembly website.
   b. Discussion of the need to re-envision the Staff Social (chaired by Lisa Blanco).
   c. Citation of Excellence reward deadline is approaching.
   d. UCSB Staff Assembly will be hosting CUCSA (which includes all Staff Assemblies across the UC system) March 2nd-4th.
   e. There are no thoughts on restructuring the Staff Awards at this time; there aren’t a lot of nominations.

VI. New Business
   a. Viena Zeitler provided an impromptu report on the new retirement benefits structure. The plan will apply to staff hired after July 1st, 2016, so it will not affect current employees and should only affect about 8% of new employees as it will affect those making $117,000+. It will affect staff who leave campus and then return, but not staff who move to other positions on campus. The proposal goes to the UC Regents in March. Bargaining units deal with retirement benefits separately, so they are not included in the new structure.

Meeting adjourned at 11:24am.

Minutes submitted by Mónica Solórzano