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We have a perception problem in higher ed HR … part of it created by other campus leaders who narrowly view our roles, and part of it, unfortunately, created by us. It’s time for us to more clearly define our work and the contributions that we could and should be making on campus. I’m not talking about a “seat at the table.” Aren’t we sick of talking about that anyway? I’m talking about the competencies that higher ed HR professionals need in order to be successful now and to ensure our relevance in the future.

A group of higher ed HR professionals gathered almost two years ago at CUPA-HR headquarters to begin the creation of a higher ed HR learning framework — the competencies needed to be successful as a higher ed HR professional. The association has been using the framework for over a year (to guide our learning programs, our content and our focus areas), but I bet some of you are just now hearing about it for the first time. If you haven’t already done so, I encourage you to take a look at the CUPA-HR Learning Framework (www.cupahr.org/learning/framework.aspx) and:

• Chart your personal learning needs. Even the most seasoned CHRO has areas for development and growth.

• Ask your HR colleagues to use the framework to chart their personal learning needs.

• Share it with your boss … particularly if your boss is not in HR! He or she needs to see this framework to help him or her understand the breadth and depth of what HR’s contributions could and should be.

During the coming months, the framework will continue to life and include competency definitions, learning opportunities and resources. It may take some time for us to fully build the higher ed HR resources to support learning for each competency, but we pledge to do so!

We know that many of you are unable to attend our face-to-face events on a regular basis, so our learning and professional development team is working with higher ed HR professionals from across the country to develop e-learning opportunities that help you with the learning you need, when you need it (learn more at www.cupahr.org/learning/courses.aspx). Our first e-learning course, CUPA-HR Boot Camp, has been wildly successful, with over 800 registrants to date. Anyone in a higher ed HR position should begin with a baseline competency in the core areas that define HR, and Boot Camp provides this baseline competency.

Our second e-learning course, which launched in mid-April, is Understanding Higher Ed. Taking this online course should be required of ANYONE new to higher ed (not just HR professionals). It’s so important that our new colleagues gain a broader perspective of the culture and environment that is higher ed. We will continue to launch new e-learning courses while also making frequent updates to the courses that we already have in place (by the way, if you are interested in helping us develop some of our online learning content, please let us know by sending an e-mail to learn@cupahr.org).

It’s time to change the “health and happiness patrol” perception of our work, so let’s chart a path to ensure that our work is more clearly and more broadly defined. Together, let’s build the competencies that help us not only be successful today, but also become relevant, contributing campus leaders of the future.

Andy Brantley | CUPA-HR President and CEO
**HR a Hot Job in 2014**

There has been a recent uptick in hiring for HR professionals, a positive sign for an industry that is steadily gaining momentum following the economic downturn. According to a January 2014 survey from the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), HR generalists are in the highest demand and salaries for these positions are on the rise. SHRM also noted that organizations are looking for HR professionals with training and development expertise, experience in HR information systems and compensation experts.

Another indication HR is growing in popularity? The profession was named a “2014 Hot Job” by leading employment services provider Randstad. “The spike in HR positions in recent months is indicative of an economy in preparation to hire,” says Rebecca Callahan, group president of professional solutions for Randstad. “Unfortunately, HR personnel were scaled back during the economic downturn, but the sudden demand for these employees is a positive sign for 2014, especially in the areas of HRIS, recruiting, benefits, onboarding, payroll and employee relations.”

*This brief first appeared on Randstad’s website (www.randstadusa.com/workforce360). It was reprinted here with permission from Randstad.*

---

**Hispanic-Serving Institutions on the Rise**

The number of colleges and universities designated as Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) continues to grow, currently representing 11 percent of higher education institutions in the United States. In its annual analysis of HSIs, Excelencia in Education found that 370 institutions in 2012-13 met the criteria for HSI designation, up from 356 in 2011-12 (HSIs are defined by federal law as accredited and degree-granting higher education institutions with 25 percent or more total undergraduate FTE Hispanic student enrollment). And the numbers are likely to rise at an even greater clip over the next few years, as 277 institutions were identified in the 2012-13 analysis as emerging HSIs (institutions with 15-24 percent undergrad FTE Hispanic enrollment).

**Other Findings**

- More than half (59 percent) of Latino undergraduates in the U.S. are enrolled at HSIs.
- Almost half (47 percent) of FTE students enrolled at HSIs are Latino.
- HSIs are currently very concentrated geographically – while HSIs are located in 15 states and Puerto Rico, 85 percent are located in five states and Puerto Rico. California has the most HSIs (127), followed by Texas (68), Puerto Rico (59), New Mexico (22), Florida (20) and New York (18).
- Emerging HSIs, however, are located in 31 states; 35 percent are public two-year institutions and 38 percent are private four-year institutions.
- The majority of HSIs are two-year institutions (48 percent are community colleges and 4 percent are private two-year institutions). In comparison, about 20 percent of HSIs are four-year public colleges or universities and 28 percent are private four-year institutions.
APA Survey Finds U.S. Employers Unresponsive to Employee Needs

More than one-third of American workers experience chronic work stress, with low salaries, lack of opportunity for advancement and heavy workloads topping the list of contributing factors, according to a 2013 survey by the American Psychological Association’s Center for Organizational Excellence.

Many employees appear to feel stuck, with only 39 percent citing sufficient opportunities for internal career advancement and just over half (51 percent) saying they feel valued at work.

Compounding the problem, less than half of those surveyed reported that they felt they receive adequate monetary compensation or non-monetary recognition for their contributions on the job (46 percent and 43 percent, respectively). Additionally, just 43 percent said that recognition is based on fair and useful performance evaluations. In addition to feeling undervalued, they also reported feeling unheard. Less than half (47 percent) said their employers regularly seek input from employees and even fewer (37 percent) said the organization makes changes based on that feedback.

Despite growing awareness of the importance of a healthy workplace, few employees in the survey said their organizations provide sufficient resources to help them manage stress (36 percent) and meet their mental health needs (44 percent). Just 42 percent said their organizations promote and support a healthy lifestyle, and only 36 percent reported regularly participating in workplace health and wellness programs.

Only half (52 percent) of those surveyed believe their employers value work-life balance; 39 percent reported that their employers provide options for flexible work; and 30 percent said their employers provide benefits that help them more easily meet their non-work demands. Overall, one-third of those surveyed said that work interfering during personal or family time has a significant impact on their level of work stress, and a quarter reported that job demands interfere with their ability to fulfill family or home responsibilities.

Women Still Face Disparities at Work

Despite many advances for women in the workplace, the office still doesn’t feel like a level playing field for many women who reported feeling less valued than men (48 percent of women vs. 54 percent of men). Less than half (43 percent) of the women surveyed said they receive adequate monetary compensation for their work, compared to 48 percent of men.

Further, fewer women than men reported that their employer provides sufficient opportunities for internal career advancement (35 percent vs. 43 percent) or resources to help them manage stress (34 percent vs. 38 percent). Only 37 percent of women reported regularly using employee benefits designed to help them meet demands outside the office, compared to almost half of men (46 percent), and just 38 percent of women said they regularly utilize flexible work arrangements, compared to 42 percent of men.
Circles of Knowledge

Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) employs approximately 6,400 faculty and staff and offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in eight schools on its 155-acre main campus. As a large, decentralized institution, business practices are implemented by leadership in the different departments and units to meet the needs of individual management centers. While this level of operational flexibility has its benefits, one downside is that ensuring information flow between and among the various departments and divisions can be challenging.

In early 2010, CWRU’s organizational development and learning (ODL) division began exploring ways to enhance the exchange and sharing of knowledge across campus. Out of this need for a better understanding among staff members of how the work of all CWRU divisions, departments and offices intersects and how individuals can leverage personal and professional connections to enrich their own work came the Staff Mentoring Circles program. The idea was to break down silos, facilitate collaboration and communication, enhance personal and professional skills, and re-engage staff.

The Groundwork

To get the mentoring program up and running, the ODL division formed an advisory committee consisting of individuals from several campus units. This initial step not only provided ODL and committee members the opportunity to broaden and deepen their understanding of needs and opportunities, but also conveyed to stakeholders the importance the university placed on employees’ perspectives. The committee considered options for the most appropriate structure for the program and ultimately concluded that a group mentoring approach best aligned with the initiative’s goals. The committee then set out to recruit potential mentees and mentors. Mentee candidates were identified through focus groups, and potential mentors consisted of senior leaders (deans, directors, vice presidents) from across the university who possessed both the desire and the ability to influence and engage others.

This process was followed by a needs assessment that highlighted four key areas important to mentees: networking skills, leadership presence, managing professional relationships and career development. Over the next year, the committee worked to design an inclusive program that would combine coaching and mentoring, serve as a support network for creative problem solving, and help to build strategies for career development.

The first Staff Mentoring Circles program was rolled out in fall 2011. Participation was limited to 21 mentees and registration was on a first-come, first-served basis. The roster was full in less than 10 minutes. Due to the popularity of the program, in spring 2012, the number of participants was increased to 28.

The Program

Each mentoring cohort consists of 28 mentees divided into four groups, with each individual in the group representing a different department/division (thus ensuring participants are exposed to a wide range of campus units), and three senior-level mentors. The program runs eight months, with mentoring circles meeting once per month for 90 minutes during the lunch hour. Mentees remain together as a cohort and in their circles throughout the program, while the mentors rotate between the four groups. Mentors are expected to facilitate conversations and to serve as
a resource for professional development. Individual mentoring sessions are not a component of the program, but an option for mentors to consider. The program also encourages peer-to-peer mentoring/networking to enhance professional growth and build bonds among colleagues.

“The Staff Mentoring Circles program is designed to enhance personal and professional skills and help staff members and leaders forge new relationships and develop strategies for collaboration between and among various campus divisions,” says Carolyn Gregory, CWRU’s vice president for human resources. “Additionally, the program encourages and promotes the melding of diverse thoughts, work styles, personalities, generations and cultures across campus and cultivates a learning community where employees and executive leaders learn and grow together.”

The Outcomes
Now in its fourth year, the program continues to draw significant interest and positive feedback, says Gregory. “Both mentors and mentees benefit in myriad ways,” she says. “By acting as mentors, senior leaders are exposed to the emerging talent pool; enhance their coaching, leadership and management skills; and increase their generational awareness.” According to Gregory, mentors also have facilitated greater transparency about the goals of the university. Mentees, meanwhile, have reported an increased understanding of the culture of the university; more opportunities for meaningful professional development; an exposure to diverse perspectives and experiences; a way to identify and remedy potential skills gaps within themselves; and the opportunity to demonstrate their strengths and explore their potential.

The Staff Mentoring Circles program not only enables Case Western staff to build relationships with a diverse network of mentors across campus, but also provides opportunities for them to approach their work in new and different ways, says Gregory. “The program fosters open communication, encourages a high level of employee engagement, and aids employees’ understanding of the university’s complexities and uniqueness and how individuals can contribute to helping the university reach an even greater potential.”

---

Which of the following is NOT an example of mandated training required for most state institutions?

- Performance Management/Appraisal
- Diversity and Inclusion
- Nondiscrimination/Sexual Harassment/Title IX
- Effective Communication

Not sure? It may be time to get back to basics on HR in higher education with CUPA-HR Boot Camp, an e-learning course that provides HR essentials with a higher ed twist.

www.cupahr.org/bootcamp
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Walking the Talk: Workforce Diversity at Cal State Fullerton

When it comes to student enrollment, California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) is one of the country’s most diverse universities, designated as a Hispanic, Asian-American and Native American/Pacific Islander-Serving Institution and ranked ninth in the nation in terms of baccalaureate degrees awarded to minority students by Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, based on data from the U.S. Department of Education. However, diversity within the institution’s staff and faculty ranks is lacking and does not reflect the student population it serves.

When Mildred Garcia assumed the presidency of CSUF two years ago, one of the first things she set out to do was to change this reality. By including the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and staff as one of four goals laid out in the university’s five-year strategic plan, Garcia ensured that her institution wouldn’t just be paying lip service to diversity and inclusion. Instead, she opened the door for real and lasting change, and she empowered human resources to lead the charge.

Setting the Stage
To nurture this vision, President Garcia moved HR out of the administrative unit in which it was housed and created a stand-alone division of human resources, diversity and inclusion (HRDI), encompassing both staff and faculty personnel functions. In doing so, she elevated the head of HR to a vice president level, and subsequently hired Lori Gentles to lead the new division.

“When I joined CSUF last July, I knew I had my work cut out for me — as the new head of a new division, working under a new president, charged with implementing a workforce diversity strategy for the largest campus in the Cal State System, I’d be lying if I said I wasn’t overwhelmed,” says Gentles. “But when I saw how supportive President Garcia was and how important this work is to her and that she was willing to allocate the funds and resources that would allow real progress to be made, I breathed a sigh of relief and jumped in with both feet!”

Making Strides
CSUF is planning to hire more than 130 new faculty members over the next two years, “so this is the perfect opportunity to really change the landscape of our faculty makeup,” says Gentles. By leading several new programs and initiatives related to workforce diversity, Gentles is confident HRDI can help the university achieve this goal.

Diversity Recruitment Training
Over the past year, HRDI has conducted training sessions across campus with college deans, department chairs and faculty search committee chairs to educate them about best practices in recruiting and onboarding. Training topics have included several critical aspects of the recruitment process, such as how to develop applicant feeder programs; guarding against unconscious bias in search and screening; finding funding for recruitment initiatives that focus on underrepresented groups; coordinating recruitment with community, government and academic associations; creating faculty position descriptions which attract highly qualified candidates; and best practices in retention strategies.

E-Recruit for Faculty
HRDI implemented an e-recruitment program that has resulted in close to 95 percent of faculty candidates self-identifying their ethnicities (previous efforts achieved only 30 percent to 50 percent self-identification rates). While e-recruiting has been in place for many years for management and staff positions at CSUF, faculty recruitment remained paper-based due to the complexity of the process. However, the evolution of technology and a growing acceptance of e-recruitment in higher ed provided
Inclusion cultivates excellence

an opportunity for HRDI to test a new approach that also resulted in a better diversity metric. “Since e-recruitment was implemented last fall, we’ve seen dramatic increases in both the number of applicants and the overall diversity of candidates,” says Gentles. “In fact, the diversity rates in most demographic categories are exceeding national averages. And these results will impact the classroom experience for years to come.”

Campus Climate Survey
In March, HRDI launched a campus climate survey to assess the learning and working environment at CSUF. The survey was designed to assess the experiences and behaviors of faculty, staff and administrators and their perceptions of institutional actions including administrative policies and academic initiatives that impact campus climate. “The survey will help us determine how well we are doing to promote and maintain a positive, inclusive and supportive campus climate where all individuals and groups feel welcomed, safe, respected and valued,” says Gentles. “The results will identify institutional strengths and challenges relating to campus climate issues and should provide valuable data to help us improve recruitment and retention and to foster an inclusive environment.”

Results of the survey will be made available to the campus community in the fall and will drive the university’s next steps in its workforce diversity plan.

Entrance Survey and New Employee Orientation
An “entrance” survey given to each new hire assesses the factors that attracted the individual to CSUF as a place of employment and his or her experience during the application, interview, onboarding and new employee orientation processes. “We use data gleaned from these entrance surveys to inform continuous improvement in our recruiting, hiring and retention efforts,” says Gentles.

HRDI also recently revamped its new employee orientation, with the program focusing on the fact that each individual, from the hourly employee to the faculty member to the senior executive, has the same primary duty: to support student success. Another component to the new employee orientation program is a new hire “mixer.” Twice per year, faculty and staff hired within the previous six months are invited to a mixer to discuss how they are acclimating to the environment and to share with HRDI any concerns or feedback they may have about the workplace. It is also a time for co-workers to network and build a sense of community, says Gentles.

University Awards
In April, HRDI hosted the inaugural University Awards program, which celebrated the accomplishments of both staff and faculty (prior to this year, staff and faculty had always had separate employee recognition programs). “For many years, CSUF’s employee recognition program had been focused exclusively on time served at the university,” says Gentles. And while she acknowledges that recognizing time served is important, “it’s what we do in those 10, 15, 20 years to advance the university’s goals that is real cause for celebration.” The new awards program recognizes accomplishments in leadership, teamwork and collaboration, and diversity and inclusion.

HR’s Role As Cultural Architect
CSUF has undergone tremendous change over the past two years — a new president, a new executive leadership team, a new strategic plan, and an increased focus on workforce diversity. And, as Gentles puts it, “a new direction, new priorities, a different focus — all require a new mindset for our campus community.” And Gentles is committed to helping her division shift that mindset and shape a new campus culture.

“I am a true believer that HR can and should serve as the compass of an organization, shaping and guiding its culture through policies, practices, programs and positioning,” says Gentles. “I’ve been working with our HR folks to try and shift the mindset about the work we do — to help them realize that the reach we have is bigger and broader than just about any other campus division. By reframing the significance of what we do (instead of saying, ‘we have 3,700 employees,’ it’s ‘we manage more than $400 million in assets’), we have begun to take our role as cultural architects more seriously. Now that ‘diversity and inclusion’ is part of our division’s name, it has lit a fire — DE&I work is now part of the fabric of what we do on a daily basis.”

On the Fast Track
The diversity work at CSUF has been going at breakneck speed. “Thanks to President Garcia’s commitment to creating a more diverse and inclusive workplace, we’ve been able to accomplish more in nine months than many organizations do in five years,” says Gentles. “Instead of talking things to death, we’re actually doing, and I think the campus community is really beginning to understand the benefit that is derived from the breadth of views and the unique contributions that a diverse workforce brings to our university.”
The question of whether or not to increase the federal minimum wage and to what level has become a central topic of discussion in Washington, D.C., this year. Democrats claim that the wage increase will reduce poverty and improve the economy by providing workers with more money to spend on goods and services. Republicans, on the other hand, argue against the wage hike, stating that it will increase costs of employment and thus lead to job loss, hurting the very people it is intended to help. Fueling the policy debate is a recent report by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), a nonpartisan budget agency, which gives support to both sides of the argument. The report states that the wage increase could result in a net loss of about 500,000 jobs, but at the same time would lift 900,000 Americans out of poverty.

In addition to the policy implications are, of course, political concerns. Democrats have made a wage hike the cornerstone of their agenda leading up to the fall midterm elections, with the White House and top Democrats in the House and the Senate pushing to increase the wage floor from $7.25 to $10.10 an hour with annual increases thereafter tied to the consumer price index. Some pundits have accused Democrats of focusing on the issue in hopes of changing the discussion to something other than the Affordable Care Act, which has suffered various setbacks. Others have said pushing wage hikes both nationally and as part of state ballot initiatives is part of the Democrats’ strategy to get out the vote and overcome the Republicans’ expected voter turnout advantage in the midterm elections (younger voters, who tend to support Democrats, have consistently lower turnout in midterm elections).
Regardless of any specific political motivations, many Democratic pundits have said pushing the wage hike right now is generally smart politics, given a recent poll which found half of adults would be more likely to vote for a congressional candidate who supports increasing the minimum wage, while only 20 percent said they would be less likely to support such a candidate. Not all Democrats agree, however. Several Senate Democrats face tough elections this year, running in states where Governor Romney beat President Obama (in some cases by significant margins) in the 2012 presidential election. Those senators and other moderate Senate Democrats have been hesitant to support the measure and are reportedly pushing legislation with a less dramatic increase and no automatic future increases.

So what does this all mean for higher ed HR? Given the Republican-Democrat split on the issue and the reluctance of moderate Democrats to embrace the proposal, it is unlikely Congress will enact a wage increase this year, particularly one that calls for an increase to $10.10 with future automatic increases. That said, many colleges and universities nonetheless likely will face an increase in the wage floor, at least for some employees, in the next year. Some 19 states have already instituted minimum wage rates higher than Congress has set for the federal rate and other states and local jurisdictions are looking to enact wage increases through the normal legislative process or via ballot initiatives. In addition, the president issued an executive order (EO) that will require federal contractors to pay employees working on contract at least $10.10. More details about the executive order, the legislation being pushed in Congress, and the possible implications for higher ed are set forth below.

If institutions are forced to increase minimum pay levels, they may lack the funds to adjust the pay levels across the board, and it may become difficult to maintain a relative distance between the wages of an entry-level employee and a more senior one.
thereafter. Thus far, the Senate has held three hearings on the minimum wage. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) was expected to have the Senate vote on the bill in mid-March but instead delayed the vote until May. Several Democrats in the Senate, many up for re-election, have expressed concern with the large jump to $10.10 and have proposed $9 an hour so employers are not impacted as heavily by the change. This resistance by some has caused Reid to hold off on a vote for the short-term in hopes that Democrats can be united and send a strong message to the House on the need for action. Yet, Reid has said that he will take action on the bill even if he does not get support from every Democrat.

In the House, Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) is not expected to take up the Harkin/Miller bill of his own accord. Republicans believe the minimum wage increase that has been proposed would hurt the economy by making it more expensive for businesses to hire. House Democrats, led by Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), are expected to file a discharge petition, a rarely used parliamentary tool used by the minority party, seeking to force the House to vote. A discharge petition requires the signatures of an absolute majority of House members (218) to bring a bill to the floor that has not been discharged from a House committee.

In some cases, the threat of a discharge petition can be as powerful as the petition itself to jumpstart House activity on a piece of legislation. However, Pelosi would have to garner significant support from House Democrats and Republicans to make the threat of the discharge petition real.

**Implications for Higher Ed**

The findings of the aforementioned CBO report added fuel to the already heated debate and received sharp criticism from the White House about the report’s accuracy. CBO stands by its findings, saying that they line up with findings of other economists. It did say the estimate is just that — an estimate — and that there could be a slight decrease in employment (of about a million jobs).

For colleges and universities specifically, the EO, and down the road the legislation (should it become law), could have an impact on budgets and HR. The initial bump for covered federal contractors to $10.10 per hour in less than a year will not be a major change for all campuses if their local minimum wage rate is already higher or the pay range minimum for the institution currently surpasses the new rate. Others may face increased budget pressure as labor costs increase.

Wage compression may also be a concern. If colleges and universities are forced to increase their minimum pay levels, wage compression may result when institutions lack the funds to adjust the pay levels across the board. As a result, it may become more difficult to maintain a relative distance between the wages of an entry-level employee and a more senior one. Wage discrepancies between those working on federal contracts and those not may also be an issue triggered by the EO. Individuals with the same title or job could be paid different rates simply because one is working on a federal contract and the other is not.

Individuals with the same title or job could be paid different rates simply because one is working on a federal contract and the other is not.

Josh Ulman is chief government relations officer for CUPA-HR. He can be reached at julman@cupahr.org.

Christi Layman is manager of government relations for CUPA-HR. She can be reached at clayman@cupahr.org.
In the Higher Ed HR Trailblazers series, we’re highlighting CUPA-HR members who have enjoyed long, successful careers in higher education human resources and who were instrumental in cultivating, growing and expanding the HR role on their campuses. They’ve all contributed tremendously to the profession and to CUPA-HR — and they have some great stories to tell!

For this installment of the series, we spoke with three retired chief HR officers — Ray Fortunato, Hosea Long and Roosevelt Thomas — who began their careers in higher ed HR in an era when the work of HR was very different from today. Nevertheless, they each had the foresight to know what HR should be doing and the determination to lead their divisions down that path.
When did you begin working in higher ed HR and in what capacity? What other positions did you go on to hold?

Ray Fortunato: I began working in the personnel department at The Pennsylvania State University as employment manager in 1948. My only prior work experience before taking the job was as a combat infantry officer fighting in Germany during WWII. I made my entire higher ed HR career at Penn State, serving as manager of employee relations, director of employee relations, director of personnel administration, and finally assistant vice president for human resources. After retiring from Penn State in 1985, I presided over my consulting firm specializing in higher ed administration. Altogether, I consulted at 84 institutions.

Hosea Long: I began my 28 years of working in higher education HR at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) in 1985 (prior to this I had worked in the private sector for several years). I was hired in a new position — coordinator of classified employee services — which was designed to provide a full range of HR support services for all classified staff positions with the university. I spent five years at UALR. Before leaving, I enrolled in graduate school there, pursuing a degree in interpersonal and organizational communication.

UALR provided me with a solid background in understanding the unique nature of higher ed HR. I was able to form strong relationships with faculty in the college of business as well as faculty who taught in many areas related to HR and organizational development.

Learning early on how to interact with faculty served me well throughout my career. After I left UALR, I joined University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and served there until I retired earlier this year.

Roosevelt Thomas: I began my career in 1971 working for the U.S. Office of Education as a training facilitator and later became director of training for the Southeast Regional Drug Education and Training Resource Center in Miami, Florida. While working on my doctorate degree at the University of Miami (UM) in the mid-1970s, I was a trainer with the Florida School Desegregation Consulting Center located in UM’s School of Education.

My actual personnel experience began in July 1978 when I was hired as assistant to the executive vice president for administration and finance at UM with a charge of coordinating the preparation of a comprehensive personnel policies and procedures manual for nonexempt staff. In December 1978, the executive director for personnel resigned, and I was offered the position. In 1981, I was given responsibility for UM’s affirmative action program and was promoted to assistant vice president for personnel and affirmative action (I was the first African-American at UM to hold a position with “vice president” in the title).

After developing a professional development and training department, I was promoted to associate vice president, at which time I changed the name of the department to human resources and changed the affirmative action unit to equality administration. In 1996 I became vice president for HR, a position I held until my retirement in 2008.
What was the role of HR when you first began working in the profession? How did that role change over the years?

Fortunato: Centralized HR was almost nonexistent in higher ed in 1948. Frequently, benefits were handled in the controller’s office. There were only a few federal and state mandates to bother with. A few institutions had unions to deal with, and often the business vice president handled that. Deans and other administrative officers pretty much ran their own shows. Many institutions did not have centralized personnel policies. However, in some institutions, employees were covered by civil service regulations, and HR departments were somewhat more organized in such institutions. As governments passed more employment-related legislation, the need for centralized HR became more apparent and our profession grew.

In our early days (the 1940s and early 1950s), there were two situations at Penn State that affected personnel’s acceptance as a new entity — one positive and the other negative. Following World War II, Penn State, like most institutions, grew at an incredible rate as ex-GIs returned to school. Many of these returning soldiers were married and their wives needed employment, so they roamed the campus visiting various departments. To the relief of many administrators, our employment division took on the responsibility of serving as the go-between for these women and the various departments on campus that were looking to hire, and our department was appreciated for that service.

The second situation involved a work stoppage by the employees in a major department. Our president was upset and asked me for the cause. I explained to him that I had tried to convince the department head to change his negative behavior toward his employees, but he didn’t listen and continued his polarizing behavior — thus, the work stoppage. As a result, the president reorganized the personnel department and our reporting lines to give us more clout. This helped significantly in our ability to make a difference at Penn State.

Long: I often joke with folks by saying that when I got into HR, all we had to do was keep records and make sure people got paid on time. Over three decades, the work has certainly advanced to requirements far beyond that. An HR professional these days has to have skill sets encompassing many areas in the social sciences, business administration, communications, and a smattering of other disciplines in order to be of any use to organizations and to propel themselves forward in their careers.

Thomas: When I began working at UM, personnel handled employment-related issues of hourly paid staff only. It was not viewed as a significant administrative operation, and we had no voice in the management of exempt staff — the university president, vice presidents and deans managed those activities.

What were your greatest challenges initially?

Fortunato: Convincing deans that we needed policies that might change their basic authority. I felt like a salesman, trying to convince administrators to change how they had been acting and what they had been doing for years. I had to convince people to cross streets they didn’t see a need to cross. It wasn’t easy. Yet, as part of my job in HR, I had to ensure that our institution was in total compliance with appropriate laws. Today, we accept such need for compliance as a given, but not back then.

A second challenge was to clearly define and delineate the services that HR could and should provide. Presidents and other top officers came up through the faculty ranks and, therefore, didn’t have a clue about what HR could and should be doing. I spent a great deal of time making sure that our leaders understood what we were capable of doing and what was necessary to do. I considered it my job to define our responsibilities and portfolio.

Later, as a consultant, I was surprised to hear several presidents ask me “What should I expect of my HR department?” When I was working in HR at Penn State, I made sure that my leaders understood our job and capabilities. I also learned through my consulting work that at some institutions, that question hasn’t been resolved even now — what should the role of the HR department be?

Long: I think my greatest challenge was dealing with the “unspoken” elitism that existed between faculty and administrators and staff. An extension from that was the opinion many had of HR as being a necessary evil. Getting people to view HR as more than an operation that was simply involved with a string of transactional tasks that added very little if any value to the organization was a significant challenge during my days at UALR.
**Thomas:** In my very first HR role, my primary duty was to lead the development of a comprehensive personnel policies and procedures manual. That was tough, as I was brand new to the personnel side of things. Then, in my role as executive director for personnel, I was charged with elevating the status of the personnel department (which at the time, only dealt with hourly paid employees and had very little respect from UM administration and staff). That, too, was a challenging undertaking. And then there was a unionization attempt among hourly employees, which was defeated. All of these things happened within my first three years on the job.

**Did you experience stumbling blocks on your career path?**

**Fortunato:** I was lucky. I received support for our program — but it took work. By nature, I am an optimist. If I perceived a negative situation, I went toward the situation to find a solution. But sometimes I had to accept the fact that the problem at hand couldn’t be solved and that it was a waste of time trying.

**Long:** I think the biggest stumbling blocks I encountered had more to do with people who were traditionalist in their thinking — people who couldn’t or refused to see the changes that were happening with regards to demographics, culture, technology and mindset and who viewed change as something inherently bad. That, along with administrators who had difficulty seeing HR as a strategic business partner vs. a non-value-adding operation.

**Thomas:** What might be considered a stumbling block by most people was, to me, a challenge which I was eager to face. I was young, perhaps a bit cocky, full of confidence, and had tremendous support from my boss and the president.

**Who were your greatest supporters? Did you have a mentor(s)? How did they help you in your career?**

**Fortunato:** My first boss was really tough but he taught me a lot, and that kind of tough loving care was exactly what I needed at the time. Our legal counsel was a great supporter and mentor to me. Two Penn State presidents — Milton Eisenhower (President Eisenhower’s brother) and Eric Walker — did a lot for me as well. These mentors helped me understand what was doable at that point in our university’s history.

**Long:** As I look back, there are three people in particular that come to mind. The first was the affirmative action/EEO officer at UALR and the second in command of HR. She hired me at UALR, but she was also was a major influence in my career at an earlier stage, when she hired me as an affirmative action/EEO specialist in the Arkansas governor’s office back in 1977. She was always very supportive and acted in ways like a mother to me.

The second was my first boss at UAMS. He was charged with developing a highly functional, strategically focused HR operation, and he thought I could contribute to that venture. It wasn’t long after coming to UAMS that he and I began having discussions about the Hudson Institute’s Workforce 2000 studies that projected a new workforce for the future — one that was more diverse than ever before. Those talks ended up in us formalizing the work of diversity and inclusion at UAMS by forming the chancellor diversity committee, which is still operational today.

The third person would have to be the vice chancellor for finance and administration at UAMS, who was not the stereotypical finance chief. I’ve always thought that was the case because he was educated as an economist, rather than a traditional finance person. He always listened to HR, supported HR in the position we took and promoted me to the chief HR officer when there was a tide of opinion from many leaders on campus against my being promoted to that position. He conducted a national search, as sentiment dictated, but he gave me the job after a year of recruiting activity.

**Thomas:** My greatest supporters were my immediate supervisors: the executive vice president for administration and finance and the executive vice president for business and finance. The presidents I worked under were also great supporters.

**Do you have any “war stories” you can share?**

**Fortunato:** No war stories per se. But dealing with people can create many humorous and not-so-humorous stories. Here are a couple of funny ones: On my second day of employment, I was asked to interview a candidate for a vacancy we had. Everything was going fine until he asked me what the job paid. I didn’t know so I faked it. I said, “We’ll pay you what you’re worth.” He replied, “I can’t live on that!” At least he was honest!
Another time I was conducting a grievance hearing for an hourly employee. I asked, “Just why are you aggrieved?” He said, “Because I have tenuority!” Little did he know, but he invented a wonderful new word!

**Long:** I would have to say my war stories have more to do with fighting for budget dollars than anything else. These experiences, down through the years, have melded into one blob of a saga without separate episodic lines. The constant drive to keep HR at the table and to be seen as an important function that supports the most important resource is a never-ending string of battles.

**Looking back, is there anything you would have done differently in your career?**

**Fortunato:** Obviously, I wasn’t perfect. However, I enjoy a positive attitude, so I considered every transaction as a positive experience to learn from. I was lucky to be in an organization that supported what we did. I worked hard for that support. While there were bumps in the road, I can’t think of anything that makes me wish I could turn back the clock.

**Long:** I don’t think I would have done anything differently. Throughout my career, I have always benefited from the presence of people who have been there to support me in ways that I would never have imagined. Opportunities for growth and development have been plentiful, and for that, I am so thankful.

**Do you have any advice for those just starting their higher ed HR career?**

**Fortunato:** As part of my consulting work, I had occasion to speak with many groups of employees about their opinions of their institution’s HR function. From their responses, I found these attributes to be most important for HR professionals: (1) have a sense of urgency; (2) pay attention to the “little things” (like returning phone calls in a timely manner, answering e-mails, keeping promises, etc., as those things determine your image); (3) be visible — get out of your office and visit the areas and workplaces you serve; (4) be a “can-do” person and be fair in all that you do; (5) make sure that your administration understands your dedication to maximum employee productivity and minimal costs; (6) be inquisitive; and (7) always strive to broaden your knowledge base.

**Long:** View your job as an integral strategic element that’s critical to the success of the organization. Read everything you can get your hands on about HR, as well as anything related to social sciences, business, HR law, organizational development and even history as it relates to leadership and management. Approach HR as a practice that you are continually striving to improve, and don’t ever think you know it all. Finally, look, listen and let your observations encourage you to innovation.

**Thomas:** Pursue best practices in HR by examining not only models in other institutions, but also outside of higher ed. Focus less on transactional activities and more on strategic initiatives and strategic planning. Use metrics in evaluating effectiveness and successes. Develop close partnerships with vice presidents and deans, and be visible to leaders throughout your organization and serve as an internal consultant to them.

Are your Stars Ready to Fly?

With turnover low and a large pool of talent available, some institutions are unaware that there is a new war forming: the War for Stars. High performers and staff with scarce skills are in demand and are seizing opportunities outside of your institution.

To win this War for Stars, employers need to create a performance culture that attracts, retains and rewards these stars.

Sibson has the research, experience, and expertise to help you become a magnet for star talent, making your organization a winner in today’s competitive staffing environment.

To learn how to become a talent magnet and win the War for Stars, contact Kelly Jones, Senior Vice President and Higher Education Practice Leader at 216.687.4434 or kjones@sibson.com, or visit us at: www.sibson.com/stars
Cultivating Labor Peace With Adjunct Faculty

By Carmen Plaza de Jennings and Jayne Benz Chipman
The wave of media attention highlighting the working conditions of adjunct professors in academia across the nation is difficult to miss these days. Even Congress has become involved. The House Education and Workforce Committee (HEWC) recently issued what has been heralded as Congress’ first report on the state of adjuncts in America. The HEWC’s report, *The Just-In-Time Professor*, concluded that “[i]n short, adjuncts and other contingent faculty likely make up the most highly educated and experienced workers on food stamps and other public assistance in the country.”

With news like this, it is easy to think that the problems are insurmountable, unionization of adjunct faculty is inevitable, and labor peace is not attainable. But think again. There are a number of actions that can be taken — not all of them costly or big — to cultivate labor peace with adjuncts.

Substandard working conditions have historically provided fertile ground for labor unions to organize workers, and adjuncts are proving to be no exception. HR professionals and other college and university administrators who work with non-unionized faculty are faced with a seemingly impossible dilemma in the academic world where freedom of thought and action are accepted and valued — how to maintain a union-free workplace without being perceived in the public eye as anti-union. Indeed, one university earned special mention in the HEWC’s report for hiring a reputedly “anti-union” law firm to represent its interests to fight the organizing campaign mounted by its 1,400 part-time, non-tenured faculty. Likewise, the HEWC’s report highlighted another institution’s refusal to recognize and bargain with its adjunct union.

Successfully navigating the fine line between union-free and anti-union can be done, but it requires forethought, enlightenment, diplomacy and common sense on the part of the administration.

**The Growth of Adjunct Union Organizing**

The challenges faced by non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty (more commonly referred to as adjuncts, part-timers or contingent faculty) are not new in U.S. academia. Lower pay than tenured or tenure-track colleagues, lack of benefits, unpredictable work schedules with no real job security or upward mobility, little or no voice in shared governance, and an overall perceived or actual lack of respect have long been the hallmarks of adjuncts’ issues. These challenges are not unique to any particular size or type of college or university. Institutions large and small, public and private, two-year and four-year and beyond, all have increasingly come to rely upon a contingent faculty workforce. This growth in academia’s reliance on a temporary, flexible, on-call faculty workforce with unpredictable schedules — a “just-in-time” workforce — mirrors the current trend in the general U.S. labor market.

What is new, however, is the widespread public attention that adjunct labor issues — both fact and fiction — have garnered in recent years through media (and now Congress). Editorials, commentary and blogs have enabled adjuncts and their advocates to develop a unified voice across institutions, regions and the country. It has also placed a collective “human” face on adjunct struggles that has aided union organizers. This increased attention has spurred increased adjunct union organization.

The increase in adjunct faculty organizing efforts has also been fueled by simple mathematics — the significant increase in the adjunct ranks while the tenure track continues to shrink. Adjuncts have long been part of existing collective bargaining units comprised primarily of full-time faculty at some institutions. However, that landscape is changing. Full-time faculty who are unionized tend to be represented in large part by one of two unions well-known in academia — the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers. Additionally, some chapters of the influential American Association of University Professors engage in collective bargaining on behalf of professors.

These established faculty representatives have been criticized by some adjunct advocates of bending to the interests of full-time professors at the expense of a growing majority of part-timers. Consequently, some adjuncts are now gravitating toward other labor unions that have been more closely associated with blue collar and public service workers than college professors. Adjuncts are also forming bargaining units comprised solely of members of their part-time ranks. Most prominently, the Service Employees International Union’s “Adjunct Action” regional campaign has successfully targeted adjuncts at private colleges and universities in different metropolitan areas such as Boston, the Washington, D.C.-metro area and Los Angeles.

**The Shift Toward a “Just-In-Time” Professorate**

The HEWC report, relying on a variety of different research studies and the responses from its own eForum conducted in November 2013, highlights the dramatic changes to the faculty workforce across all higher education institutions during the past several decades.
acknowledging that the eforum — wherein contingent faculty across the country were invited to comment via e-mail on their working conditions — was neither scientific nor comprehensive, the hewc noted that the responses were nevertheless consistent with news reports and other research on the topic of adjunct working conditions. the report presents the following picture:

- the number of part-time faculty increased more than 300 percent between 1975 and 2011;
- adjuncts made up 20 percent of all higher education faculty in 1970, and comprise half of higher education faculty today;
- the trends in adjunct faculty pay, benefits and working conditions are consistent across all institution types;
- median adjunct pay for a three-credit course is $2,700;
- adjuncts would need to teach nearly 17 courses per year to earn wages comparable to a full-time faculty member (researchers consider a full load to be eight courses per academic year);
- only 22.6 percent of adjunct faculty have access to benefits through their academic employer; and
- unionized adjuncts earn 25 percent more per course than non-unionized adjuncts.

foreshadowing potential government intervention at some future date, the hewc noted that “[t]he link between student outcomes and contingent faculty working conditions — not just the adjuncts’ schedules and compensation but the respect and professional support they receive from their schools — deserves serious scrutiny from the [HEWC] and other policymakers around the country, as well as from institutions of higher education themselves.”

by getting to know and understand the precise nature of adjunct issues beyond the general complaints regarding compensation, benefits and job security, you’ll be able to take steps to address the issues that could push employees to organize.

institutions that have the forethought and insight to confront and address the often tough issues of their “just-in-time” faculty in advance of a union organizing campaign, to the extent possible within an institution’s budget and academic culture, stand the best chance of maintaining adjunct labor peace. taking the following actions will place your institution in the best position for achieving this goal.

get to know your institution’s adjunct faculty
you know you have them, but do you really know who they are? all too frequently, institutions do not truly focus on adjuncts beyond the sheer numbers. institutions should have a broader understanding of their adjunct workforce and the role it plays within their academic departments. this means developing an understanding of the individuals comprising this contingent of your faculty. while each institution may do this differently, the types of information to gather at a minimum include name, date of hire, classes taught for the institution (including years, credit hours and compensation), annual earnings and benefits, and employee grievances and the topics of those grievances.

if possible, the extent to which adjuncts teach at other colleges or universities should also be ascertained as part of this review. this type of information can provide valuable insight into issues of comparability and adjuncts’ expectations at your institution. moreover, it will enable your institution to critique how it is utilizing adjuncts. beyond the initial review, a process for updating the data on a quarterly or semester basis should be part of the overall plan.
**Take the Pulse of Your Adjunct Faculty**

In addition to gathering facts about the individuals comprising your adjunct faculty workforce, it is critical to periodically take the pulse of this faculty contingent. This means proactively gathering information from key administrators and managers such as deans and department chairs regarding current workplace issues, employee grievances, operational needs and efficiencies, and potential political landmines that all too often are not evident from the more passive review of paper and data alone. It also means obtaining input from the adjuncts themselves. Only by truly getting to know and understand the precise nature of the issues beyond the general complaints regarding compensation, benefits and job security, will you be able to take steps to address issues that, if left unaddressed, could push employees to organize.

You may find out through this process that certain anticipated problem issues are not as problematic for the majority of adjuncts at your institution as you initially think. More significantly, you will often find other important problem areas that are not on your radar, or have been misjudged or overlooked. Even if your institution is not able or willing to provide all the remedies adjunct employees are seeking, having an ability to credibly and constructively discuss problem areas with a solid command of the facts will help diminish a perception that there is a lack of interest and respect for adjunct issues and concerns.

**Assess/Update Existing Policies and Practices**

One thing employees typically seek through union representation is improvement in workplace policies and practices. The time to review (and revise) your adjunct policies and practices — written or otherwise — is in advance of an organizing campaign. In cases where policies are not in writing, serious consideration should be given to doing so. Well-written policies have the benefit of providing clear guidance and stability on key issues in the employer-employee relationship, something that is frequently a goal of collective bargaining. Key insight for the creation and/or revision of adjunct policies should be gained by your efforts to take the pulse of the adjunct workforce. Additionally, obtaining input in the process directly from your institution’s adjunct faculty should assist in fostering a sense of respect and inclusion that adjunct faculty frequently report is lacking in their institution.

Examples of some of the types of policies that are typically of keen interest to adjuncts and their advocates that should be included in your review are listed below. To the extent that your institution does not presently have written policies for adjuncts on these topics, consideration should be given to the impact that having such policies would have on fostering labor peace:

- Standards for adjunct contract appointment, renewal, evaluation, reemployment preference and dismissal;
- The adjunct course assignment process, including scheduling, timing and manner of notification of assignments, effect of class cancellation/low course enrollment, and full-time faculty overload issues;
- Non-classroom expectations for adjuncts such as office hours, student advising and supervision, research, department meeting attendance/participation requirements, and the role of part-time faculty in shared governance and committees;
- Compensation and benefits (if any);
- Adjunct access to office space, computers/technology and administrative support; and
- Professional development support and opportunities.

**Gain an Outside Perspective**

Your campus and adjuncts do not exist in a vacuum. Up-to-date comparability data is a key component to achieving labor peace. Therefore, it is essential to ascertain how your college or university compares to similar institutions in terms of adjunct compensation, benefits, contract renewal, professional support, participation in shared governance, and other issues of importance to this segment of your workforce. Data (such as CUPA-HR’s Per-Course Faculty Salary Survey), policies, and even collective bargaining agreements from comparable institutions are a good place
to find the information that can provide this important perspective. Although the needs and cultures of individual colleges and universities will differ, collective bargaining agreements and policies at other institutions can prove to be invaluable models for consideration of what may and may not work for your faculty and institution. Beyond the review of documentation, you should also speak with your colleagues at the comparable institutions to discuss their experiences, issues and resolutions.

Learn From Labor Organizations
A tremendous amount of valuable information about adjunct issues can be gleaned from labor organizations themselves, by reviewing labor organization websites and conducting a simple Internet search.

Align Adjunct Interests With Management
Under federal labor law applicable to private colleges and universities, faculty members who exercise absolute authority over academic matters have been precluded from joining a union. Faculty members who formulate and effectuate management policies by expressing and making operative decisions of their employer are considered members of management under what is known as the Yeshiva exemption.

While most adjunct faculty will not typically qualify as management under Yeshiva, taking steps to more fully align adjuncts with management by increasing integration into the institution's shared governance will increase their sense of investment in the institution. The more fully integrated with the institution and management adjunct faculty become, the less likely it may be that they will seek union representation. Including adjunct faculty in shared governance where appropriate, and other academic and policy committees, is one way to achieve better integration and buy-in of adjunct faculty to the mission of your institution.

Be Proactive
Ultimately, employees who feel that they are respected by management, treated fairly, and adequately compensated and valued are less likely to think that they need to organize to bring about desired change. Institutions that take the time upfront to understand this important human dynamic, do careful review and planning and develop a conscientious approach to making the types of short-term and long-term changes that are meaningful to their “just-in-time” professors will increase their chances of labor peace without union intervention.

Carmen Plaza de Jennings, Esq., is a partner in the San Francisco Office of Hirschfeld Kraemer LLP. Her practice includes representation of higher education institutions in all areas of labor and employment law, including labor negotiations with faculty unions on adjunct faculty issues. She can be reached at cpdjennings@hkemploymentlaw.com.

Jayne Benz Chipman, Esq., is a senior associate in the San Francisco Office of Hirschfeld Kraemer LLP. Her practice includes representing colleges and universities in labor, employment and a broad range of legal matters. She can be reached at jchipman@hkemploymentlaw.com.

Case Study
Human resources at Villanova University has partnered with academic affairs to improve the hiring process for faculty, which includes providing support to adjuncts. Learn more about the partnership and HR’s role at blog.cupahr.org/faculty-talent-management.
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University of California, San Diego is one of 10 campuses in the University of California system. With a total campus enrollment of more than 29,000 undergraduate and graduate students, UC San Diego employs more than 20,000 faculty and staff, making it the second largest employer in San Diego, behind the U.S. federal government. Amid the astonishing growth and ascendant academic reputation of UC San Diego, the total funding provided by the state of California today represents 6.6 percent of the university’s operating budget, compared to close to 40 percent 25 years ago.

Like most other departments on campus, human resources has felt the belt tightening — between 2007 and 2013, HR saw a budget reduction of more than $3.5 million, and staffing was slashed from 91 to 63 FTE. In the midst of the continuing budget crisis, the HR management team met to address three fundamental questions:

• What services are we capable of continuing to deliver?
• How do we respond in the short term to the budgetary challenges?
• What is our long-term strategy for delivering exemplary service?

We quickly determined that there were several programmatic initiatives that could be eliminated, but the reality was that customer expectations for HR services were escalating. Therefore, reduction of services was simply not an option. We had to get creative.

A Novel Approach

The solution we identified? Entrepreneurism. Entrepreneurism represented both a short-term strategy and a long-term vision for ongoing strengthening of HR’s service delivery and for providing sustainable funding streams to support the department’s operations and development of staff. Specifically, systems, services and programs that HR had developed or was planning to develop would be the “products” that would be offered for purchase to other UC campuses, other universities and research institutions with affiliations or close working relationships with UC San Diego. Early on, it was decided that two key principles would drive our entrepreneurial strategy: (1) HR must deliver highly regarded services to the campus (HR’s primary customers) before offering these services to other universities and organizations, and (2) there can be no decline in service excellence to HR’s primary customer, the UC San Diego campus, resulting from efforts devoted to the provision of services to other organizations.

In establishing the strategic plan for our entrepreneurial efforts, decisions had to be made pertaining to the choice of products, services and customer markets along with a realistic assessment of time and effort that would need to be invested. The process for the selection and marketing of our products began with a review of what we considered to be our “best practices” that could be adapted easily by other organizations. Rather than relying on our own assessment of identifying best practice services, it was critical that we review UC San Diego customer feedback.

Our department has used performance metrics and customer feedback mechanisms for many years to continuously focus on improving business processes and customer service. Among the tools that we use to assess service delivery are an annual customer satisfaction survey, an annual work climate survey, point-of-service surveys, benchmarking metrics and campus advisory councils. Seven of the 10 HR department divisions measured on the 2013 survey are in the highest rated category of “excellent,” while each of the three remaining divisions are in the next highest category of “good,” and very close to pushing into the “excellent” category. Additionally, of the 50 campus business units measured by the survey, eight of the top 10 are in the HR department. HR is also the highest rated campus department for the annual climate survey.

Selling Our Services

Based on customer satisfaction data and other customer input, we identified the products and services that would be most feasible for us to leverage to generate revenue. Our business case was built upon deploying our most successful...
and adaptable products to work environments with HR needs similar to those of UC San Diego.

Executive Recruitment Service
In 2007, our department established an in-house executive search service in response to the more than $1 million that the campus was spending annually on outside search firms. Starting with one recruiter and then adding a second based on growing demand for service, 183 campus recruitments were completed during the past seven years with over $3.3 million in savings when compared to typical fees charged by search firms.

Recognizing that other UC campuses and other universities would have similar staffing needs, our Executive Recruitment Service was marketed outside of UC San Diego through HR’s professional and peer contacts. This service has completed 56 successful searches for organizations outside of UC San Diego during the past four years. A key selling point for this service is that searches are conducted for fees that are roughly a third of what is paid to outside executive search firms. The recruiters’ expertise in handling higher education searches allows them to effectively source and build pools of strong candidates for similar opportunities at other UC campuses and other universities.

HireOnline
This online applicant tracking system was built in-house by HR staff to effectively support, recruit and streamline the staff hiring process at UC San Diego. Subsequent to the system being demonstrated for other universities, requests to purchase the system have been growing steadily. The system is built exclusively for higher education. Thus, establishing custom features to the system is accomplished easily based on hiring process standards found at many large research universities.

Our business case was built upon deploying our most successful and adaptable products to work environments with HR needs similar to those of UC San Diego.

JDOnline
This electronic job description system was also developed within HR and complements the HireOnline system. Job descriptions can be built from scratch in a matter of minutes. The system provides a viewable library of current and previous job descriptions, tracks changes to positions, maintains the history of positions, and enhances the speed with which job descriptions are routed and classified. Like HireOnline, JDOnline is based on classification process standards found at many large research universities.

Mentor–Mentee Matching System
UC San Diego has a robust mentorship program that pairs staff who wish to serve as mentors to staff seeking mentors. The online matching system, developed within our department, is another tool that has been purchased on a fee-for-service basis by other organizations.

Temporary Employment Services (TES)
HR has provided UC San Diego with in-house temporary placement services for more than 20 years. During the past decade, the service has grown from providing what were primarily clerical and support positions to a variety of service, technical, healthcare and financial management positions. Over the past several years, TES has reached out to other research institutions adjacent to UC San Diego that have many of the same staffing needs that TES fills. The efficiency of an easy billing process and access to a pool of well qualified temporary workers have been major benefits cited by customers for using the service.

E-learning
Online learning as a staff development tool has grown in popularity at UC San Diego due to its convenience and flexibility. Examples of e-learning that we have marketed to other organizations include two major learning tutorials: the Culturally Competent Management Program and Succession Planning. The content for both of these courses was developed by HR and produced using an outside vendor. Both courses are attracting a great deal of interest from other organizations.

Background Checks
To address escalating costs for campus background checks, including pre-employment criminal conviction record checks conducted by an outside service provider, HR
established its own background check service. Using technology that permits digitally scanned fingerprints to be electronically transmitted to the California Department of Justice and the FBI, we provide the service to campus departments. In the 18 months since its launch, $50,000 in savings has been realized by UC San Diego compared to fees charged by the previous service provider. During the past year, we’ve begun conducting background checks for campus affiliates and area research institutes on a fee-for-service basis. Business has been brisk.

Outcomes
HR’s entrepreneurial efforts have generated significant revenue for the department — nearly $1 million — since the services for a fee were launched two and a half years ago. HR department positions have been restored, none of which are devoted to revenue generation activities. Training and development opportunities that had been frozen due to funding cuts have been re-established and program resources have been boosted from the funding provided by the revenue. By seeking progressive and creative solutions to serve our customers and produce revenue, our business processes have been streamlined and made more efficient. As a result, HR department staffing levels, while still not optimal, will not need to return to their former levels to provide exemplary service.

HR performance results have also improved since the inception of our revenue generation initiatives, upholding the principle of delivering proven successful services to UC San Diego campus customers with no decline in service excellence. We use many of the same measures to assess customer satisfaction with UC San Diego campus customers as well as customers from other organizations. Like any business, poor service will doom the enterprise, so success should be defined in advance based on the outcomes the customer hopes to achieve. Measures of success need to be used accordingly by the service provider as a form of self-accountability.

Lessons Learned
While management of our entrepreneurial initiatives is evolving, there are a number of lessons we’ve learned that are guiding our future plans:

- Revenue generating initiatives targeting outside customers often require approval from multiple organizational entities — receiving the green light from offices such as technology transfer, risk management, legal and the controller, among others, may be required before going outside the organization to offer services for a fee. There also may be political and/or regulatory issues to consider in determining whether entrepreneurial ventures should be pursued.

- Start small and don’t overcommit resources — begin with one or two resources or services that have a proven track record on campus before venturing outside. It’s much easier to gradually increase efforts than to be overly ambitious and retreat from commitments to outside organizations.

- Assess expansion of services carefully — continuously review whether expansion of services to other organizations is supported by internal resources that are sustainable.

- Take a balanced approach to pricing services — careful market research will help determine pricing that will offer a discount over competitors but still produce a fair return.

- There is a greater return on investment in providing products/services that are easily adaptable to other organizations’ needs — simply, the less labor intensive the processes of providing the product by the producer and implementing the product by the customer, the greater the return on investment for both parties. Continuous internal process improvement supports success with external customers.

Above all, we’ve learned that entrepreneurship is a strategy that can not only generate revenue, but also improve services, programs and processes within an organization. As we continue to explore new avenues for bringing in revenue, our efforts will be shaped by embracing internal organizational excellence as the engine that drives excellence with customers outside the organization.

Thomas R. Leet is assistant vice chancellor for human resources at University of California, San Diego. He can be reached at tleet@ucsd.edu.
“An organization mired in complicated processes and short-term results is simply not in a position to encourage innovation, no matter how many new programs its leaders talk about or implement, or how often they demand innovation from their employees.”

“An organization that empowers its people to think critically, question relentlessly and act boldly is by default an innovative organization, the kind that will own the future.”

“As the speed of change increases and demand for results continues to grow, critical thinking in all its forms — questioning, creating, inventing, exploring — too often takes a backseat to efficiency, output and short-term ROI.”

“No, too many CEOs and executives … insist that employees try to build on bad things rather than allowing them to tear down the bad and do something new … [Employees] eventually become complacent zombie workers, repeating the same thing day after day, lacking any incentive to be innovative.”
These are insights from someone who makes innovation her life’s work. As founder and chief executive officer of innovation research and training firm futurethink, Lisa Bodell helps companies and organizations worldwide harness their power of innovation by breaking out of their comfort zones and embracing the “what ifs.” She’s all about rocking the boat, breaking the mold and empowering organizations and their people to question the status quo, experiment with new ways of doing business and embrace change. Ahead of the CUPA-HR annual conference this fall, where we’re pleased to welcome Bodell as a keynote speaker, we sat down with her to talk about innovation and change — and how easily we can help shape the future of our organizations if we’re simply open to shaking things up a bit.

Q: What exactly does innovation mean and how is it different from creativity?
A: Creativity thinks up new things but innovation does them. Creativity is about the idea and innovation is about the execution. Most people have ideas, but far less see them through. Frankly, coming up with ideas is the easy part; building them into valuable concepts — that make money or change lives or improve situations or however you define “value” — is much harder. Creativity involves strategic thinking, curiosity, imagination — all of which are important. But an innovator goes above and beyond that. Among an innovator’s inherent traits are agility, resilience (to see an idea through even when they incur setbacks), and the ability to execute the idea. In short, innovation is more than just creativity.

Q: Can innovative thinking be taught or developed in an organization? What are some simple ways to foster innovation in the workplace?
A: We all have the innate ability to be innovative, we just have to know how to tap into that part of our brains. To help employees explore their innovative sides, organizational leaders must give them the freedom to think big, reinforce the notion that no idea is too “out there,” and make sure every idea is acknowledged and considered. Leaders must create opportunities for collaboration, showcase and applaud change agents in the organization, and lead by example. Even something as simple as killing rules, updating or eliminating antiquated processes, or getting rid of things that don’t work well can spur innovation and open the door for long-lasting change.

Q: You say that innovation is tied to optimism. How so?
A: People can’t be innovative if they’re always skeptical, and in many organizations, there are lots of what I call “professional skeptics,” whose first reaction to a new way of doing something or a new way of thinking about something is not to be open and objective but instead to rattle off all the reasons that idea won’t work. When that kind of pessimistic or negative behavior is prevalent in an organization, ideas don’t get a fair chance. We have to choose to be open to change, and when we are, we’ll be able to see more scenarios and more possibilities. If we’re not optimistic, there’s no way we’ll see the potential of innovative change.

Q: What characteristics are common in organizations that have developed a culture of continuous and widespread innovation?
A: Innovative organizations boast strategic imagination, resilience and agility. They know what innovation will do for them and where it will take them. Organizations that are NOT innovative are the ones that are too complex; the ones that are content with doing things the way they’ve always been done; the ones that are mired in meetings and processes — and because of this, people aren’t inspired … in fact, they’re actually demotivated. In addition to the “negative” mindsets that exist in organizations, there seem to be two types of mindsets in the work world that people view as more positive and therefore more innovative — “let’s be agreeable” and “let’s be different.”

The mistake is: agreeable is not innovative. Sure, these organizational cultures are polite, and they get ideas to market, but they tend not to be more than incremental ideas — new colors, new features, new improvements. Whereas really innovative organizations know that having contrast — even conflict — can be a good thing and lead to better and bigger innovations that upend the playing field.

Q: You talk a lot about change agents in relation to innovation. What are some characteristics of a change agent?
A: A change agent stands out in the crowd. By nature, a change agent goes against the status quo, but in a good way. A change agent has strategic imagination — he or she is not just a dreamer, but a dreamer with purpose … someone who dares to be curious. A change agent is open to change — someone who actually listens to and thinks
through new ideas and new ways of doing things. A change agent is agile — able to pivot, able to change course when he or she is met with changes in plans. A change agent is resilient when met with adversity and resistance and sees things through and doesn’t give up on the vision. A change agent is provocative and knows how to ask questions to shake up thinking and challenge the status quo.

**Q: How can an individual develop into an effective change agent within his or her organization?**

**A:** Everyone is capable of creating change, and the best way to start is through “little bigs” — simple changes that can make a big difference inside an organization. I encourage leaders to start small and do things to encourage innovation within themselves and others — gain critical trust and credibility, then go from there. Examples of “little bigs” could be things like killing rules or unnecessary meetings, asking provocative but productive questions, getting people out of the office to see new things, encouraging people to network with others within the organization to learn new things, inviting “outsiders” to your brainstorms. Just start small, and see where that takes you.

**Q: How can change agents be successful in an environment that is resistant to change?**

**A:** In a conservative environment like academia, it’s better to take small steps than to go all out — people will be more comfortable moving toward change than being thrown into the middle of it. Let them experience it in small ways. Get some small, piloted things in place so people will know that organizational leadership is on board with change and that it really can happen. Show, don’t tell. Sometimes it’s easier to ask forgiveness than to seek permission! Pilot things — somebody has to start somewhere, so why not you? But don’t make people feel as if they have to change overnight; simply help them stretch.

**Q: What would you say are the biggest contributing factors to success when it comes to change and innovation in an organization?**

**A:** First, the purpose of innovation must be defined in a visionary, inspiring way (not just in terms of ROI). This is what gets people motivated to participate in innovation in the first place. For example, you don’t want to be the learning institution that “innovates to make the most money in the world, bar none;” you want to be “the most innovative learning institution that helps people reach their personal potential and transform their lives” — see? There is a big difference.

Second, the change must be leader-supported. We often teach senior managers that they need to lead by example when it comes to innovation — to provoke, to ask questions, to take smart risks, to encourage experimentation. And finally, people must be empowered to carry out the change and be innovative in doing so. If you tell them to be innovative and then never execute an idea, don’t provide sufficient funding, or don’t let people contribute, the initiative will simply die. Unless these key tenets of change happen, innovation is nothing more than lip service.

To hear more from Lisa Bodell, plan to join us September 28-30 in San Antonio, Texas, for the CUPA-HR Annual Conference and Expo 2014 (see www.cupahr.org/conference2014 for details). Make sure to also check out her new book, *Kill the Company: End the Status Quo, Start an Innovation Revolution.*
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Creating the Leaders of the Future:
Integrating Diversity and Leadership Development

By Alice Miller and Jon Derek Croteau

Despite concerted efforts to increase diversity in the leadership ranks in higher education, such diversity is still lacking. The representation of women, people of color and LGBTQ individuals in top administrative and academic roles typically does not reflect the demographics of the students and communities these institutions serve. This is of great concern if colleges and universities are going to exemplify their missions of providing rich, multidimensional, multicultural, equitable educational experiences.

Why are diversity efforts falling short? One reason is that many initiatives designed to cultivate leadership diversity are often too narrowly conceived. Such initiatives may, for instance, promote a diverse, inclusive environment but not go the extra mile to help individuals — let’s call them “diverse high-potentials” — obtain the tools they need to build leadership capabilities and portfolios over time. In such instances, leadership diversity initiatives consist of well-intentioned policies but little more.

We believe that leadership diversity must derive from deliberate, sustained leadership development for these high-potentials, an idea that higher education institutions are beginning to embrace. In our experience, recruiting diverse leaders from the outside is an uncertain and expensive proposition given the small pool of qualified candidates and the fierce competition for executives who are considered “diverse.” Thus, creative and comprehensive internal professional development initiatives are critical.

A Connective Context

Leadership development is no easy task even when diversity is not factored in — it is a challenge and concern across all industries. Identifying and preparing the next generation of great leaders is a current obsession in the corporate world, for example, as the “war for talent” rages. In The Leadership Pipeline, authors Ram Charan, Stephen Drotter and James Noel outline the roots of the problem as follows:

“Many companies are failing to develop leadership bench strength and day-to-day leadership effectiveness. Leading-edge development programs, no matter how well-designed, aren’t sufficient to achieve these goals. What’s lacking is a connective context. In other words, the connection between leadership development training programs, succession planning, performance management and rewards is tenuously defined at best. In most companies, human resources orchestrates these activities, and the various groups responsible for them compete for resources, management attention and power. Human resources efforts are rarely integrated.”

This scenario likely resonates with higher education HR professionals, especially in regards to resource challenges and the difficulty of integrating various critical efforts when overarching support from the president and other
senior administrators is lacking. To secure management attention and improve the success of leadership development efforts, Charan, Drotter and Noel espouse the “pipeline” methodology, which strives to identify and create strong leaders throughout organizations via a formal, integrated, sustained approach. A critical assertion the authors make is that the success of executives is based upon years of accumulated skills and expertise. Leaders are not born, nor are they made overnight. Good leaders are years in the making and have had a wealth of experiences at multiple levels of one or more organizations in order to prepare them for top posts.

It is not enough, for example, to recruit and hire faculty and low-level administrators and assume that, over time, they will ripen and become ready for greater responsibilities. To build effective leadership at all levels, organizations need to:

- Identify high-potential leadership candidates early;
- Provide them with growth assignments;
- Give useful feedback;
- Coach and mentor them; and
- Offer or facilitate leadership development courses and curricula.

Doing so requires dedicated time and resources, and yet the point of a pipeline-oriented leadership development approach is that it encourages a “grow” vs. “buy” mentality, which pays dividends in the long run.

Let’s take a look at how this approach might work for someone in a first-time managerial position within higher education — a department chair, say. As a novice supervisor, this individual is not just taking on more responsibility; she or he needs to approach work differently. This includes reallocating time to complete her or his own work and oversee the work of others; valuing managerial work and viewing it as mission-critical; and ensuring that others are fulfilled and better at what they do.

There is something to be said for baptism by fire, but first-time managers — especially those that have traveled an academic track most of their careers — need organizational support to grow and develop as leaders, perhaps with the potential to one day assume senior positions.

**Diversity and Bench Strength**

The professional development approach aims to build bench strength throughout organizations, and many of the same activities it encourages — growth assignments, feedback, coaching and mentoring — can be applied to building a diverse bench. These activities also provide a fundamental element — motivation — for the success of leadership diversity efforts. Diverse leadership candidates themselves bear responsibility to explore and pursue career development opportunities at their disposal. Leadership diversity efforts require a coordinated commitment from both institutions and leadership candidates (and the groups who represent them). That is to say, these initiatives must be top-down and bottom-up.

But they should also have a lateral component — that is, initiatives must be integrated across departments, schools and even campuses. This alludes to the “connective context” of which Charan, Drotter and Noel write. Leadership candidates must see a tangible link between their efforts to develop themselves and similar efforts taking place all across campus. They must witness others’ successes and be able to envision a long-term career payoff for themselves.

Many leadership diversity efforts in higher education today stop short of establishing this context. They may, for example, go out of their way to recognize and support affiliate groups on campus and to reach out to diverse high-potentials, but fail to take the extra step of pursuing sustained, strategic leadership development.

**Going the Extra Mile**

Let’s use the example of an openly gay female faculty member who is named chair of the English department. The woman may see the occasion as an opportunity to launch her own career in administration, and to further LGBTQ and/or women’s issues and visibility in route. She may have grand ambitions. For its part, however, the institution may be content knowing that a “diverse” chair heads up a prominent department, taking it as a sign that its inclusivity and diversity efforts are working. But that’s really just the start.
begins of supporting the development of the leader — facilitating the mindset shift described earlier in valuing and embracing managerial work. It’s a particularly challenging shift to make for a faculty member accustomed to near absolute autonomy in her work. And yet it may be a transformation she is eager to undergo after years in the classroom.

So while the institution may have identified a diverse high-potential in its ranks, it needs to go the extra mile to help the chair move up the administrative ladder. Examples of what an institution might provide in this instance include:

**Growth assignments** — participating in or chairing campus-wide committees; spearheading policy or program development; representing the institution at important functions or in media opportunities; engaging in community outreach or fundraising on the school’s behalf.

**Feedback** — focused performance reviews; one-on-one interviews with HR or other institutional representatives; regular, formal mentoring sessions; engagement with career coaches and advisors; leadership assessments that identify strengths and potential career derailers.

**Training and coaching** — one-on-one coaching from professional consultants; funding for general leadership development programs (e.g., Center for Creative Leadership, ACE Leadership Academy for Department Chairs) and diversity-oriented leadership programs and organizations (e.g., Stanford’s Executive Program for Women Leaders).

It is important to reiterate that, to be truly effective in developing leadership capabilities, the above activities must be sustained, coordinated and cumulative.

**Promising Practices**

There are colleges and universities adopting progressive, integrated programs to ensure that leaders such as the hypothetical English chair described above get the development support they need. Institutions are building programs that combine sophisticated diversity initiatives with leadership development — striving to incorporate other “connective” elements such as succession planning, performance management and rewards. They are then tying these efforts to their institutions’ high-level strategic planning.

**Recruiting diverse leaders from the outside is an uncertain and expensive proposition given the small pool of qualified candidates and the fierce competition for executives who are considered “diverse.” Thus, internal leadership development initiatives are critical.**

At last fall’s CUPA-HR annual conference in Las Vegas, the association’s diversity, equity and inclusion committee hosted a workshop highlighting promising practices that institutions are undertaking to improve the sophistication and effectiveness of diversity-related HR practices. The session emphasized that diversity efforts follow an “evolutionary path,” beginning at informational stages and progressing ultimately to a state of institutionalization and strategic integration. Leadership building is one core element.

One of the workshop presenters was Cheryl Cofield, director of culture, diversity and inclusion at Georgia Institute of Technology. Cofield walked the audience through her institution’s myriad diversity and inclusion programs, taking care to illustrate how various components, including those aimed at leadership development, are linked to broader people strategies, HR goals and institutional goals. The effort to marry leadership development to culture and inclusion is a critical work in progress, notes Cofield.

For example, the institute is just launching a new program focused on developing high-potential women leaders, but has experienced many tangible successes to date, including the recent formation of six diversity-related employee resource groups (ERGs) which have helped to identify more than 70 leadership development opportunities for participants. (To read more about Georgia Tech’s employee resource groups, see the article “A Roadmap for ERGs (With HR at the Wheel)” from the Fall 2013 issue of *The Higher Education Workplace* magazine – www.cupahr.org/ERG.)

Georgia Tech’s efforts focus on fostering transformation across the institution and enhancing the self-awareness,
cultural competence and “cultural dexterity” of top leaders. “With power comes awesome responsibility, and we’re helping leaders understand the tremendous impact they have on campus climate,” Cofield says.

Among the others on the event’s agenda, Lori Gentles, vice president for human resources, diversity and inclusion at California State University, Fullerton presented on the new division of diversity and inclusion within the university’s HR organization. (See the Inclusion Cultivates Excellence column on p. 9 to read more about this new venture.) And reinforcing the idea that higher education can learn from corporate diversity programs, John Basile, vice president of diversity and inclusion for Fidelity Investments, spoke about how the HR department at his firm has gotten buy-in from senior management for diversity and leadership development programs.

HR As Catalyst
The challenge for HR executives in higher education is to take progressive ideas regarding the development of diverse leadership and build unequivocal institutional support around them — to get academic and administrative leadership to, verbally and financially, champion leadership development. What follows are some critical steps HR can take:

Implore the president to establish leadership diversity as a priority and to set tangible goals towards achieving it. This will depend on what type of president is in office, but HR leaders can build their case on the premise that leadership diversity is critical to the institution’s mission and is achievable through creative, comprehensive programs.

Make leadership diversity a budget and resource priority. Serious and successful initiatives need money and people over an extended period of time.

Track diverse leaders as they develop and grow over time. Measures must be in place to intermittently reconnect with diverse high-potentials and ensure that they are progressing and have the career support they need.

Build continuous improvement into leadership diversity efforts. Ensure the institution is monitoring what’s working and what’s not, so that it can revise and improve upon past efforts.

If your institution has one, get the chief diversity officer involved. Surprisingly, CDOs are often not made an integral part of leadership development initiatives, which is certainly a missed opportunity.

Higher Education Leadership Development Programs

ACE Leadership Academy for Department Chairs
www.acenet.edu/leadership/programs/Pages/Leadership-Academy-for-Dept-Chairs.aspx

ACE Fellows Program
www.acenet.edu/leadership/programs/Pages/ACE-Fellows-Program.aspx

ACE Institute for New Chief Academic Officers
www.acenet.edu/leadership/programs/Pages/ACE-Institute-for-New-Chief-Academic-Officers.aspx

Advancement Leadership Academy
http://advancementleaders.org

Center for Creative Leadership
www.ccl.org/leadership/index.aspx

Council of Independent Colleges Senior Leadership Academy
www.cic.edu/meetings-and-events/Leadership-Development/Pages/Senior-Leadership-Academy.aspx

Harvard Graduate School of Education Management Development Program
www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/higher-education/portfolio/management-development.html

HERS Institutes
http://hersnet.org/institutes/what-are-the-institutes

Indiana Center for Philanthropy: Women’s Philanthropy Institute
www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/womens-philanthropy-institute

Rutgers University Center for Organizational Development and Leadership
www.odl.rutgers.edu

Stanford University Executive Program for Women Leaders
www.gsb.stanford.edu/exed/epwl

Stanford University Executive Program for Nonprofit Leaders
www.gsb.stanford.edu/gipr/epnl

http://hersnet.org/institutes/what-are-the-institutes
Final Thoughts
When executive candidates interview for open positions at colleges and universities, they are often asked the “diversity question,” which is typically a two-parter: “What is diversity and what does it mean to you?” It is not an easy question. How many of us can answer it eloquently, beyond what’s stated in our institution’s diversity statement? Yet it is a central question to the success of diversity initiatives — and specifically to those aimed at improving diversity among senior leadership. Unless human resources and institutional leaders take the question seriously and really explore its nuances, efforts to develop leadership diversity will continue to lag behind hopes and expectations.

We are collectively getting better at the first part — “What is diversity?” There is more of an appreciation today that diversity isn’t just about acknowledging and celebrating differences but about making sure any legitimate differentiating characteristic — age, race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, nationality, physical disability, speech or accent, and on and on — does not become a prohibiting factor in one’s ability to succeed. The acceptance of inclusion as a fundamental component of diversity has been an important, liberating step forward.

The second part of the diversity question — “What does it mean to you?” — is the key to improving leadership diversity programs. HR professionals can address this question through a commitment to more sophisticated and sustained initiatives to groom diverse leaders for future success. Higher ed seems at the cusp of recognizing not just the importance but also the value of diverse leadership, and many institutions are establishing models for building leadership teams that will one day — hopefully soon — reflect the constituencies they represent.

Alice Miller is a consultant in the higher education practice of the executive search firm Witt/Kieffer. She has more than 30 years of experience in higher education and is the former vice president of human resources for Emory University.

Jon Derek Croteau, Ed.D., is a senior partner with Witt/Kieffer and has written extensively on leadership development, including the books The People-First Approach and Making the Case for Leadership. Prior to joining Witt/Kieffer, he served as associate vice president for campaign planning and operations, which included HR and talent management, at Carnegie Mellon University.
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Faculty and staff engagement — in human resources, that can be one of the most difficult things to achieve, particularly during periods of change. As head of human resources for a health sciences university affiliated with an academic medical center, I saw the results in a series of faculty surveys we conducted that demonstrated a lack of alignment among leaders at the university and the medical center. Each perceived that the other was on a different path — and it seemed never the two should meet.

It was clear that in order to be successful, we needed to work together on the same team. And leadership agreed. Many departments would be involved, but HR played a key role in developing an incentive plan that would be tied to specific metrics, to drive the performance of all leaders toward achieving very specific strategic goals.

Metrics-based incentive plans are unusual in public higher education. And even more unusual was what Georgia Regents University (GRU) leadership would propose: a salary-at-risk model in which a specially selected pool of key leaders would contribute a certain percentage of their salary to the plan. They could then earn their contributions back — along with additional monies — if the organization met specific performance expectations.

It was a bold plan — and one that reflected the greater climate of transformation and culture change already occurring at the institution.

**Background**
Throughout its 186-year history, GRU has seen its share of transformation and change. In the early 1930s, it was saved from closure through an outpouring of support from the Augusta, Georgia community. Later, it became a department within the University of Georgia before returning to an independent entity in 1950 as the Medical College of Georgia within the University System of Georgia. The university and the hospital began operating...
separately in 2000 when the hospital was separated from the university as a 501(c)3 not-for-profit corporation. At the same time, a third entity managed the physician practices.

After nearly a decade under this operating system, the University System of Georgia board of regents determined that in order for the institution to become the next great health sciences university, its clinical and academic missions had to be aligned. When incoming President Ricardo Azziz signed the historic agreement on July 1, 2010, to formally create a unified structure for the university, the medical center and the physicians practice group, it was with the knowledge that a culture transformation had to happen. Along with the new structure came a new name: Georgia Health Sciences University (which would later become Georgia Regents University when the university consolidated with Augusta State University in 2013).

In addition, beginning in his first 90 days, President Azziz launched an enterprise-wide strategic planning initiative that sought solutions in four primary areas: educational excellence, research growth, clinical integration/development and workforce development. Workforce development was a key priority because the health system and university had vastly different cultures and pay scales. Stories about “overpaid” university administrators had even been highlighted in local media, which fueled negative community perceptions. While transforming the reward/recognition structure could not effect culture change on its own, it could play a key role in aligning teams and breaking down silos.

**Step One: Salary Review**

As the CHRO, I was tapped to help lead the rewards/recognition initiative for the university, along with leaders from the medical center and the finance and legal departments. A consulting firm was also brought on board. Prior to the integration of the clinical and academic enterprises, healthcare and university employees worked under a differing system of pay programs. While the health system already had a robust metrics-based incentive plan in place, the university — as is typical in public higher education — did not.

Our first task was to work with the consulting firm to conduct a survey of leaders’ pay levels relative to the market. Surprisingly, despite a public perception that university administrators were highly paid, that turned out not to be the case. Instead, there was wide disparity. For example, one leader employed by the medical center was earning in the 50th percentile of the market (with eligibility for a 25 percent bonus), while another who was employed by the university was at 80 percent of the 50th percentile, with no eligibility for bonus pay. Survey results also showed that a few leaders were being paid quite low relative to the market, so our first step was to bring everyone to a minimum competitive base pay level.

After aligning salaries across the university, medical center and physicians practice group, we found our next task far more challenging: designing a new incentive plan that could help further align leadership.

**Step Two: Plan Development**

While our consulting firm had numerous models of metrics-based incentive plans to draw from (from both the corporate sector and academia) — and President Azziz himself came from an incentive pay environment at Cedars-Sinai in Los Angeles — our cross-functional team worked with university leadership to take these ideas a step further.

One type of metrics-based plan, the salary-at-risk plan, calls for employees to invest a portion of their salaries back into the company and receive a return if the company meets certain metrics. While these types of plans are not common, there are examples: physician-owned practices, law firms, accounting firms and even sales teams may have some form of investment back into the company that delivers a return if the company performs well.

While these plans are even less common at universities, incoming Purdue University President Mitch Daniels made national news in the fall of 2013 when he requested that trustees lower his base pay and designate 30 percent to be at risk, based on his performance on a specific set of weighted goals. After much consideration, we identified a number of factors at our institution that made this type of plan feasible, including:

- Leadership support for the development of a salary-at-risk plan;
- Low pay relative to the market (if administrators were already compensated highly compared to the market, there would be no need for a salary-at-risk plan);
- Geographic proximity of the three entities being aligned, which allowed leaders to meet personally in developing the plan;
• No additional monies available from the state or from tuition to fund the plan, thus making a self-funded plan necessary; and

• The larger cultural transformation occurring with the integration of the clinical and academic enterprises, and the need to align leadership and break down silos.

Legal Factors
During early meetings, administrators raised an important question: Is a salary-at-risk plan like this even legal in a public institution? There was a perception among state employees that they could not be eligible for additional payments for work that they, in essence, were already being paid to accomplish. Administrators worried these payments might be viewed as a gratuity.

However, in consultation with our counsel, we determined a metrics-based incentive plan is legally permissible, as long as state institutions follow legal parameters that pertain to notification, fairness and consistent application. With that knowledge, we worked carefully to consider:

• Who is eligible to receive incentive payments under this plan?

• What are the specific metrics that must be achieved?

• Are we following state law and board of regents policy with regards to the parameters of this program?

• How will we appropriately notify those who are eligible for this plan?

Other factors also had to be taken into consideration. For example, it was important that we made sure our metrics fell within guidelines defined by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education and the Department of Education, as related to fundraising and enrollment. We also needed to ensure that participation in the plan would not negatively impact retirement contributions and that those whose pay was partially grant-funded could legally be eligible for the plan.

Our cross-functional team worked over the course of a year to develop the salary-at-risk policy and program. During that time, we identified a pool of more than 50 leaders who would invest a portion of their salary into the self-funded plan, engaged these stakeholders in plan development, and outlined both payout percentages and weights for each metric.

The Plan
We began the process by hosting a series of small group meetings with the pool of clinical and university leaders who would participate in the plan, including deans, associate/assistant vice presidents and, later, clinical department chairs. During our discussions, we found that while many leaders were supportive, many also had concerns. For example, one leader we spoke with was herself comfortable with the idea of performance-based metrics (as she was already familiar with the idea of performance-based metrics because her role at the institution involves data collection and planning to support change management), but she was concerned for the morale of administrators who would be asked to give up a portion of their salaries, and who had already been working tirelessly and without the benefit of salary increases for many years due to the state budget crisis.

The small group settings were key, as we were able to present a non-threatening open forum which facilitated discussion so that leaders could voice concerns without fear of being labeled a non-team player. We also held follow-up meetings so that leaders could see that their concerns and feedback were heard and incorporated in the plan design as well as within specific metrics. Although the goal of the meetings was not consensus, this feedback helped shape the overall plan as well as measure and improve readiness. It also began a process that senior leaders hoped to achieve with the salary-at-risk plan all along: aligning leadership around a common set of goals.

The fact that leaders would be staking 2.5 percent of their own base pay in the plan also forged a connection — and sent a strong message to the university community and the community at large. The amount was deliberately selected: “A rising tide lifts all boats” has become the new mantra, with the recognition that leaders will either all succeed together or all fail together, and leaders are focused on working together to succeed.
We keep participants on course toward a funded retirement.

What makes our approach to retirement readiness so effective is that it’s so personalized. At any time, participants can check their own retirement forecast to get an idea of whether they’re on course toward a funded retirement and, if not, what steps they can take to improve it. Think how much more engaged your participants would be with this kind of actionable guidance. To learn more, call 888-401-5826 or visit trsretire.com.
Lessons Learned

1. **Even small amounts of money can shape behavior and improve organizational effectiveness.** Focus on goals, teamwork and performance.

2. **The metrics matter.** Having an incentive plan required that we get much better at selecting metrics, setting goals and tracking and reporting progress.

3. **Leadership support is critical.** There were enough skeptics and distractions that without a determined leader, the salary-at-risk pay plan probably would not have happened.

4. **Readiness matters.** It takes longer than you think, but extended stakeholder engagement helps people get on board.

not so large as to discourage participants, but large enough to make an impact. If the organization achieved the threshold metrics defined for the goals, the participants would earn back their 2.5 percent contribution. If the organization achieved the target or high performance metrics for the goals, that achievement would reward the participants with an additional 2.5 percent or 5 percent, respectively.

The meetings also gave us an opportunity to familiarize university leadership with the concept of performance metrics (as compared to individual performance goals, which do not necessarily foster teamwork or overall institutional excellence). And it soon became clear that defining these appropriate, measurable metrics was just as important, if not more important, than the payout amounts. During the first year, leaders worked toward a short list of metrics that simply brought together existing health system metrics and added university-focused metrics. The system was not ideal; health system leaders were frustrated that they didn’t have the full opportunity to impact university metrics and vice versa.

But we listened — and even as some metrics were removed, others were added. Our current pay plan includes a robust, weighted set of metrics, including those that all leaders have a stake in, as well as more specific weighted measures for health system, university or enterprise-wide employees.

Lessons Learned

The plan is now in its third year, and “how are we doing on the metrics?” has become a common question in leadership meetings across the enterprise. Additional senior leaders have also become part of the program following a statewide consolidation of schools within the University System of Georgia, which brought together Georgia Health Sciences University and the proximate primarily undergraduate Augusta State University to create Georgia Regents University last year.

While the organization has achieved its metrics and the participating leaders have earned payouts, the plan’s true success lies in how it has fostered teamwork across the enterprise through not one, but two major consolidations of different workplace cultures. Prior to the development of an enterprise-wide, metrics-based, salary-at-risk plan, individuals’ focus tended primarily to be on their own areas and how they were performing, with less concern about their teammates.

“A rising tide lifts all boats” has become the new mantra, with the recognition that leaders will either all succeed together or all fail together, and leaders are focused on working together to succeed. A performance-driven culture is now in place, where leadership activities have become increasingly intentional and purposeful and our efforts are focused toward the achievement of the enterprise strategic goals.

As an example, Beth Brigdon, vice president for institutional effectiveness at GRU, points to one of the goals within Strategic Priority #2: Increase student retention, progression and graduation. “Those would be just words if we didn’t commit to them,” she says. “Putting them in our strategic plan is the first step in that commitment. Allocating budgetary resources to increase student success is the second part. And the capstone is including it in the performance pay plan. When the president endorses a goal and commits to a metric in the performance pay plan, we understand the importance and
the responsibility we all have in helping achieve that goal. We achieve alignment, and there’s a commitment all the way through the ranks.”

Although this type of salary-at-risk incentive plan is highly unique, it can succeed, particularly in the circumstance where a major cultural transformation is already occurring. As higher education continues to look for ways to trim costs, more universities and systems across the nation are contemplating the benefits of consolidating. These systems are also increasingly looking at new business models and performance-based metrics to ensure accountability.

In the end, whether or not a university is looking to adopt a salary-at-risk model like GRU’s or a simple performance measure model, compensation can be a powerful tool to assist in culture change — and it does not necessarily require large amounts of money. However, in order to create a new way of measuring and operating (particularly in a more traditional educational environment), it takes strong leadership and stakeholder engagement.

Also vital is sustained, persistent execution, including being thoughtful, deliberate and taking the appropriate time to ensure that performance indicators truly move an institution toward the path of achieving its mission and that you avoid unintended consequences. This also includes communication of progress against the metrics throughout the year and course corrections when necessary.

Ultimately, the project’s success can perhaps best be expressed by the words of one senior leader, who addressed his teammates with the following question and challenge: “If we can’t at least meet our threshold metrics and earn back our 2.5 percent, then what kind of leaders are we?”

Susan Norton is vice president for human resources at Georgia Regents University. She can be reached at snorton@gru.edu.

What do 1,000 colleges and universities have in common?

The HigherEdJobs Unlimited Posting Plan.

Make sure all your job openings get exposure to our network of 1 million monthly higher education professionals. At only $2,095-$5,995 a year (based on FTE employees), you’ll save thousands of dollars compared to print. Serving academia since 1996, our unlimited posting customers include every type of non-profit institution. And last year, 98 percent of the 1,000 schools on this plan renewed their account. Is your school one of them?
We’re constantly adding to our calendar of events – chapter meetings, region conferences, just-in-time webinars and more. Visit www.cupahr.org/events/calendar.aspx for a full listing.
Why Will You Attend?

Register in May to Join Your Peers September 28-30 for the CUPA-HR Annual Conference and Expo 2014

www.cupahr.org/SanAntonio
**Recommended Reading**

*Kill the Company* (**by Lisa Bodell**)

In today’s work world, process often trumps culture, and the very structures put in place to help organizations grow instead end up holding them back. In this book, Lisa Bodell asserts that now is the time to “kill the company,” move beyond the status quo, and start a revolution in how we think and work.

*Hear from Lisa Bodell at CUPA-HR’s Annual Conference and Expo 2014, September 28–30 in San Antonio.*

*Quiet: The Power of Introverts in a World That Can’t Stop Talking* (**by Susan Cain**)

At least one-third of the people we know are introverts. They are the ones who prefer listening to speaking, reading to partying; who innovate and create but dislike self-promotion; who favor working on their own over brainstorming in teams. In *Quiet*, Susan Cain demonstrates how dramatically society undervalues introverts, and how much we lose in doing so.

---

**Welcome to CUPA-HR!**

We’re pleased to welcome our newest members to CUPA-HR.

**Institutional Members:**

- Adler Graduate School
- American Samoa Community College
- American Sentinel University
- California State University-San Bernardino
- Colorado State University-Pueblo
- Evangel University
- Felician College
- Lawrence University
- Lipscomb University
- Oakwood University
- Rocky Vista University
- SAE Institute Group, Inc.
- St. Anthony College of Nursing
- State University of New York at New Paltz
- State University of New York College at Oswego
- University of Michigan-Flint
- Washington State Board for Community & Technical Colleges

**Affiliate Members:**

- MEA-MFT – 4045
- Texas Department of Savings and Mortgage Lending

**Student Members:**

- Trish Carroll
- Lauren Harkins
- Quincy Johnson
- Kant Khatri
- Solveig Kruse
- Eric Zanconato

**Corporate Members:**

- Academic Impressions
- LTC Financial Partners, LLC
- PageUp People
- Riviera Advisors, Inc.
- Skinny Cat Software LLC
- Strategic Information Resources
At EmblemHealth, we understand and respect the diverse needs of New York’s colleges and universities. And we provide faculty, staff and students the plans and products that allow for quality, accessible care.

With coverage for approximately 3.4 million people — and options like wellness programs and mobile-friendly tools for care on the go — we help our members stay healthy, get well and live better. So they can continue to inspire the future.

To find out more about EmblemHealth, contact:

SHAWN McLoughlin
Director of Labor Operations
1-646-447-6865
smcloughlin@emblemhealth.com

MATTHEW MAINES, RHU
Senior Marketing Representative
1-315-433-8794
mmaines@emblemhealth.com

www.emblemhealth.com/highereducation

Offices located in New York City • Albany • Buffalo • Long Island • Syracuse

Group Health Incorporated (GHI), GHI HMO Select, Inc. (GHI HMO), HIP Health Plan of New York (HIP), HIP Insurance Company of New York and EmblemHealth Services Company, LLC are EmblemHealth companies. EmblemHealth Services Company, LLC provides administrative services to the EmblemHealth companies.