

RAY T. FORTUNATO ASSOCIATES

256 WOODLAND DRIVE
STATE COLLEGE, PA 16803

814-238-6411

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

REVIEW OF
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION
SYSTEMS

FINAL REPORT

September 8, 1988

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Executive Summary	1
II. The Charge and the Process	3
III. The State Universities Civil Service System . .	4
Background Information	4
The Civil Service System	6
The Testing Program	8
Quality of Candidates on Rosters	9
The System Appears to Stifle Affirma- tive Action	10
The Bumping Process	10
Conflicts between the Civil Service Statute and the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act	12
Competitive Salaries	13
Summary of Recommendations	13
IV. Academic Professional Category	15
Background Information	15
Wide Variety of Positions Included Under the Academic Professional Category	16
Problems Because of the Current Lack of Systems for the Academic Professional Category	17
Recommended New Broad Classification Groupings	18
Some Advantages of Using the Recommended Broad Classification Categories	20
Establishment of Policies for the Executive Administrator and Non-Tenured Academic Groups	20
Establishment of Policies for the Adminis- trative/Professional Category	21
Handling Personnel Affairs for Adminis- trative/Professional Staff Members	23
Summary of Recommendations	24
V. Organization of the Personnel Function	26
Background Information	26

The Elements of the Personnel Function and Who Should Be Responsible	26
Responsibility for Non-Tenured Academics . . .	28
Responsibility for Administrative/ Professionals	28
Discontinuance of the Term "Non-Academic" . . .	29
Planned Decentralization and Reporting Lines	29
Change "Personnel" to "Human Resources Administration"	30
New Titles	30
Student Employment	30
Summary of Recommendations	30

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Schedule of Those Interviewed by Ray T. Fortunato at the Urbana Campus	32
B. Schedule of Those Interviewed by Ray T. Fortunato at the Chicago Campus	35
C. Survey of Five Big 10 Institutions Regarding How They Broadly Classify Their Employees	37
D. Sample Memorandum of Personal Service for an Executive Administrator	38
E. Sample Memorandum of Personal Service for an Executive Administrator with Faculty Rank	39
F. Sample Continuing Memorandum for an Administrative/Professional Staff Member	41

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Parts of many of the issues placed before the consultant have been studied in depth by several committees over the past few years. However, in the opinion of the consultant what is needed are some basic changes in the broad categories to which staff members are assigned, new or revised policies to meet the employee and management needs for those new categories of employees and a personnel administration delivery system that decentralizes as much as possible but, at the same time, handles centrally those issues that are of corporate concern.

The category called Academic Professional reporting to the academic administration is unique in higher education within the knowledge of the consultant. It is difficult to effect policies for that category, because it contains so many different kinds of positions with different missions at so many different levels in the organization. The recommendations contained in this report attempt to place similar types of employees into groupings that permit better policy development.

In considering these recommendations, the consultant did not attempt to consider the idealistic, but rather attempted to recommend items that he felt could be carried out even though some require Merit Board approval, some require legislation and most require changes in University policies.

As requested, in most cases the report provides structural guidelines for improving the personnel program rather than details of specific policies.

Listed below is a summary of some of the recommendations made in the report. These brief statements do not explain the background base for making the recommendations. However, the background information contained in this report is important in the consideration of these recommendations. Many other recommendations are contained in the body of the report.

1. Petition the Merit Board to exclude from the Civil Service System, positions that would be exempt from overtime under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Thus the System would cover only those positions eligible for overtime (clerical, secretarial, unskilled labor, semi-skilled labor, tradespeople, technicians, and so forth).

Such a change should eliminate some of the complaints heard about that System.

2. Recommend amendments to the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act to determine what are proper subjects for bargaining to avoid conflict with the regulations of the State Universities Civil Service System.

3. Establish the following five broad basic classification categories for all faculty and staff members. (Complete definitions of these categories are found in the report).

Executive Administrator
Academic and Non-Tenured Academic
Academic Administrator
Administrative/Professional
Support Staff

4. Develop a policy manual and handbook for the new Administrative/Professional group to include many of the applicable policies now affecting Academic Professionals, plus policies on probationary period, termination of employment, and appeal procedures.

5. Develop a system for determining levels of positions (together with salary plans) within the Administrative/Professional group.

6. Retain the responsibility for the Non-Tenured Academic group with the academic administration and assign the responsibility for the Administrative/Professional group to the personnel office.

7. Introduce a program of planned decentralization of the personnel program by having the central personnel office handle only those items that are of corporate concern and delegating to the campus some of the central staff members and responsibilities.

Introduce more postauditing of personnel actions (rather than preauditing).

In order to accomplish this decentralization effectively, provide dual reporting lines for the campus personnel offices directly to the campus chancellors and to the central administration personnel office.

II. THE CHARGE AND THE PROCESS

In his letter of April 18, 1988 to the consultant, President Stanley O. Ikenberry outlined the following charge:

" I would like you to consult with the general officers and such other administrators as you believe necessary, evaluate the existing personnel systems, policies and practices, identify areas for improvement and submit recommendations to me. I would like you to devote particular attention to three areas:

1) policies, practices, and organizational structure for administering academic professional employees;

2) the adequacy of Civil Service rules and procedures in relation to the needs of the University and its employees;

3) coordination and/or consolidation of personnel functions within and between the campuses and central administration relative to all categories of employees."

The consultant made three visits to the University of Illinois to interview a wide variety of individuals on a schedule established by the University. For the names of those interviewed in Urbana, see Attachment "A". For the names of those interviewed in Chicago, see Attachment "B".

In addition to the interviews, many documents supplied by a variety of administrators at the University were reviewed by the consultant. Included among the documents were publications and other papers such as Policy and Rules - Nonacademic; Academic Staff Handbook - Urbana; Handbook for Faculty and Staff - Chicago; State Universities Civil Service Statutes and Rules; By-Laws of the Board of Trustees; General Rules Concerning University Organization and Procedure; Guidelines and Administrative Procedures for University-Campus Relationships; University of Illinois Statutes; organizational charts; a variety of committee reports on the academic professional category of staff members; a list of employee organizations and the types of employees covered by each; and so forth.

Also, contacts were made by the consultant with other institutions about their systems for broadly classifying groups of employees and about their organizational structures.

III. THE STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

A. Background Information

The University of Illinois is covered by the Illinois State Universities Civil Service System which covers all state institutions whether complex research institutions such as the University of Illinois, or less complex institutions, such as Sangamon State University.

Since there is one Civil Service System for all four systems of higher education in Illinois, many needs which are unique to the University of Illinois are not shared by the other three systems. This makes it much more difficult for the University to accomplish its objectives.

The system dictates job evaluation, compensation, and personnel policies for those employees covered by the system.

By far the majority of University administrators interviewed by the consultant characterized the system as ponderous and unresponsive to the needs of the University. They stated that the system is replete with employee protections but contains a dearth of good management protections. For example, if all of the steps indicated (warnings and suspensions) in the discipline and dismissal regulations were applied in the process of dismissing an inadequate employee, about one year of time would pass between the time of the first warning to the time of the actual dismissal. (That time frame was verified by personnel officers who work with the system).

The process for obtaining changes in Civil Service rules and regulations contains many built-in roadblocks, such as review by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR), which may inhibit action or result in inertia by the Merit Board.

One story related during the interviews gives an interesting outlook on some of the problems with the system. One of the administrators interviewed had need for a professional engineer with special background.

He listed the vacancy with Personnel and learned that there were no candidates on the roster for that position. Therefore, the administrator was permitted to recruit outside of the State of Illinois when looking for someone to fill the unique requirements of the position. (Under Civil Service

rules, recruitment is limited to the State of Illinois unless there are no candidates on the register).

The recruitment effort uncovered a uniquely qualified, female engineer from another state whose background and experience closely fit the vacancy. She made a trip to the University for an interview. When the administrator informed Personnel that he wished to make an offer to her, he was informed that he was not permitted to consider her because an in-state candidate had applied to the register in the meantime. The candidate was a male who passed the minimal qualifications of the test but, in the judgment of the administrator, fell far short of the qualifications of the other candidate. However, he had to hire the man for the vacancy.

Thus, an affirmation action effort (female engineer) was thwarted and a fully qualified candidate was greatly inconvenienced both in time and money. Usually, candidates use their precious vacation when interviewing in another city. While going for an interview is always a gamble, a fully qualified female engineer who was encouraged by the administrator (and rightfully so) had expectations that her investment in time and money would pay off.

This incident graphically outlines a number of problems with the Civil Service System as it relates to such higher level positions:

- o Once the administrator was given the go-ahead to recruit out-of-state, shouldn't that close off his obligation to any future candidates on that register?

- o Doesn't such a system greatly curtail the University's affirmative action obligation?

- o Should higher level professional positions be covered by the restrictive regulations of the Civil Service System? (Indeed many similar positions are in the Academic Professional category).

- o Does the testing system for such important higher level positions result in hiring on a minimal qualifications basis, rather than the best possible candidate after an exhaustive search basis? Maintaining excellence for the University is dependent upon selecting the very best candidate available, not someone who happens to be on a register at the time a position becomes available.

B. The Civil Service System

All of the above questions suggest the need for a change in the positions which are covered by the Civil Service System. The consultant recommends that the Civil Service System be limited to include positions considered to be "non-exempt" under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The System was put into effect many years ago and before colleges and universities were covered under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). Had that Act been in effect at the time the Civil Service program was established, the scope of positions covered by the program may have been different. The FLSA divides positions into two basic categories - Exempt (those executive, administrative, and professional positions which are not eligible for overtime), and Non-exempt (those positions that are eligible for overtime because their work does not require knowledge of an advanced type in the field of science or learning nor does it require learning leading to original work for which time is not easily measured.)

This is not the drastic step that it might seem. So many "exempt" positions have been moved out from under the Civil Service System and have become "Academic Professional" that the number of "exempt" positions still covered by the System represents a small percentage of the total number of positions covered in the System.

Currently, some positions with the same basic responsibilities are found in both the Civil Service System and in the academic professional category. For example, during the interviews, the consultant met with a group of six staff members who were described generically as "unit business managers." Four of the six were designated as Academic Professionals and the other two were covered under the Civil Service System.

The consultant believes that the Civil Service regulations apply better to Non-exempt positions than the Exempt positions even though the regulations are highly bureaucratic and stifling even for those positions.

Recruitment of Non-exempt employees can be accomplished readily within the confines of the State. That is a normal market place for such positions (clerical, secretarial, unskilled labor, tradespeople, semi-skilled labor, and so forth).

However, for Exempt positions, where the best qualified

employees in the market place are needed to maintain the University's status of excellence, recruitment should not be confined to the State. Indeed, to restrict recruiting does not make for the most effective use of tax payer dollars. Individuals hired into Exempt positions should bring unique qualifications rather than minimal qualifications to their work. They are the leaders who effect program improvements, can lead in cost effective programs, and save the precious and limited tax dollars. To limit recruitment and depend on Civil Service minimal qualifications and testing programs is counter productive in the judgment of the consultant.

Therefore, the consultant recommends that the University seek to limit the Civil Service coverage to Non-exempt positions as defined under the Fair Labor Standards Act. While an amendment to the Act would be the cleanest way to accomplish this, the Merit Board could accomplish the same result through its administration of the principal administrative employee exemption. The statute specifically provides that those employees who are not covered by civil service includes "principal administrative employees of each institution and agency as determined by the Merit Board..."

Some current Exempt employees might wish to remain in the Civil Service System. Arrangements should be made for "grandfathering" such individuals.

The removal of all executive, administrative and professional positions which are FLSA exempt from Civil Service would significantly alleviate many of the problems discussed in this section of the report including:

- o The marked tendency on the part of many University administrators to inflate positions in order to exclude them from Civil Service.

- o The difficulties which the University has had in attracting qualified applicants where recruitment is limited to Illinois residents.

- o The limitations caused by the "rule of three".

- o The difficulty in getting new classifications approved by the Merit Board.

While the exclusion of all FLSA exempt positions from coverage under Civil Service would not be the panacea for all of the problems inherent with Civil Service, it would go a long way towards solving several of the major

problems with respect to Civil Service. It would, in short, make it much easier for the University to coexist with the State Universities Civil Service System.

C. The Testing Program

Many complaints were heard about the testing program. Complaints ranged from the lack of validation of the tests to tests not meeting up-to-date standards and technology.

Pursuant to the authorizing statute, the Executive Director of the Civil Service System and his staff have the responsibility for preparing, conducting and grading examinations. While the Merit Board has delegated to the University and other universities governed by the statute the responsibility for conducting and grading the examinations, the actual examinations are prepared by the Merit Board staff.

Those interviewed are very concerned because the examinations which are used to fill Civil Service positions have not been validated for EEO purposes. In addition, the University has experienced difficulty in terms of the creation of new classifications which require the preparation of new examinations. With the very small professional staff, there are frequently delays in getting the Merit Board to create new classifications and to prepare examinations for new classifications.

The consultant discussed these perceptions with the administrative officers of the Civil Service System. There was concurrence that such problems exist and that they are attempting to remedy them. However, the Manager of Testing for the System stated that she had a staff of only three to handle over 11,000 classifications.

Obviously, it's difficult to be critical of the people responsible for up-dating tests with that staffing ratio. The elimination of Exempt positions from the purview of the Civil Service System would eliminate part of the problem since the tests for such positions appear to be most in need of updating.

In any case, two recommendations are made:

1. Consideration should be given to the hiring of outside consultants who specialize in the validation and updating of tests. Currently, the task appears to be endless for the very limited staff assigned to it, or

2. The University should seek the right to prepare examinations, subject only to the Merit Board's expeditious approval.

D. Quality of Candidates on the Registers

There were complaints about the quality of applicants (who had passed tests) on the registers. Mr. Ingerski and his staff pointed out that the University should do more rigorous recruiting. That sounds like a good suggestion. However, if a roster has three or more individuals on it and a vacancy is listed, that register is considered to be closed and no additional recruitment may take place. That's true even if the administrator feels that the candidates are only minimally qualified.

Therefore, in many cases, recruitment can take place only if no vacancy has been listed. That means committing staff time for recruiting and testing and funds for recruiting when no vacancy exists. Then, when there is a vacancy, experience has shown that many of those recruited earlier are no longer available. The Personnel Office is not staffed to handle such phantom recruitment except for frequently filled positions, nor should it be.

Perhaps an answer is to permit recruitment in any case where the administrative officer can show that the roster is inadequate for his or her (or affirmative action) needs.

Under Civil Service is the statutory requirement that the University limit its consideration to the three candidates with the highest examination scores. Thus, whenever the University has a position which it needs to fill, the University can be required to notify the Director of the Merit Board who, in turn, has the responsibility to "certify to the employer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the register for the classification to which the position is assigned".

Section 36h(1) then provides that "the employer shall elect one of these persons certified for the position and shall notify the Director of the Merit Board of the selection."

The use of the "rule of three" in filling Civil Service positions based on examination scores has been administered by the Merit Board in a very rigid, mechanical

fashion. For example, if three candidates score 100 and two candidates score 99, the University may only consider the three candidates scoring 100 even though the candidates who scored 99 are essentially equivalent in terms of qualifications.

This can create particular problems in terms of trying to comply with affirmative action goals.

Although the University has discussed the concept of bracketing or ranges with the Merit Board, i.e., all who score within a specific range would be considered equal in terms of certifying eligible candidates, the Merit Board has not taken any action on this suggestion.

The consultant recommends that the University urge the Merit Board to incorporate the concept of bracketing with respect to the implementation of the "rule of three", at the very least with respect to certain critical classifications.

E. The System Appears to Stifle Affirmative Action

Then, too, in the recruitment picture is the issue of affirmative action. The system, with the recruiting difficulties (see above), appears to make it difficult to actively seek and hire minority applicants except in "learner" or "trainee" level positions, unless a woman or a minority candidate happens to be on the roster. Open recruitment such as described above would enhance the opportunities for recruiting women and minorities at all levels.

F. The Bumping Process

That consultant understands that the basic policy giving an employee the right to bump into another position if he/she loses the job through no fault of his/her own is contained in the Civil Service Regulations. However, the specific details of how the policy is carried out within the University is a University regulation.

Under the University's regulation, a list of priorities for bumping exists, as follows:

1. first an employee has the right to bump the most junior employee with the same job title within the same department

2. if such a position is nonexistent, the employee may bump into a lower level position within the promotion

fashion. For example, if three candidates score 100 and two candidates score 99, the University may only consider the three candidates scoring 100 even though the candidates who scored 99 are essentially equivalent in terms of qualifications.

This can create particular problems in terms of trying to comply with affirmative action goals.

Although the University has discussed the concept of bracketing or ranges with the Merit Board, i.e., all who score within a specific range would be considered equal in terms of certifying eligible candidates, the Merit Board has not taken any action on this suggestion.

The consultant recommends that the University urge the Merit Board to incorporate the concept of bracketing with respect to the implementation of the "rule of three", at the very least with respect to certain critical classifications.

E. The System Appears to Stifle Affirmative Action

Then, too, in the recruitment picture is the issue of affirmative action. The system, with the recruiting difficulties (see above), appears to make it difficult to actively seek and hire minority applicants except in "learner" or "trainee" level positions, unless a woman or a minority candidate happens to be on the roster. Open recruitment such as described above would enhance the opportunities for recruiting women and minorities at all levels.

F. The Bumping Process

That consultant understands that the basic policy giving an employee the right to bump into another position if he/she loses the job through no fault of his/her own is contained in the Civil Service Regulations. However, the specific details of how the policy is carried out within the University is a University regulation.

Under the University's regulation, a list of priorities for bumping exists, as follows:

1. first an employee has the right to bump the most junior employee with the same job title within the same department

2. if such a position is nonexistent, the employee may bump into a lower level position within the promotion

line for which he/she is qualified either within the same department or the next higher unit

3. if such a position is nonexistent, the employee may bump into the types of position described above anywhere on the same Campus.

Included in the University's regulations, is a group of jobs referred to as "selective certification positions" indicated to be so unique that no one is permitted to bump into or out of them.

Those sound like reasonable regulations, if one is to have a bumping policy. However, many complaints were registered with the consultant. It's very discouraging to spend a great deal of time training an excellent employee to do a job and then have a less qualified employee bump into that employee's position. That is an example of the complaint expressed by several administrators that the Civil Service System has many employee rights but few management rights.

Some administrators stated that whenever layoffs occur, those employees let go frequently are the less effective employees. In some cases they are the employees that the department wanted to get rid of but would never take the initiative to do go through the perceived "cumbersome" dismissal regulations. Then, these "less than desirable" employees are the ones bumping into jobs. That observation may or may not be true. However, it was heard several times.

Other administrators, particularly in unique areas such as the hospital, stated that too many different types of positions are included under the same job title. Then, when bumping occurs within the job title, employees unqualified for the unique facets of the work, have bumping rights.

Realistically, a policy on bumping once in place in all probability is not going to be eliminated. Therefore, two recommendations are made for making the current regulations more workable.

1. Seek to pull out from broad job title groups any positions within those titles that have unique qualifications. Assign new job titles to those unique positions.

2. Consider expanding the number of positions in the group entitled "selective certification positions".

G. Conflicts between the Civil Service Statute and the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act

Several conflicts in law appear between the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act and the State Universities Civil Service Act in regard to matters subject to collective bargaining. Areas of conflict include the following:

- o Discharge appeals
- o Seniority
- o Layoffs
- o Reassignments and transfers
- o Wages for employees in prevailing rate classifications

For example, questions have been raised regarding one's right to appeal through a negotiated grievance procedure, including arbitration, and still maintaining the right to appeal to the Merit Board on the same issue.

The conflicts in the laws have caused ambiguity over mandatory subjects for bargaining.

The consultant recommends that the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act be amended to provide specifically that if an employee's discharge is subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure contained in a collective bargaining agreement, then the parties are required to negotiate, upon the request of either party, over whether the contractual arbitration procedure is the sole and exclusive forum for challenging an employee's termination.

Further, to deal with the conflict between Civil Service and collective bargaining, it is recommended that the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act be amended to provide that, with respect to certain designated matters (e.g., seniority and layoffs), such matters are subject to negotiations at the request of either party and that if an agreement is reached which conflicts with the Civil Service Act and/or rules and regulations issued by the Merit Board, then the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement shall prevail.

This recommended approach has been followed in several public sector collective bargaining laws to specifically establish what is within the exclusive domain of Civil

Service and what may be changed by virtue of collective bargaining.

If the law is not clarified regarding which matters are subject to collective bargaining, the University may continue to have situations such as the "service bonus points" issue where AFSCME requested the University to negotiate over the issue. The University was willing to meet and discuss the issue.

Subsequently, AFSCME filed an unfair labor practice charge against the University and the three other systems of higher education alleging that each university violated its duty to bargain in good faith over the issue and that the Merit Board and the universities are co-employers with respect to the issue.

If AFSCME's position is upheld by the IELRB, it would mean that there would be one further significant roadblock in terms of trying to get the Merit Board to adopt new rules or to revise existing rules. In addition, the Merit Board would have to be involved in any such negotiations. To suggest that such a result would make it more difficult to effect changes in Merit Board rules and regulations is to state the obvious.

H. Competitive Salaries

Administrators, particularly at the Chicago Campus, indicated that the salary levels were not adequate for staffing their positions. They stated that hiring in the Chicago market place is significantly more competitive and difficult than in the Urbana market place.

Obviously, the consultant did not have the time to make market place comparisons. However, the consultant recommends that that issue be explored very thoroughly by the University.

I. Summary of Recommendations

1. Petition the Merit Board to exclude from the Civil Service System, all positions that would be Exempt from overtime under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Thus, the System would cover only those positions eligible for overtime (clerical, secretarial, unskilled labor, semi skilled labor, tradespeople, technicians, and so forth).

2. Recommend that the Merit Board hire outside consultants to eliminate the backlog of required validation and updating of the Civil Service examinations, and/or permit the University to prepare examinations subject to the Merit Board's expeditious approval.

3. Petition the Merit Board to pursue the concept of "bracketing" qualified candidates with respect to implementation of the "rule of three".

4. In regard to "bumping", seek to pull out from broad title groupings any positions within those titles that have unique qualifications and assign new titles to those positions. Consider expanding the number of positions in the group entitled "selective certification positions."

5. Recommend amendments to the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act to provide specifically that, if an employee's discharge is subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure contained in a collective bargaining agreement, the parties are required to negotiate, upon the request of either party, over whether the contractual arbitration procedure is the sole and exclusive forum for challenging an employee's termination.

6. Recommend amendments to the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act to provide that, with respect to certain designated matters (e.g., seniority and layoffs), such matters are subject to negotiations at the request of either party and that if an agreement is reached which conflicts with the Civil Service Act and/or rules and regulations issued by the Merit Board, then the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement shall prevail.

7. Eliminate the requirement that forces an employer to consider late entries on the register after the employer has initiated a recruiting campaign following permission to do so.

8. Study the potential need for some salary differentials for the Chicago labor market.

IV. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL CATEGORY

A. Background Information

Under the University Civil Service Merit Board regulations, certain "principal administrative employees" may be approved by the Merit Board for exemption from the Civil Service Regulations.

"Principal Administrative Employee" as determined by the Merit Board (Section 36c 3) is understood to mean an employee:

"A. (1) Whose primary duty is administrative management of a Campus or Agency division or like unit; and
(2) Who reports to the chief Executive Officer of the Campus or Agency:

OR

"B. (1) Who performs an independent administrative function and who reports to the Chief Executive Officer, or who performs an independent administrative function and reports to the President, Vice President, Chancellor, or Vice Chancellor or Provost of a Campus or Agency;

OR

"C. (1) Who is charged with high level administrative responsibilities coupled with administrative policy making functions and whose decisions affect the academic program or administrative policies; and
(2) Who performs these duties with only general administrative supervision or direction and who exercises discretion and independent judgment;

OR

"D. (1) Whose primary responsibility is the administration of an academic unit engaged in academic instruction or research (e.g. Dean, Associate and Assistant Dean, Department Head, Associate and Assistant Department Head.)

OR

"E. (1) Who is in a position requiring a knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study (as distinguished from

a general academic education) and which requires the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment: and

(2) Who is recommended to be exempt by the chief authority of the institution or agency.

At the University of Illinois, employees so exempted are referred to as academic professional staff members. The consultant was not able to learn how that title was applied to this group.

Apparently, the Merit Board has been liberal in granting exemptions because the academic professional category has grown rapidly and now includes 3-4,000 such individuals. Currently such positions fall under the purview of the academic administrative function.

If the consultant were working at the University, he would certainly try to get positions under his control out from under the restrictive confines of the civil service system with its limited geographic recruiting, non-validated, and in some cases out-dated, testing program, and limitations on salary levels in some instances.

B. Wide Variety of Positions Included Under the Academic Professional Category.

The academic professional category has evolved into one with a wide variety of types of positions at many levels and with a very wide spread of pay levels. It includes very high level positions such as Vice Chancellor or Research Scientist and many entry level administrative and professional staff positions such as Staff Assistant or Staff Associate.

Many of the positions are research and agricultural extension positions which at many other institutions are covered in a non-tenure-eligible academic category under the purview of the academic administrative function.

On the other hand, a great many of the "academic professional" positions appear to be performing functions that at many institutions would be included in an Administrative/Professional category under the purview of the institutions' personnel offices. See Attachment C for a survey of five Big 10 institutions. In that study, all five of the Big 10 institutions surveyed designate such employees as Administrative/Professional and they are handled under the purview of the institutions' personnel offices.

Included in the current academic professional category are many non-descriptive-of-level-of-responsibility titles such as assistant to..., special assistant to..., staff assistant, staff associate, assistant department head, and so forth. Such titles could range in responsibilities from program development and administration to "go-for" assistance.

There appear to be some titles of the same general type in which some incumbents are covered by the Civil Service System and others are in the academic professional category.

C. Problems Because of the Current Lack of Systems for the Academic Professional Category.

Whenever federal and state legislative bodies pass legislation affecting employees regarding equal pay, "exemptness" under the Fair Labor Standards Act, affirmative action, and so forth, it is done with the assumption that employers will have in place systems of internal control to comply with such laws and regulations. Such systems do not appear to be in place for the academic professional category. If legal complaints are lodged, federal agencies may fill that void with their own systems.

During the interview process, the consultant asked some questions regarding the administration of positions assigned to the academic administrative category:

o Can one administrator (with more money in his/her budget) take an employee from another administrative unit to take on lesser responsibilities but at a higher pay level? The answer was "yes".

o Is there any salary plan to avoid unequal pay problems and complaints based on sex or race among academic professional employees? The answer was "no" (real job content and level may be unknown).

o Is it possible that some employees in the academic professional category would be found to be "Non-exempt" under the Fair Labor Standards Act (and thus eligible for overtime payments) if the actual duties performed were carefully scrutinized under the provisions of the Act? The answer was "yes, there could be some".

o Is there any check to insure that the duties that caused the positions to be exempted are indeed the duties that actually are being performed by the incumbent? The answer was "no".

o Is it possible that two individuals under the same position title could be performing duties and responsibilities at quite different levels? The answer was "yes".

o Is it possible that two individuals exempted under the same position title and performing the same basic level of duties and responsibilities might be paid at entirely different levels of salary? The answer was "yes".

o Is it possible for an administrator to give an employee a pay increase by simply indicating that the position is now at a higher level (without a program to determine level of position). The answer was "yes".

These questions and any comments made in this report about the handling of this category of employee are not to be considered critical of the institution or any individual. In fact, the institution should be complimented for using the "Principal Administrative Employee" exemption to the extent that it does to meet its programmatic needs.

However, because of the growth of this category and the very large number of staff members it now encompasses, there is now a need for a more systematic approach to the matters of position descriptions, salary administration, promotion, employment, and so forth.

A problem with even considering systems for these staff members is what's in the "eyes of the beholders" about any systematized approach of personnel administration. Those who, on the one hand know only the bureaucratic civil service system with all of its regulations and, on the other hand, know the current rather unrestrictive and free system for handling academic professional matters may not be aware that there can be a middle ground that brings some order but is not so highly systematized to be restrictive and is not only feasible but is carried out already in higher education.

First, consideration needs to be given to redefining the basic overall classification categories at the University and assigning responsibilities accordingly.

D. Recommended New Broad Classification Groupings

A list of recommended categories follows. Such a listing tracks what is used at some other major research and land grant institutions, although the names of the categories may differ from institution to institution.

The groupings are as follows:

EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATOR - Includes the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Business and Finance, Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Chief Legal Counsel, Director of University Public Affairs, Executive Assistant to the President, Secretary of the Board of Trustees, and the Deans of Colleges.

Includes administrative personnel who report directly to an Executive Administrator (other than the Dean of a College) and who head major departments or functions (other than academic departments or functions) of major scope that are either University-wide or Camus-wide in coverage.

All Executive Administrators are appointed on an "at-will basis.

ACADEMIC AND NON-TENURED ACADEMIC - The term "academic" applies to the existing academic ranks. The term "non-tenured academic" applies to a series of non-tenured research ranks or agricultural extension staff ranks. (Qualifications for these academic professional ranks are similar to those in appropriate academic disciplines - doctorates in most cases, masters degrees in most others. These positions are under the purview of the Academic Vice Chancellor.

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR - Includes those with faculty rank who head up major academic units such as an academic department, a school, an institute, and so forth. It includes also, Assistant and Associate Deans in academic colleges and Assistant and Associate Chancellors who have academic rank and have been delegated academic administrative functions such as undergraduate studies, graduate studies, research, and so forth. (The academic administrator appointment is on an "at-will" basis; however, if an individual is removed from an administrative position, the faculty regulations pertain regarding the faculty appointment). Such positions are under the purview of the Academic Vice Chancellor.

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL - Meets the Merit Board qualifications on the Principal Administrative Position Exemption form. Performs administrative, professional, and executive responsibilities as outlined in the "Exempt" status under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such positions are under the purview of the newly constituted Office of Human Resources Administration.

SUPPORT STAFF - Those positions covered by the Civil Service System. (A recommendation is made elsewhere in this

report to petition the Merit Board to have the the Civil Service System cover only those positions designated as Non-Exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act).

E. Some Advantages of Using the Recommended Broad Classification Categories.

Using the above types of basic classification categories has several advantages some of which are:

- o Eases the installation of personnel policies because each group contains staff members of the same type. For example, probationary periods should be used for administrative/professional staff members but not for "at-will" staff members.

- o Clearly defines who is and who is not appointed on an "at-will" basis.

- o Places research and agriculture extension personnel in a category where non-tenured ranks can be established similar to faculty ranks, and promotion can occur in the same general manner as for faculty. Unlike other administrative and professional employees, who normally are promoted by assuming a different set and higher level of duties and responsibilities, faculty members are promoted usually based on their professional reputation and achievements without necessarily changing basic duties and responsibilities.

- o Places researchers and agricultural extension staff members under the purview of the Academic Vice Chancellor.

- o Places other administrative/professional staff members under the purview of a newly constituted Office of Human Resources. (The University of Illinois is the only institution known to the consultant that has such staff members under the purview of the academic administration).

F. Establishment of Policies for the Executive Administrative and Non-tenured Academic Groups.

Salary administration and appointments can continue as they are for Executive Administrators. Salaries should float in the market place and be handled on an individual basis subject to approval of the President.

However, it is recommended that a contract form be used that states clearly that such appointments may be terminated at any time upon written notice (at-will appointment). A sample Memorandum of Personal Service form (contract) is attached. See Attachment D. Attached also is a similar Memorandum Of Personal Service for an Executive Administrator who has academic rank. See Attachment E.

For researchers (recommended non-tenured academic group), specific ranks similar to academic ranks should be established. Salaries should vary by discipline and be related to the academic discipline in which the researcher has credentials. Promotion in rank should be handled in the same way in which faculty promotions are handled. Basically, existing policies applicable to the Academic and Academic Professional categories should apply.

Agricultural Extension County Personnel should be handled the same as researchers.

G. Establishment of Policies for the Administrative/Professional Category

For the Administrative/Professional category, most of the policies applicable for the current academic professional category may apply. However, several changes and additions are recommended, as follows:

o The consultant recommends discontinuance of annual contracts and replacing them with once-and-done Memoranda of Personal Service for all Administrative/Professional staff members other than those paid on "soft money". A recommended sample copy is found in Attachment F. This would require a change in the current University Statutes which limit contracts for non-tenure track professionals to one year (renewable). However, such policies were made for the current Academic Professional group which has a large range of very high level together with low level administrative and professional positions.

Four of the five Big 10 institutions surveyed (see Attachment C) do not have annual contracts for such employees. The fifth institution gives some annual contracts but not in cases where the employment is expected to be continuous.

The current system of annual contracts was criticized by both employees and administrators.

One such employee stated it very well when she said, "I don't really work for the University. I work only for my immediate supervisor. He has total power over my employment and I have no University protections other than notice, if he decides to discontinue my service."

When a new employee is hired into an administrative position at any level and is asked to sign a one year contract, it causes apprehension particularly for someone being hired into a lower level administrative position. Should I quit my present position? Should I sell my home? Should I buy a new home? Will I have a position next year?

Administrators on the other hand have a different problem. Without a probationary period policy for new hires, the University can be stuck for at least six months (plus any time worked) in any case where they determine that a new hire is a total misfit for a position.

The periods of notice policy now required with annual contracts would be eliminated and replaced by termination of employment policies. See below.

o Because the Administrative/Professional group has been included within a group called Academic Professional which includes a wide range of positions from Vice Chancellor to Assistant To..., a deliniation has not been clear about which staff members are employed on an "at-will" basis and which employees should have the right to be dismissed for cause. Cause can include lack of funds, discontinuance of a program, gross misconduct, failure to meet acceptable standards of performance, and so forth.

The consultant recommends that with the introduction of the new category called Administrative/Professional, policies be established for:

1. probationary period (probably one year in length because of the complexity of many such positions).
2. termination of employment policy for lack of funds, discontinuance of a program, gross misconduct, failure to meet acceptable standards of performance, and so forth.
3. An appeal procedure to settle problems or perceived problems.

A new Administrative/Professional policy manual and handbook should be developed which includes the policies listed above in addition to those that are applicable from

the current Academic Professional Handbook.

o The consultant recommends also, that some order be established for Administrative/Professional positions in regard to position and salary level.

Because of the past history with and negative thoughts about the stifling influence of the Civil Service System, the consultant recommends that a system be established that will establish several levels of positions without using a civil service type of procedure for so doing.

New position descriptions will be needed which accurately reflect duties and responsibilities. Those descriptions will need to be checked against the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to insure that only positions exempted from overtime payments are included in this category.

New position titles will be needed in some cases to reflect more accurately the duties and responsibilities of the positions.

A system for placing these positions in levels and establishing salary levels will need to be developed. Salary schedules should have flexibility to enable the University to meet bona fide market needs. All salary adjustments should be made entirely on a merit basis.

Such a task is too large to be handled "in house". It is recommended that the University contact several consultants that specialize in higher education positions to recommend and execute systems that will meet the University's needs.

H. Handling Personnel Affairs for Administrative/Professional Staff Members.

Currently, since staff members in the recommended new Administrative/Professional category are included within the wide range of positions covered by the Academic Professional category, personnel matters (employment, salary administration, promotion, and so forth) are handled by academic administration on the campuses. This is very unusual in higher education. The survey of five Big 10 institutions shows that in all of the institutions such personnel affairs are handled by the Personnel Departments.

The current arrangement at the University of Illinois causes some problems in the employment area. For example, if an accountant applicant for employment were interested in employment on the Urbana Campus of the University of Illinois, he or she would not know where to apply. Some accounting positions are under Civil Service (handled by the Personnel Office). Others have been classified as Academic Professionals (handled under the Academic Affairs Office).

According to those interviewed by the consultant, the Academic Offices handling Academic Professional positions are not known to the outside public. Thus, excellent candidates for employment may be lost to the institution. Or, worse, a claim of discrimination can occur because a female, minority, or older candidate was overlooked for consideration.

This problem does not exist for those Academic Professional candidates for bona fide research or agriculture extension county positions (the recommended new Non-Tenured Academic Category). Candidates with faculty-type credentials generally apply directly to their academic discipline departments. Candidates for agriculture extension county positions apply directly to that area.

A systematic program for promotion for Administrative/Professionals does not exist and should be developed. Indeed, the current lack of a system to determine the levels of such positions makes it difficult to determine whether a change in positions is a promotion, lateral move, or a demotion. The dollars available in an administrator's budget make that determination. That does not appear to be good use of scarce University dollars.

The consultant recommends that the personnel affairs for the Administrative/Professional category be handled by the recommended newly constituted Office of Human Resources Administration.

I. Summary of Recommendations

1. Establish five broad classification categories of staff members so that similar types of staff members are grouped together to make policy development more effective. The categories are as follows:

a. Executive Administrator - (Top administrators who are employed on an "at-will" basis. See more complete definition in this section of the report).

b. Academic and Non-Tenured Academic - (The Non-Tenured Academic would include bona fide researchers and agriculture extension county staff members currently in the Academic Professional group. See more complete definition in this section of the report.)

c. Academic Administrator - (Those with academic rank who head up academic units. The administrative part of the appointment in on an "at-will" basis. See more complete definition in this section of the report.)

d. Administrative Professional - (Those who are exempt from the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and who meet the the Merit Board's definition of a "principal administrative employee". See more complete definition in this section of the report.)

e. Support Staff - (Those covered by the Civil Service regulations. The consultant recommends that Civil Service cover only positions eligible for overtime under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and referred to as "non-exempt".)

2. Introduce contracts (Memorandum of Personal Service) that indicate clearly the "at-will" employment basis of those in section 1.a and c above.

3. Establish ranks similar to academic ranks for bona fide researchers and agriculture extension county staff members (the Recommended Non-Tenured Academic group).

4. Promote staff members in 3 above from rank to rank on a basis similar to faculty members.

5. Eliminate annual contracts for all Administrative/Professional staff members except those paid on "soft" funds.

6. Develop a policy manual and handbook for Administrative/Professional staff members using many of the current applicable Academic Professional policies plus new policies on Probationary Period, Termination of Employment, and an Appeal Procedure.

7. Develop a salary administration plan for Administrative/Professional staff members.

8. Assign the handling of personnel matters for the new Administrative/Professional group to the recommended newly constituted Office of Human Resources Administration.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE PERSONNEL FUNCTION

A. Background Information

How should the personnel function be organized to carry out the recommendations outlined in the first two sections of this report?

Currently, there are several separate personnel departments which are not joined together for concerted activities. One serves the central administration staff and has the responsibility for setting basic personnel policies for all "nonacademic" staff throughout the University. Each campus has a "nonacademic" personnel office. Each campus has also, a personnel office which handles personnel matters for faculty and the group currently known as academic professionals. In addition, there is a student employment office at the Urbana campus. Student employment is handled in the "nonacademic" personnel office at the Chicago campus.

There is no direct-line reporting responsibility of the campus "nonacademic" personnel offices to the central administration personnel office which has policy making authority for such employees.

Under the current scattered system, the University appears to have no one specifically assigned the responsibility for reacting and responding to new federal or state legislation which applies to all classes of employees.

For example, when Congress passed The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 which requires all paid individuals to sign an I-9 form, there was no one office that responded to that Act and set up University policy for compliance. One administrator told the consultant that she received four different memos from four different offices on how to comply with that Act.

The consultant believes that in an excellent research institution such as the University of Illinois, which is a federation of autonomous units, "planned" decentralization of administration is desirable.

B. The Elements of the Personnel Function and Who Should be Responsible

The consultant subdivided the personnel function into

its component parts and suggested which parts should be handled centrally and which parts should be delegated to the campuses. This deliniation of responsibilities was reviewed with a variety of administrators. There was general acceptance that such subdivisions of basic responsibilities made sense.

A list of those subdivisions together with suggested assigned responsibility for each function follows:

(NOTE: All of the subdivisions below assume consultation between the campus and central personnel functions. For example, while labor relations negotiations and unit determination are listed under Central Administration, campus representatives should play an important part and should be at the bargaining table. In some cases, because of current policies, responsibilities have been assigned to both the campus and central administration).

PERSONNEL FUNCTION	CAMPUS RESPONSIBILITY	CENTRAL RESPONSIBILITY
Employment	X	
Benefits - Planning		X
Benefits - dissemination of information	X	
Training	X	
Salary Administration & Classification	X	X
Labor Relations - Negotia- tions, unit determination		X
Labor Relations - grievance handling, contract inter- pretation	X	X
Nonrenewal of Contract in early years	X	
Nonrenewal of Contract in later years		X
Records Management Planning		X
Records Mangement Useage and input	X	
Policy Development		X
Reaction to New Laws		X
Personnel Research		X
Performance Evaluation	X	

Under such a system, for example, if the new Immigration Act were passed, the central administration personnel office would take charge, call together the various constituencies needed to make decisions about how the I-9 forms would apply, and issue regulations applicable to the entire University.

The formulation of and agreement with such a breakdown of personnel functions provides the background needed to discuss organizational structure. Agreement with these principles suggests a smaller central administration personnel unit and more delegation to enlarged campus units (provided the campus personnel officer reports to both the campus chancellor and the the central administration personnel officer).

When the consultant refers to a campus personnel office, he refers to all units including central administration employees on each campus. It seems redundant to have two personnel offices handling the same types of transactions at Urbana. In fact, some of those functions are already being carried out by the Urbana campus office for the administrative personnel.

C. Responsibility For Non-Tenured Academics

In the section of this report regarding "academic professional employees" (Section II), the recommendation is made that that group be subdivided and that many of them be placed into a new category called Administrative/Professional employees while others (bona fide researchers and county agricultural extension staff members) should be considered to be non-tenured academic staff members.

The consultant recommends that the existing academic personnel offices handle the non-tenured academic personnel along with academic personnel matters. In that way, that office will be responsible for staff members who are similar in policy, backgrounds and types of assignments.

D. Responsibility For Administrative/Professionals

The consultant recommends that the recommended new category called Administrative/Professional be handled by the "nonacademic" personnel office. In all five of the institutions in the study of Big 10 institutions (See Attachment C), such employees are handled by the central personnel office. In fact, the University of Illinois is the only institution in the knowledge of the consultant that has an academic office handling personnel affairs for such staff members.

E. Discontinuance of the Term "Nonacademic"

The word "nonacademic" should be erased from all records and thinking. Nonacademic is a negative word that has been dropped from general useage in universities across the country. Such employees should be referred to by their recommended new broad classification categories -Administrative/Professional, Support Staff, and so forth.

NOTE: The consultant urges that when the Administrative/Professional group is transferred to the staff personnel function, a person who has never been connected with the civil service system be assigned responsibility for their employment, promotion, policy making and so forth. This is recommended to avoid charges of the "civil service mind set" in dealing with these employees.

F. Planned Decentralization and Reporting Lines

Earlier, the term "planned decentralization" is used. The consultant recommends that as many personnel activities as possible be delegated to the campus personnel offices. The central office should postaudit (rather than preaudit) the activities of the campus personnel offices. Then, if the postaudit reveals incorrect activities, more training should be arranged in order to avoid such actions in the future.

However, in order to delegate and at the same time maintain responsibility for the actions, it is necessary to amend the reporting lines. Currently, the campus personnel directors report to the campus administration only. Neither the Associate Vice President for Personnel and Administration nor the Assistant Vice President for Personnel has any real authority over the actions taken by the campus office. Therefore, significant delegation is not feasible.

The consultant recommends that the campus personnel officers have dual reporting lines - one to the campus Chancellor and the other to the central administration personnel officer. Dual reporting lines are not uncommon in higher education. The consultant spent his career under dual reporting lines.

Reporting directly to the Chancellor rather than to one of his staff members will provide a a broader base of knowledge to both parties and will help to overcome some of the "turf" problems that exist currently.

G. Change "Personnel" to "Human Resource Administration"

The consultant recommends that the name of the personnel function be changed to Human Resources Administration. The change to the term Human Resources is occurring throughout higher education.

H. New Titles

The consultant recommends that the central administration personnel officer be titled Associate Vice President for Human Resources Administration and that the campus personnel officers have two titles as follows - Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration and Assistant Chancellor.

I. Student Employment

At many institutions across the country, student employment is handled under the Student Affairs Office by the Office of Financial Aid. The consultant recommends that the Urbana campus student employment function remain in Student Affairs and that the student employment function at the Chicago campus be moved back to the Student Affairs Office.

Consultation between the student employment function and the personnel function should continue, however, in regard to establishing general schedules of pay rates paid to students.

J. Summary of Recommendations

1. Continue to have researchers and county agricultural extension staff (recommended non-tenured academic group) fall under the purview of the academic administration.

2. Assign responsibility for recommended new Administrative/Professional group to the new Office of Human Resource Administration.

3. Discontinue useage of the term "nonacademic".

4. Introduce a program of planned decentralization by having the campus Human Resource Administration Office report to both the campus Chancellor and the Associate Vice President for Human Resource Administration.

5. Change the name of the personnel function to the Office of Human Resource Administration.

6. Change the following titles:

a. Central administration personnel officer function to the title of Associate Vice President For Human Resource Administration.

b. Campus personnel officer function to the title of Assistant Vice President for Human Resource Administration and Assistant Chancellor.

7. Assign student employment to the Financial Aid Office under the Office of Student Affairs.

ATTACHMENT A

Schedule of those interviewed by Ray T. Fortunato
at the Urbana Campus

Monday, June 20

Craig S. Bazzani - Vice President for Business and
Finance, Comptroller

Theodore Clark - Attorney with Seyfarth, Fairweather,
and Geraldson

Donald W. Ward - Assistant Vice President for Personnel
Administration

Tuesday, June 21

James R. Gallivan and Carol L. McClure from Risk Manage-
ment and the Benefits Center

Dale S. Montanelli - Director, Library Administrative
Services

Carolyn G. Burrell - Assistant Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs

Byron H. Higgins - University Counsel

Steven A. Veazie - Associate University Counsel

Stanley R. Levy - Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Robert M. Berdahl - Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs

Jane W. Loeb - Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs

Donald F. Wendel - Vice Chancellor for Administrative
Services

Richard L. Margison - Associate Vice President for
Business and Finance

Wednesday, June 22

David W. Snyder - Director for Human Resource
Management Systems

Attachment A - Continued

Robert W. Resek - Acting Vice President for Academic
Affairs

Stanley O. Ikenberry - President

Chris A. Jackson - Director, Budget and Resource Plan-
ning - Agricultural Administration

L. Denise Hendricks - Acting Director of Personnel
Services

Paul S. Hursey - Deputy Director - Personnel Services

Richard F. Canaday - Director, Budget and Resource
Planning - Department of Computer Science

Larry G. Hess - Business Manager - School of Chemical
Sciences

Deloris A. Holiman - Departmental Business Manager -
Library

Joseph A. Miller - Associate Director - Housing Division

Paul F. Mortensen - Assistant Director, Business
Affairs - School of Life Sciences

Brenda K. Nolan - Assistant Business Manager - College
of Law

Melvin Rothbaum - Professor, Labor and Industrial
Relations

Thursday, June 23

Gary B. North - Director, Housing

Anthony F. Graziano - Associate Dean and Director,
Engineering Experiment Station

Mary E. Beastall - Director, Affirmative Action and
Employment

Walter G. Ingerski - Director, State Universities
Civil Service System

Delores M. Laird - Manager, Testing - Civil Service
System

Attachment A - Continued

Emil G. Peterson - Deputy Director - Civil Service System

Kenneth L. Price - Manager, Classification and Pay Division - Civil Service System

Jean E. Somers - Assistant to Director for Field Services - Civil Service System

Jon W. Culton - Manager, Epicenter and Chairperson, Professional Advisory Committee

Alexis M. Tate - Associate Director for Public Affairs and Officer, Professional Advisory Committee

Marcia L. Miller - Nonacademic Employee Advisory Committee

Friday, June 24

George P. Porter - Director, Operation and Maintenance Division

Charles L. Middleton - Employee Representative to Director, Civil Service System

Robert K. Todd - Associate Vice President for Personnel Administration

Tuesday, August 30

Craig S. Bazzani - Vice President for Business and Finance, Comptroller

Richard C. Hanneman - Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration, Director of Campus Personnel- Chicago

Morton W. Weir - Chancellor, Urbana Campus

Stanley O. Ikenberry - President

Robert K. Todd - Associate Vice President for Administration and Personnel

ATTACHMENT B

Schedule of those interviewed by Ray T. Fortunato
at the Chicago Campus

Monday, July 18

Michele M. Thompson - Special Assistant to the President

Mary Ann Finnegan - Director, Academic Personnel Office

M. Natsuko Kihara - Associate Director, Academic
Personnel Office

Kenneth M. Smythe - Legal Counsel

Elmore H. Taylor - Associate Dean for Administration

Tuesday, July 19

J. Stephen Byerly - Associate Director, Employee
Relations

M. Jane Whitener - Chair, Personnel Advisory Committee -
Director, Conferences and Institutes

John J. Prochaska - Vice Chair, Personnel Advisory
Committee - Auditor

William G. Mays - Associate Vice Chancellor for
Administration

Philip M. Forman - Vice Chancellor and Dean, Medicine

Jay A. Levine - Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences

Donald N. Langenberg - Chancellor

James J. Stukel - Executive Vice Chancellor

Thomas W. Beckham - Vice Chancellor for Student
Services

ATTACHMENT B - Continued

Wednesday, July 20

Donavon W. Riley - Director, University Hospital

Richard Thomas - Executive, Hospital Corporation of
America

Arthur Catrambone - Associate Executive Vice Chancellor
for Administration

Beverly P. Lynch - University Librarian

Bernadette M. Greski - Staff Advisory Council

Stanton Delaney - Director, Campus Auxiliary Services

ATTACHMENT C

SURVEY OF FIVE BIG 10 INSTITUTIONS REGARDING HOW THEY BROADLY CLASSIFY THEIR EMPLOYEES

QUESTION	University of Michigan	Michigan State	Ohio State	Purdue University	University of Wisconsin
How are Executives classified? (Pres., VP Chancellor, VC, Dean, Etc.)	Separate Unclassified Administrative/Professional Group.	Separate Executive/Management Group.	Separate Senior Administrative/Professional Group.	Separate Management group.	Separate Executive Salary group.
How are qualified researchers classified? (Those with degrees similar to faculty)	Called Primary Staff. In ranks such as Research Scientist, Assoc. Res. Sci., Asst. Res. Sci., and Investigator. Promoted like faculty. Under academic admin.	Handled as non-tenured faculty. Under the purview of academic admin.	Handled as unclassified Admin./Prof. In ranks such as Sr. Res. Assoc. Res. Assoc. I, Res. Assoc. II, Res. Asst. I, Res. Asst. II. etc. Promoted like faculty. Under academic admin.	Split group assignments. Some in Academic, others in Admin./Prof. group.	Under Academic Staff group. In ranks such as Sr. Scientist, Assoc. Sci., Asst. Sci. Promoted like faculty. Under academic administration.
How are other staff exempt (FLSA) handled? Admin/Prof/Supervisory?	In Admin/Prof group under purview of Personnel Office. All positions are evaluated, placed in grades with salary scales.	(same as Michigan)	(same as Michigan)	(same as Michigan)	(same as Michigan)
How are Ag. Ext. County staff handled?	(Not applicable)	Under the academic, non-tenured group.	Under the academic group. Use faculty ranks.	Under the admin./prof. group. Use ranks.	Under a separate group. Use ranks.
Are annual contracts used for other than	No.	No.	No.	No.	Some "No" and some "Yes".

ATTACHMENT D

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Memorandum of Personal Service
Executive Administrator

The President and the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois have approved your appointment as an Executive Administrator of the University as follows:

Name _____

Title _____

Effective Date of Appointment _____

Salary and Service - Annual salary of \$ _____ on a year around basis payable _____ and subject to annual review.

In accepting this appointment you agree to abide by the regulations of the General Rules and Statutes of the University and membership in the State Universities Retirement System together with future additions, deletions, or revisions of such regulations.

Executive Administrator appointments may be terminated at any time upon written notice.

Welcome to the staff of the University of Illinois.

Very truly yours,

(President of the University)

I hereby accept appointment on the terms stated above.

Date _____ Signature _____

ATTACHMENT E

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Memorandum of Personal Service

Executive Administrator
With Faculty Rank

The President and the Board of Trustees of The University of Illinois have approved your appointment as an Executive Administrator of the University with faculty rank as follows:

Name _____
Exec. Administrator Title _____
Faculty Rank _____
Effective Date of Appointment _____

Salary and Service - Annual salary of \$ _____ * on a year around basis payable _____ and subject to annual review.

*The annual salary applies so long as you are in an Executive Administrator position. Should the terms of your appointment be amended to eliminate your Executive Administrator responsibilities, and if you would continue in a tenured faculty position (if applicable), the appointment would be a _____ week appointment and the salary would be determined to be no less than median salary for your rank in your discipline at your campus.

Appointment to the faculty is subject to University policies applicable to the designated rank and tenure status. Appointment as an Executive Administrator is a separate appointment which may be terminated upon written notice of the President.

In accepting this appointment you agree to abide by the General Rules and Statues of the University, membership in

the State Universities Retirement System, and the appropriate regulations of the Faculty Policy Handbook together with future additions, deletions, or revisions of such regulations.

Welcome to the staff of the University of Illinois.

Very truly yours,

(President of the University)

I hereby accept the appointment on the terms stated above.

Date _____ Signature _____

ATTACHMENT F

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Memorandum of Personal Service

Administrative/Professional Staff Member

The President of the the University of Illinois has approved your appointment as an Administrative/Professional Staff Member of the University.

Name _____

Title _____

Effective Date of Appointment _____

Salary and Service - Annual salary of \$ _____ for _____
(weeks or months) of service payable on a _____ basis
and reviewed annually.

In accepting this appointment you agree to abide by the regulations of the enclosed Handbook For Staff Members Designated as Administrative/Professional and membership in the State Universities Retirement System together with future additions, deletions or revisions of such regulations. Details of the policies outlined in the handbook are found in the University's Personnel Policy Manual for Administrative/Professional staff members.

Administrative/Professional appointments have a probationary period of up to twelve months. Following successful completion of the probationary period, termination can occur because of discontinuance of the need for the position, lack of funds, or an incumbent not meeting acceptable standards of performance as outlined in the Handbook and Policy Manual.

Welcome to the staff of the University of Illinois.

Very truly yours,

(President of the University)

I hereby accept the appointment on the terms stated above.

Date _____ Signature _____