1. Call to Order – meeting began at 9:06 AM in Brookens 204 D
   b. Visitors and guests included Patti Sims and Wes Weisenburn.

2. Approval of Agenda
   a. Motion to approve by Natalie and 2nd by Bryan
   b. Motion passed

3. Approval of Minutes
   a. Minor spelling/grammatical modification to 10/16/08 minutes were made.
   b. Motion to carry over approval of minutes to the next meeting was made by Tammy and 2nd by Lori.
   c. Motion passed

4. Old Business
   a. Board of Trustees
      i. The BOT is meeting today on campus and Barb Cass is representing APAC, which is why she could not be in attendance at this meeting. It was noted that when the BOT meets on a campus, the AP group sends a representative to the meeting, so AP’s have been represented at all the meetings.
   b. UPPAC meeting with President White
      i. Tammy reported she, Jerry, Tyler, and Barb attended the UPPAC meeting with President White. Overall, the meeting went well and the President asked that those present go back to their campuses and express his appreciation to AP’s for their hard work and dedication. The meeting lasted about ½ hour and 3 areas were put forth as actionable suggestions; Salary equity, including a comprehensive study by an outside consulting group, Career advancement and professional development opportunities, and a Biennial survey and online exit interview to assess the progress of issues of concern to APs. Jerry also requested that the President consider using UPPAC as an advisory board, and he seemed to be receptive to that idea. The President was also open to the idea of Non Monetary Compensation, and asked for specific examples. Things that were talked about included formal recognition for activities/committee work and flex time. He also supported conducting baseline surveys, would like to have a common one, and was willing to identify someone out of Academic Affairs for support. UIUC has just completed their own survey and UIC has also created a survey and is getting ready to implement it. UPPAC was very appreciative of the support shown by John Loya in recommending the Hay group for salary equity study and a robust discussion followed. There was discussion about personnel policies and how they impact retention of AP’s, internal postings, etc. There is currently a website where positions for all three
campuses are posted, however there are some technical problems with the site, as not all job postings are there. There was also discussion about creating career paths for AP’s, not only on their own campus, but perhaps across all 3. There was discussion about how difficult a process this would be. One possibility was “banding”; trying to organize AP positions by skill set, rather than by title, since titles vary so much from position to position. Wes and Patti agreed that it would be a monumental task, but would be well worth it in the long run. Maintaining and occasional reviewing would be needed, but the hard part is the initial set-up.

Tammy also gave a summary of the campus reports for CAP (UIUC) and APAC at UIC. At UIUC there are working on new timesheets to comply with the State Ethics requirement, revising their bylaws (a new district was added with the Institute of Natural Resources joining the University), adding AP senators to the Senate, and their problem with getting paperwork completed for their CAPE award. The UIC annual report gave a list of APAC sponsored events for the year, and updated their website, mission statement, and APAC brochure. President White also discussed the budget and indicated that we are facing the deepest recession since 1982. He reassured UPPAC that the Chancellors have met and are working on plans to deal with the expected shortfall. He also stated that although the majority of our budget is in personnel, layoffs would be the very last resort. He also indicated that there is not a solid hiring freeze, but that all positions are being reviewed before hiring and being held if at all possible. Bryan asked Wes and Patti how a layoff would impact APs, and they replied that hard funded positions would have the normal notification rights (6 months or 1 year, depending on length of service). Visiting positions have no notification rights, but the contract has to be fulfilled. For AP’s who are under soft funding, their Notice of Appointment would be followed. Patti also followed up on the new time reporting requirement and said that we will also be starting it next year and we have to be fully compliant by 2010.

c. Holiday Party

i. Natalie reported that the APAC Holiday Party would be held December 10th from 4-6 in the Restaurant. Three announcements will be sent out on Nov.26th, Dec. 3rd, and the 9th. Tammy encouraged everyone to promote attendance and donations.

5. New Business

a. CRC – The committee did not meet, but Dick gave an update on the Supervisor Survey. Of the 550 that were sent out, 309 were returned, which
was close to 60%. He didn’t know the breakdown of APs vs. CS employees. The results will first be reviewed and then distributed.

b. Campus Senate – Barb had attended the October 24th meeting and everyone had reviewed the notes she had sent out prior to the meeting. Lori reported that Pat Langley had cancelled the November 7th meeting and instead held a retreat for faculty senators. The reason given for the retreat is that AP’s have APAC to discuss their concerns, CS workers have CSAC, and the Administrators have their cabinets, but that faculty have no other body besides the senate. The next meeting is November 21st.

c. Grievance Committee – The open meeting that was held on October 29th to solicit comments and suggestions about the grievance process was not well attended – the only people in attendance was Barb Cass, Deb Koua, Natalie Taylor, Jerry Burkhart, and Dick Schuldt. It was decided that instead of rewriting the current policy, that we should start by “beefing up” the current one and perhaps provide supplemental documents to APs to educate them on the role of the Ombus office and what is currently available. Additionally, any changes that would be made would have to have approval all the way through the Campus Senate.

d. APAC website – no report.

e. CSAC – Bryan was unable to attend and the CSAC representative was not present. However, Wes had attended the meeting and reported that the Chancellor and Provost had met with CSAC and discussed much of the same topics as they had with APAC. He did say that CSAC was very concerned about student retention, and wondered what was being discussed about addressing the problem. Lori then discussed the CARR committee, which felt that admissions policy and process was the number 1 and number 2 issues, and that retention was 3rd on the list of priorities. After being further questioned, she explained that the voting members (faculty and students only) made the priorities and that although the ex-officio members made a strong case for retention being the top priority, the votes did not turn out that way. The committee has been broken up into subcommittees, but since Lori is not on the retention subcommittee, is unsure of what has been discussed in that group. She did mention that there was another meeting that afternoon, and that she might hear an update from all subcommittees.

f. Professional Development – no report

6. Public Comments

a. none

Natalie moved and Bryan seconded to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Next meeting: Thursday, December 11, 2008, Brookens 204 D