

# University Council

MINUTES

MARCH 13, 2012

2:00 PM

TALENT DEVELOPMENT AND  
HUMAN RESOURCES

MEETING CALLED BY	Sue McKibben, Chair
TYPE OF MEETING	Committee Meeting
FACILITATOR	Sue McKibben, Chair
NOTE TAKER	Margaret Canzonetta
ATTENDEES	Members: Becky Hoover, Margaret Canzonetta, Sue McKibben, Mary MacCracken, Kelsey Risman, Neil Sapienza, Aeisha Motley  Absent with notice: Susan Speers, Mark Stanislaw, Caleb Clark

## Agenda topics

### TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

DISCUSSION	Ms. McKibben reviewed the document containing the terms of office for members of the Committee. She asked members to get back to her with any questions or problems with the listing.

### PILOT OF PERFORMANCE REVIEW

DISCUSSION	Becky Hoover informed the Committee about concerns employees were expressing about the assessment of overall performance on the new annual performance review tool. They question the definition of “meeting expectations” and the use of “exceeding expectations.” Becky explained that in the training sessions they are emphasizing that “meeting expectations” is meritorious performance and that those employees who consistently have an “exceeded expectation” rating, (e.g. esp. for more than one year), may have outgrown their position and be ready for a promotion. The staff has an issue with differential pay. More training sessions have been added due to interest in the new process.

### ISSUE BRIEF ASSIGNED TO STANDING COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION	Sue discussed the Issue Brief request to document and recognize service as a talent initiative for University Council members. The Committee discussed whether members should be recognized when they have not committed any time to the Committee. Sue indicated that the University Council document provides for the replacement of any member who has more than three absences without notice. This would establish a standard for attendance for those members that are not committed.

Becky reported that she is working on a recognition instrument for the roles of team members in a team project and that recognition for service on UC is consistent with that kind of team effort. Also, faculty members are recognized by getting points for service on a committee. Students will be recognized through “The Akron Experience” effort and perhaps a similar program could be devised for employees.

The Committee agreed that the bar needs to be higher than just being on a committee and that there needs to be at least acceptable levels of attendance. The Committee agreed that perhaps a simple letter from the Provost should be provided to recognize service. Becky suggested that University Communications create a draft of the letter consistent with Vision 2020.

Becky also discussed the University’s current service award system. As it stands, the system recognizes only length of service, not quality of service. In addition to recognizing length of service, questions such as “What kind of employee do we want?”, “What makes a star?”, and “What exceeds expectations?” were questions that we also need to address. Employees that “make a difference” should be recognized. The Committee felt that employees needed to step it up and become stars and wanted to talk more about how to recognize those employees using a fair and consistent process.