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In 2010, the CUPA-HR board of directors and national office staff faced a dilemma. The state of Arizona had just passed immigration laws that we believed did not reflect the values and ethics of higher ed HR professionals and the association. The immediate challenge for us was that we had just signed a contract for our 2011 Association Leadership Program to be held in Arizona. The immigration laws were immediately challenged, but we knew that the challenge and dilemma could drag on for years. What message would it send to our members and to other associations if we ignored the controversy and continued with our plans to hold the program in Arizona?

As we debated the pros and cons of holding our event in Arizona, board member Lynn Bynum, who would go on to become chair of the board, challenged us to review our core values and ethics (www.cupahr.org/about/values.aspx) and make the decision based on this review. I cannot speak for the other board members who were part of the discussion, but the following words from our code of professional ethics made it clear to me that we needed to cancel the Arizona contract:

- Model inclusiveness and treat others with dignity and respect.
- Abstain from actions or decisions that could result in a conflict of interest or damage our credibility.
- Stand ready to make difficult decisions for the good of our organizations and our profession.

The board voted to cancel the contract and move the program to another state. We then agreed that we needed to be clearer regarding higher ed HR’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. This led to the development of our position statement on diversity, equity and inclusion (www.cupahr.org/about/diversity.aspx), the creation of

our action plan, and the incredible work that has been accomplished since 2010! One thing I have learned during the last several years is that I have to help many of my higher ed HR colleagues understand that this is not just about affirmative action compliance. Another thing I have learned is that we all have biases, some intentional and some unintentional. I share the following with you as my “elevator speech” regarding the importance of this work for higher ed HR professionals, for me as your president and CEO, and for me as a person.

The higher ed student population and employee population are changing and becoming more diverse in every way, shape and form. As HR professionals, it is critically important that we acknowledge, embrace and celebrate these differences and that we create a place of work and learning that enables everyone to have the opportunity to have windows through which they can see and learn about the different perspectives of others. It is also important for us to create mirrors through which everyone sees some reflection of themselves in the environment we create. For me, this isn’t just about the long-term relevance of CUPA-HR and higher ed HR. It is also about my own journey to learn more about myself and to become a better person, father, friend and colleague.

Have you truly found your voice? Are you prepared to take stand?

Andy Brantley | CUPA-HR President and CEO
Administrator U.

There’s a new training ground for would-be higher education leaders. Arizona State University and Georgetown University’s presidents announced earlier this year that the two universities are teaming up to create the Institute for Innovation in Higher Education Leadership. The institute, which will begin as a pilot program this fall, is envisioned as an executive training program that will meet over four long weekends each year.

The program is entering a space somewhat occupied already by the Harvard Graduate School of Education, the American Council on Education (ACE) and several trade associations. An emphasis of the ASU-Georgetown program is to cater to a variety of college leaders, including executives, trustees and others who aspire to lead in higher ed. “In some ways, if you’re already the president, it’s probably too late – you’re already in the job,” says ASU President Michael Crow. Crow says the standard model for turning out higher ed leaders — “let’s have the academic dean become the chair become the dean become the president” — may no longer work.

Jeff Selingo, a professor of practice at ASU and a contributing editor at The Chronicle of Higher Education, says the goal of the institute is to focus on strategic thinking rather than the day-to-day tactical skills that other programs by and large teach. “What we’re really going to focus on is innovation in the long term,” Selingo says. He, Crow and Georgetown President John DeGioia came up with the idea for the innovation institute, which will be a not-for-profit managed by ASU and Georgetown. Potential modules for the institution’s curriculum have titles like “The Financially Sustainable University,” “New Delivery Methods” and “Change Leadership.” Selingo said the price point for the program would be about that of similar programs, like Harvard’s Seminar for New Presidents.

ACE, higher ed’s umbrella trade group, launched an Institute for New Presidents in summer 2012. Other training programs for new presidents are run by sector-specific associations, including the Council of Independent Colleges, the American Association of Community Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

This brief was authored by Ry Rivard and first appeared in the March 19, 2014 issue of Inside Higher Ed. It was reprinted here with permission from Inside Higher Ed.
Number of Employers Passing on Applicants Due to Social Media Posts Continues to Rise

More employers are turning to social networking sites to find additional information on potential candidates — and they’re not entirely impressed with what they’re seeing. A recent survey from CareerBuilder found that just over half (51 percent) of employers who research job candidates on social media said they’ve found content that caused them to not hire the candidate, up from 43 percent last year and 34 percent in 2012.

Of the employers surveyed, 43 percent use social networking sites to research job candidates, up from 39 percent last year and 36 percent in 2012. But employers aren’t limiting themselves to just social networks when it comes to researching candidates’ web presences. Forty-five percent of survey respondents use search engines such as Google to research potential job candidates, with 20 percent saying they do so frequently or always.

The national survey included a representative sample of 2,138 hiring managers and human resources professionals, and a representative sample of 3,022 full-time, private-sector workers across industries and company sizes.

Helping or Hurting?
So what are employers finding on social media that’s prompting them to eliminate candidates from consideration? The most common reasons to pass on a candidate included:

• Job candidate posted provocative or inappropriate photographs or information – 46 percent;
• Job candidate posted information about them drinking or using drugs – 41 percent;
• Job candidates bad-mouthed their previous company or a fellow employee – 36 percent;
• Job candidate had poor communication skills – 32 percent;
• Job candidate posted discriminatory comments related to race, gender, religion, etc. – 28 percent;
• Job candidate lied about qualifications – 25 percent;
• Job candidate shared confidential information from previous employers – 24 percent;
• Job candidate was linked to criminal behavior – 22 percent;
• Job candidate’s screen name was unprofessional – 21 percent.

However, one third of those surveyed who research candidates on social networking sites say they’ve found content that made them more likely to hire a candidate. What’s more, nearly a quarter (23 percent) found content that directly led to them hiring the candidate. Some of the most common reasons employers hired a candidate based on their social networking presence included:

• Employer got a good feel for the job candidate’s personality and could see a good fit within the company culture – 46 percent
• Job candidate’s background information supported their professional qualifications for the job – 45 percent;
• Job candidate’s site conveyed a professional image – 43 percent;
• Job candidate was well-rounded, showed a wide range of interests – 40 percent;
• Job candidate had great communication skills – 40 percent;
• Job candidate was creative – 36 percent;
• Job candidate received awards and accolades – 31 percent;
• Other people posted great references about the job candidate – 30 percent;
• Job candidate had interacted with the hiring company’s social media accounts – 24 percent;
• Job candidate had a large amount of followers or subscribers – 14 percent.
Historically, promotion and tenure have been laborious and exhausting tasks for both faculty members and administrators. There has been little technical advancement over the years, and huge paper packets are the norm. Facing the administrative burden of promotion and tenure for roughly 240 candidates each year, and unable to find any commercial solutions, the University of Florida (UF) developed its own online promotion and tenure work process — the first of its kind in the country.

How It Works
The Online Promotion and Tenure (OPT) process was created in UF’s existing human resources management system and was a collaborative effort between the office of the provost and academic affairs, HR services, IT enterprise systems, faculty and staff in pilot departments and colleges, and faculty senate councils. Following is a run-down of how the process works.

Once an academic department identifies a candidate for promotion or tenure, the individual is entered into the online system. Much of the information required (such as education, teaching evaluations, graduate student information, publications, and patent and copyright agreements) can be autopopulated by pulling data from other UF systems. The promotion or tenure candidate is able to access his or her profile via self-service, and packet preparation is done using Microsoft Word, allowing for ease of use and familiarity. The online system allows all of the different and separate documents required to support a promotion or tenure candidacy to be attached as PDF files and to be combined into one document for the convenience of reviewers. The candidate can upload as many times as necessary, with the new file replacing the old each time. When the faculty member is confident that the packet is complete and correct, he or she certifies the document and the review process begins.

An OPT administrator is the first to review the packet and can return it to the promotion or tenure candidate for revision and recertification if need be. When the OPT administrator is satisfied that the packet is in its final form, he or she then certifies the packet, which becomes “frozen” (meaning no changes can be made going forward). The packet then follows the traditional review trajectory — it goes first to the candidate’s department, then to the college committee, then to the university committee, and finally to the president, who makes the final decision. As the review status changes as the packet progresses through the process, a summary page provides updates and e-mails are sent to the candidate and to whomever has the next task in the process, alerting them of the status change and actions needed. Reviewers have access to the packet only after it has been certified, while the candidate, the department chair and the dean have access throughout the process.

“From e-mail reminders, to pop-ups when an individual is in the system alerting him or her that an action needs to be taken, to hover graphics showing where the candidate is in the process, to a detailed orientation to the steps in the current phase, the system is designed above all else to facilitate ease of use and time savings for the candidate, the administrators and the review committees,” says Janet Malphurs, assistant director of HR/academic personnel at the University of Florida.
Training
To ensure that all OPT users are comfortable using the system, the OPT team has developed extensive online training resources, including simulations and instruction guides detailing each step in the process for each participant group (the candidate, department administrators, department reviewers, department chairs, college administrators, college review committee members and college deans). Other training resources include in-person workshops, a list of FAQs, a flow chart of the OPT process, and a how-to guide on managing publications for OPT.

Outcomes
The return on investment for the online promotion and tenure process has been far beyond the expectations of the OPT team. After only a year of full implementation, outcomes have included a 90 percent reduction in paper, a reduction in printing and administrative costs, a marked reduction in work time for faculty and staff, consistency and conformance within the tenure review process, easier accessibility to promotion and tenure packets for academic reviewers, improved transparency at all review levels, and the ability for tenure candidates to monitor their progress throughout the cycle. According to Malphurs, the cost savings for the first year alone was nearly $203,000.

What’s Next?
Other institutions around the country are starting to take notice of this novel approach to the promotion and tenure process, and several have contacted the OPT team to talk specifics. Vendors are also showing interest, with one having already approached the university to discuss its assistance in creating such a system to offer their higher ed clients. The OPT team is continually looking for ways to improve the system and the process.

“As we move into year two of using the system university-wide, we’ll be refining and refreshing and continuing to solicit feedback from users,” says Malphurs. “Moving the promotion and tenure process online just makes sense in so many ways. The streamlining, the time, resource and money savings, the ease of packet preparation, the ability for candidates to be in the know at all levels of the review — all of this adds tremendous value to the entire process.”
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Diversity Certificate Program at Texas A&M Places Emphasis on Experiential Learning  By Anne Mayer

Texas A&M University has long regarded diversity as a vital component of its culture and is committed to cultivating an environment characterized by inclusion, welcome and support of all groups. Texas A&M's commitment to diversity was further affirmed in a 2012 memorandum from President R. Bowen Loftin to the campus community stating that a top priority at the university is “to create an environment which supports diversity campus-wide and increases awareness of the globally connected world in which we live … To help meet this priority, all university employees have the responsibility to create an environment in which individuals are treated with dignity and respect …”

In order to assist the university in meeting this priority and in support of its diversity plan, HR employee and organizational development (EOD) created the Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace certificate program. The purpose of the program is to contribute to a positive work climate by helping Texas A&M employees recognize, accept and value differences among coworkers and others in the community, thereby increasing their ability to work, serve and interact effectively with others within a diverse environment.

The program — which considers diversity from a holistic perspective that includes differences in gender, race, sexual orientation, political and religious viewpoints, age, cultural identity, ability and personal characteristics — introduces participants to the value of diversity and inclusion, raises awareness about their perspectives and how their actions impact others, and offers strategies for creating and maintaining a workplace that not only accepts but also values diversity.

A Multifaceted Approach to Diversity Training

The 18-month Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace certificate program blends online training and classroom workshops with a variety of experiential activities and independent assignments. Unique to the conventional methodology of employee training, the program, patterned after the concept of required courses, electives and a capstone, is akin to a degree plan and thus is a familiar strategy for learning in higher education. Required courses include workshops and online training on fostering respect, interpersonal communication, cultural competence, ADA, effective hiring practices and more.

Requiring participants to take personal responsibility for learning beyond class attendance, they also must pursue outside activities that take them beyond their zones of familiarity. Each participant must earn at least four “elective credits” chosen from a variety of enrichment activities that provide real-life experiences in diverse environments and expand their understanding of diversity. By encouraging employees to participate in a variety of university and community events they likely had previously not considered, the program aims to foster lifelong engagement in inclusionary practices and learning.

Participants are also required to journal their insights following these experiential activities, allowing for critical examination and synthesis of their experiences. These experiences are then shared during the final capstone course, further capitalizing on their journey from day one of the program.

For its Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace certificate program, Texas A&M University’s HR Employee and Organizational Development Team received a CUPA-HR 2014 HR Innovation Award. From left to right are team members Tami Overby, Jenny Smith, Anne Mayer and Jose Macias.
inclusion cultivates excellence

Creative, Cost-Effective Programming
Because EOD’s budget prohibited the purchasing of vendor-provided curriculum or external training, it was necessary to get creative with the offerings. We found that many of our existing training and development workshops had diversity components that could be repackaged and augmented with new internally-developed online and classroom courses and resources. The program was also built upon the numerous and varied opportunities offered within the university and surrounding community, much of it available at no cost, to provide enriching experiential learning outside of the traditional classroom.

Examples include activities and programs offered through Texas A&M’s disability services, office of international outreach, division of multicultural services, diversity office and African American Professional Association; lectures and seminars provided by visiting faculty on topics including social justice, religious tolerance and global understanding; and programs offered through community organizations such as the Turkish House, the Islamic Center and the African American Museum.

Program Objectives, Goals and Competencies
The goals of the Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace certificate program are to heighten awareness of diversity and inclusion, build diversity-related skills and competencies, and clarify expectations and responsibilities of employees and managers to create and maintain a diverse and inclusive workplace. Competencies targeted by the program include accountability, adaptability, clear communication, service orientation, problem solving, collaboration and inclusion.

Upon completion of the program, participants should be able to: (1) assess how their own and others’ cultural identity, filters and behaviors impact the work environment; (2) respond to bias in a proactive and transformational way; and (3) utilize strategies to bridge differences among, and work more effectively with, people who differ from one another according to a wide variety of attributes. The program seeks to not only raise skills and awareness, but also contribute to transformative change.

Since its pilot implementation in October 2012, 21 employees have earned certificates, and an additional 33 employees are currently enrolled in the program. Building on the program’s initial success, EOD is expanding its promotional efforts and anticipates a surge of enrollments over the coming year.

Personal Reflection
Perhaps nothing speaks more to the success of the Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace certificate program than the participants’ own words. Following are excerpts from program participants’ journals:

During Danny Glover’s presentation at the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. breakfast, he frequently spoke about how his family impacted his life and instilled his values. That really reinforced to me the important role parents have in helping to shape their children’s perspectives (good or bad) and that as parents, we should always be continually mindful of what seeds we plant.

What really hit home with me was how the framing of a given situation impacts the perception of that situation. In many cases we are not even aware that a skewed framing is occurring and we inadvertently perpetuate that framing and that interpretation of events. As an individual of the “power and privileged” class, it is sometimes hard for me to understand and relate to those of different classes. This session has helped to remind me to not look at situations strictly through the framework of my upbringing, but to step back and think critically and understand that how information is presented shapes the foundation of my interpretations, and that I need to continuously reevaluate with an open mind when new information or experiences come my way.

I went into this seminar thinking I would gain all these insights and understanding into other cultures, but what I didn’t expect was that in order to do that, I have to understand my own personal culture and cultural perspective. That was a real eye-opener! I also learned that culture is abstract — what I see, others may see differently, and that’s ok!

Attending this training left me hopeful and with a sense of peace. I am comfortable being more assertive than in the past in politely and respectfully challenging inappropriate conversations about sexual orientation and any other differences in individuals. I feel affirmed in my belief that our differences are what make us special and valuable.

Anne Mayer is director of HR employee and organizational development at Texas A&M University. She can be reached at amayer@tamu.edu.
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Recent NLRB Decisions May Require Changes to Employee Handbooks

By Josh Ulman and Christi Layman

It does not get closer to home, or specifically campus, for higher education HR professionals than an institution’s employee handbook. The handbook is the framework for implementing HR policy on campus. It is a document that has been toiled over; a document that has had every word scrutinized and approved by legal counsel. Edits are not made on a whim, and when they are made, it’s often a long and laborious process. Yet one federal agency — the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or Board) — is taking an interest in and demanding changes to employee handbooks.

The NLRB is charged with enforcing and interpreting the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), the statute that governs relations between unions and most private businesses, including private colleges and universities. Section 7 of the NLRA establishes the right of employees working at private employers to act collectively, with or without a union, to improve pay and working conditions. The Board recently created a webpage (www.nlrb.gov/rights-we-protect/protected-concerted-activity) to outline Section 7 rights and highlight significant cases and enforcement actions. The NLRB’s recent interest in scrutinizing private employers’ employee handbooks stems from its concern that certain provisions in handbooks negatively affect, or “chill,” employees’ rights to engage in protected concerted activity. Since employees have a right to engage in such activity with or without a union, the NLRB may require changes to your employee handbook, even if your institution is not unionized.

The Cases
The NLRB has taken action on, and continues to act on, a number of cases in recent years that provide guidance on which handbook provisions may run afoul of the NLRA.
**Hills and Dales General Hospital**

In *Hills and Dales General Hospital and Danielle Cortis* (Case No. 7-CA-53556), a complaint was filed with the Board against the hospital employer after it issued a written warning to a current employee about a Facebook post she wrote. Specifically, the employee posted the following comment in response to another post by a former employee, who had been terminated for throwing a yogurt cup at her boss: “Holy [expletive], rock on … Way to talk about the [expletive] you used to work with. I LOVE IT.” The employer issued the warning on the grounds that the post violated paragraph 16 of its Values and Standards of Behavior Policy, which stated that employees “will represent Hills and Dales in the community in a positive and professional manner in every opportunity.”

The NLRB examined the entire Values and Standards of Behavior Policy and ruled that paragraph 16 as well as paragraphs 11 and 21 violated Section 7 because they could make employees think twice about engaging in protected concerted activities. Paragraph 11 states in the relevant part that employees will not make “negative comments about … fellow team members,” and paragraph 21 states that employees “will not engage in or listen to negativity or gossip.” The Board found that employer policies prohibiting negative conversations about coworkers or managers are unlawful on their face. It found paragraph 16 unlawful because the requirement that employees must represent Hills and Dales in the community in a positive and professional manner “is just as overbroad and ambiguous as the proscription of ‘negative comments’ and ‘negativity.’”

**First Transit Inc.**

In *First Transit Inc. and Amalgamated Transit Union Local #1433 AFL-CIO* (Case No. 28-CA-023017), the Board again found several provisions in an employee handbook to be unlawful. Among them were those that prohibited:

1. Discourteous or inappropriate attitude or behavior toward other employees;
2. “Disclosure of any company information,” including wage and benefit information;
3. Employees from making statements about work-related accidents “to anyone except the police or company officials;”
4. Employees from making false statements about the company;
5. Employees from participating in “outside activities that are detrimental to the company’s image or reputation, or when a conflict of interest exists;” and
6. Employees from conducting themselves “during non-working hours in such a manner that the conduct would be detrimental to the interest or reputation of the company.”

The NLRB decided that there was enough ambiguity in these prohibitions that employees could reasonably construe them as limiting their communications and therefore violating their right to protected concerted activity.

**Walmart**

One positive case for employers, *Walmart* (Case No. 11-CA-067171), considered in a NLRB regional office, provides assistance to employers in the increasingly murky area of social media policies. In this case, the regional NLRB office submitted the case to the office of general counsel for advice on whether Walmart’s social media policy was unlawfully overbroad, and whether Walmart violated Section 8(a)(1) of the NLRA by discharging the charging party because of comments he posted on his Facebook page. During the proceedings of the case, Walmart revised the policy, and the office of the general counsel concluded that the revised social media policy was lawful and that the discharge was not unlawful because the charging party’s comments did not implicate Section 7 concerns.

In 2011 and 2012, Acting General Counsel Lafe Solomon issued a series of three guidance memos detailing a number of cases and the opinions of the office of the general counsel on each case. Each memo documented instances of lawful policies and unlawful policies. It was in the third memo where he provided guidance on a social media policy that was acceptable in its entirety with the *Walmart* case. It is important to note that the general counsel’s opinions and advice memos are not binding on the NLRB or any
Impact of the Supreme Court Ruling in Noel Canning

We expect to see additional cases in this area. However, the latest wrinkle has been the U.S. Supreme Court’s June 26 ruling in National Labor Relations Board v. Noel Canning. Noel Canning, a canning and bottling company, sued the NLRB, claiming the Board did not have authority to rule against the company in an unfair labor practice charge because the agency lacked a full quorum.

President Obama had made recess appointments to the Board while the Senate was holding pro forma sessions. The Court unanimously decided President Obama’s appointments to the Board were unconstitutional because he lacked the authority to make recess appointments at the time, determining the Senate’s pro forma sessions were valid sessions and the Senate was not in recess. The NLRB now has to find a way to review all of the cases decided during the recess appointees’ time on the Board from January 2012 through July 2013, which is estimated to be in the hundreds.

Some of the important decisions on employee handbooks were made by the now invalid recess appointees, so some of these cases will likely see some changes as the new Senate-approved Board provides new rulings. One such case is Karl Knauz Motors, Inc. d/b/a Knauz BMW and Robert Becker (Case No. 13-CA-046452). In this case, the Board upheld a decision by an administrative law judge that the respondent, which owned and operated a BMW dealership, violated Section 8(a)(1) of the NLRA by maintaining a “courtesy” rule in its employee handbook on courtesy being a responsibility of every employee.

A three-member panel of the full Board, including the unconstitutional recess appointees, found that an employer violates Section 8(a)(1) when it maintains a work rule that reasonably tends to chill employees in the exercise of their Section 7 rights. Now with the Supreme Court’s ruling in Noel Canning, this case will be revisited by the new Board; however, we expect the new Board to issue a similar ruling.

What’s Ahead?
We expect the NLRB to continue to scrutinize employee handbook policies, even for non-union workplaces. Challenges will likely continue to be brought for at-will employment statements, policies prohibiting certain employee communications or behavior, confidentiality policies, social media policies, and access to employer property. The context for these policies, how broadly they are written, and if savings clauses are included that stipulate that the rules do not prohibit any rights protected by Section 7 of the NLRA will be key in the Board’s considerations.

In light of the NLRB’s recent actions, you may want to take a fresh look at your employee handbook and consult with counsel to see if changes should be made.

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.
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Not long ago, the office of human resources at the University of Minnesota faced a dilemma: its facilities were gradually becoming outdated and were not serving the needs of employees. The department had staff spread among five buildings on the large Minneapolis campus. Face-to-face meetings were time consuming. Relationships between departments were distant. Employees reported that their biggest problem was getting replies in a timely manner from colleagues and managers because people were frequently in meetings. Staff struggled with older technology that made working anywhere on campus difficult.

Practically and aesthetically, the offices had more challenges. In one building in particular, some staff worked in a dungeon-like basement; employees had few places to meet informally; six-foot-tall cubicle walls blocked natural light; piles of broken furniture collected in unused cubicles; and an unusual building footprint resulted in paths that dead-ended into a person’s workspace, making it challenging just to navigate across the floor.

At the same time, the university, like other institutions in tight financial times, wrestled with the need to better manage its aging facilities, and the university’s leaders were making a strong push to consolidate and free up campus office space. So what was the answer?

For the office of human resources (OHR), the answer was a new alternative workplace environment which entailed merging offices, updating technology, creating an inviting workspace and improving office relationships, while also saving money. “From the beginning, the focus of this project was to enhance the workplace for employees so that they can have the environment and resources they need to perform their jobs more effectively,” says Kathryn Brown, vice president of the office of human resources at the University of Minnesota. “To make that possible, however, we couldn’t just reorganize our space — we had to reimagine it. The goal was to create an employee-centered workplace of the future.”

Eight months later, the transformation is stunning. The open, flexible workspace seems more like a Silicon Valley tech firm than a traditional HR office. Walls, offices and tall cubicles have been replaced with one communal room, suffused with natural and LED lighting, where employees are free to roam and work anywhere they like — at traditional desks, at standing workstations, in an abundance of informal meeting rooms or in private telephone rooms. In the process, the office of HR was able to condense its facilities from five buildings to two, upgrade its technology, and dispose of 12.5 tons of paper.

Creating Space With People in Mind
OHR’s transformation began in 2012 with the creation of a new program called Work+ (pronounced “Work Plus”). To develop the approach, the university partnered with an outside vendor to create open, flexible, contemporary office space. Human resources, university services and the office of information technology worked together to help plan the new environment, and OHR volunteered to pilot the program. From the beginning, the project sought to develop a new culture of flexibility and choice, with a focus on employee needs. The goal of Work+ was to provide employees with a holistically designed workplace with the flexibility and technology to support their individual work styles while helping the university contain costs and manage its space footprint.

Work+ began with a staff survey that gathered data about individuals’ work styles, including work activities, where they spent time, and the technology tools they used. OHR learned, for example, that its staff spend an average of 56 percent of their time working individually and 26 percent of their time in meetings and that their biggest facilities-related concerns were limited natural light and the lack of an energizing workplace.

Through the survey, OHR identified two work styles for its staff: resident workers and mobile workers. Resident workers spend most of their day at an assigned workstation, while mobile workers, such as HR consultants, spend their time in a variety of locations and work with clients across the campus. The survey results also provided a profile of both individual and group needs and provided guidance in designing the number and size of workstations and the amount of collaborative spaces, telephone rooms and gathering spaces that were needed.
The next step was a series of visioning sessions and workshops, led by the vendor and OHR leaders, to talk about the frustrations of the old workspace and what the new space could offer in terms of technology, collaboration, quick resolution of issues and enhanced interactions among colleagues. Very quickly it was clear that the new design would follow some of the leading trends in corporate office design. With newer technologies like laptops, iPads, Wi-Fi and softphones, workers today can be highly mobile and don’t have to be tied to a desk. While the University of Minnesota had developed similar spaces for students, Work+ would be the first application of this approach for employees, allowing them to wander and mingle, sit or stand, depending on their moods and needs throughout the day.

The needs of OHR’s staff turned out to be amazingly varied. Some depended on quiet for prolonged periods of concentration; others just needed a landing space where they could touch down between meetings. Some needed privacy for sensitive HR discussions; others longed for meeting space where they could zoom in for a quick 15-minute discussion. Some liked traditional desks; others preferred standing. Everyone agreed that improved technology could make them more productive.

Designing the Workplace of the Future
Based on those discussions, Work+ entered the design phase. The floor plan that emerged was a radical departure from the traditional cubicle farm and a remarkable amalgam of OHR staff members’ visions. Walls were banished, and furniture was used to create discrete zones that supported a range of work styles, from heads-down, focused workspaces to fluidly interactive and collaborative spaces. Cubicles were lowered to encourage free discussion among colleagues and ensure sight lines throughout the floor. Standing workstations sprouted. Circles of swivel chairs and café-style booths became informal meeting spaces. A “quiet zone” was created for uninterrupted work. Several closed-door conference rooms of varying sizes lined the perimeter — some that could be reserved, plus three “huddle rooms” that were drop-in only. Phone rooms allowed privacy for confidential conversations. And workspaces along the windows became open to everyone.

The Work+ project also piloted several new-to-us technologies, including LED lighting, print-on-demand technology, expanded wireless capabilities and Voice Over IP technology. One key to the Work+ design was a commitment to move OHR to a less paper-based approach to work. Floor-to-ceiling file cabinets were removed, document retention practices were revised, and paper was discarded wherever possible, which freed up valuable square feet.

Moving Into Uncertainty
As construction began and the envisioned workplace moved from theory to reality, much more work needed to be done. Such a sweeping change in the working environment also required a wholesale change in attitude toward working together in a large, communal environment. Many discussions were held to establish how

Results by the Numbers
By focusing on people and their work styles, the office of human resources Work+ remodel was able to:

- Consolidate human resources staff from 5 buildings to 2
- Reduce square footage by 22%
- Contain remodeling costs to $75 per square foot, compared to as much as $130 per square foot for a traditional remodel
- Save $52,000 in reduced maintenance over the next 16 years by replacing fluorescent lights with LED lights
- Eliminate 12.5 tons of paper from just one building
to behave with others in close proximity. For example, what if someone commandeered a group space for their private office? What is the etiquette for the common kitchen and meeting spaces, or in the quiet zone? Is it okay to eat at our desks? How should we handle confidential HR information in the new wide-open workspace? How do we let someone know they’re being too noisy? How do we resolve potential conflicts? Before the move-in, written “norms” for office behavior were developed to address these issues (although in practice these norms quickly became instinctive).

Still, some employees had mixed feelings about giving up offices, cubicles, windows and even the idea of a dedicated workspace. And while the build-out was taking place, no one knew exactly what the new space would look like or how it would function. During this transition, OHR leaders made themselves available for conversations about the Work+ concept, the new space and how everyone would need to rethink their approach to work. Communication was increased to reinforce OHR’s shared vision and to provide project updates, technology tips and a countdown calendar for preparing to move. The vice president for HR created a short video talking about the vision for Work+ that was shared with everyone several months before the move to reinforce the connection between Work+ and OHR’s mission, vision and values.

OHR leaders took the Work+ leap first, with a remodel of the vice president’s suite that followed the same principles of a large, open workspace with more meeting rooms. The vice president now has a modestly sized office — the only office on the first floor. Three senior leaders left cubicles and offices to work side-by-side at a large table in an open area. That experience helped leaders articulate to their teams the advantages of this new way of working, such as developing better relationships with colleagues, quicker resolutions to issues and more collaboration.

The full transition to the Work+ office happened during an academic break in late 2013, making the move easier in terms of workload for impacted staff. Visually, the transformation was remarkable. Although new work habits took some getting used to, staff soon learned to appreciate working in a more collegial way and having conversations face-to-face. Because most conversations could be heard...
by others, people began to feel free to insert themselves into discussions on the floor when they had important or helpful information to contribute. Using a lesson learned while staff was relocated to temporary space during construction, OHR enlisted colleagues from the IT office to be on-site during the first week of the move, who set up their own “genius bar” to answer questions and troubleshoot issues.

**Work+: More Effective, More Efficient, More Satisfying**

After having been in the new workspace for several months now, what does OHR really think of the redesign? While many staff members had some trepidation going into the process, many of the interpersonal conflicts and issues people worried about never materialized. Many managers report that the flexibility and fluidity of the space has helped their teams be more creative. One manager noted that her team held a brainstorming meeting in a new area of the space and asked other colleagues from a different area to join in the conversation. In about 10 minutes they had solved a problem they had wrestled with for two weeks, thanks to the input of others outside the team and the fresh perspective of a new physical environment.

“My first priority as an HR leader is employee wellbeing,” says Brown. “I want to see employees thrive and be productive. That’s the primary way we can contribute to the university’s mission. Now when I walk through our new space, I see people collaborating in new ways. I see employees taking advantage of the flexibility the new workspace design offers. And I know we have achieved our goal of creating a supportive work environment.”

For the university, the human resources pilot project accomplished its goal as a test case for reconfiguring workspace while putting employees front-and-center in the process, and the cost efficiency and flexibility of the Work+ approach is leading the University of Minnesota to consider extending the concept to other departments across campus. 

*Patricia Franklin is chief of staff for the office of human resources at the University of Minnesota. She can be reached at frank028@umn.edu.*

---

### Work+ Redesign Project Takeaways:

- It is possible to both meet the work needs of employees and reduce facilities costs.
- Engaging employees early on and throughout the process results in high engagement and shared ownership.
- Creating a design brief ensures that the paint colors, fabrics, woodwork, paint and furniture selection all represent an integrated design that is reflective of your organization’s culture and mission. (We had a small group of people select the interior design components based on the design brief criteria because we know interior design is not a group activity!)
- Collectively put together written guidelines identifying norms or rules of the road that will create a shared understanding of how to work together and facilitate a smooth transition.
- Develop an extensive communications strategy to keep employees updated throughout the project.
- Test technology in advance and have technology support available during the move-in.
- Keep troubleshooting after the move-in. Not everything will work out as you planned on paper. Flexibility is one of the benefits of an alternative workspace environment.
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Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice

A Campus-Wide Initiative to Foster Civility

By Daniel B. Griffith and Khadija Khaja
Many higher education institutions have developed initiatives focused on fostering a positive environment for civility on campus. But what are the characteristics of an effective civility initiative? How are such initiatives sustained so that a focus on civility becomes a mainstay of campus culture and conversation and not just another short-lived directive?

At Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), the promise for a sustained campus-wide commitment to civility has come from the development of the IUPUI Common Theme “Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice: Creating Civil Conversation,” a two-year discussion and deeper exploration of civil discourse in the classroom, workplace and public sphere. In creating and implementing the civil discourse common theme, IUPUI found that the ultimate success and sustainability of a civility initiative of this kind depends on three components:

1) Collaboration among many campus community members seeking to bring attention to the importance of an institutional commitment to civility.

2) Engaged and vibrant efforts of a committed team to plan and implement the initiative over the course of its two-year lifecycle.

3) Development of infrastructure to leave a legacy that will sustain the energy and focus on campus civility beyond the life of the initiative.

Collaboration as Catalyst

While conversations about the importance of civility in all aspects of campus life at IUPUI have occurred over many years, the most focused attention leading to the creation of the Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice initiative arose through the institution’s equal opportunity (EO) council. The EO council is the advisory council for the university’s office of equal opportunity and consists of representatives from IUPUI’s major administrative units and 19 campus schools. The council meets monthly to discuss legal, regulatory and internal policy updates involving equal opportunity and affirmative action matters and address specific issues across campus concerning matters of equity and inclusion and also serves as a conduit of information between the EO office and the campus community.

Over the past few years, the council has placed specific focus on campus civility or, more to the point, incivility. Though incivility per se is not within the purview of EO and affirmative action policy compliance, it is certainly a behavioral factor for many policy violations. In this context, the council has had two areas of focus — one that is fairly specific and one that is broader in scope. Its specific focus has been to promote the reinstitution of a campus statement on civility. In 1997, the former IUPUI chancellor developed such a statement, which was intended as an aspirational, non-policy-driven statement calling for civility among all campus community members while embracing differences, academic freedom, freedom of expression and the robust exchange of ideas. The council has endeavored to revamp this statement to reflect current campus community needs and constituent interests and is in the process of obtaining feedback from various student, faculty and staff leadership groups before encouraging adoption by the current chancellor.

As a representative body for schools and departments on campus, EO council members have expressed on their constituents’ behalf a sincere desire for a deeper exploration of civility at IUPUI, to include the classroom, the workplace and the public square. To that end, the council’s broader focus has been on identifying ways to engage the university community regarding the issues and concerns related to civility and to provide information, resources and education accordingly. It was in the course of these broader discussions that the suggestion arose to propose “civil discourse” as a topic for the IUPUI Common Theme Project.

The Common Theme Project, which took root in 2009 and is administered through the IUPUI Honors College, is designed to promote campus unity, conversation and collaboration on timely issues that connect the institution to central Indiana and the world. Each theme runs for a two-year cycle, and the civility theme is the third to be addressed in the project. And while the principal audience for the common theme is first-year students, with the intent of encouraging broad incorporation of concepts, principles and learning objectives related to the theme within first-year curriculum, the given theme is promoted campus-wide and involves events, programs and learning opportunities that serve to engage the entire campus community. Each two-year program is overseen by a steering committee and a faculty member with expertise on the subject matter.

Planning and Implementation

Initial planning for the civil discourse theme began with the facilitation of focus groups to assess perceptions among campus constituents about the state of civility and civil discourse in society and on campus, as well as to gain
insights and suggestions regarding topics and themes to address during the two-year common theme cycle. During the planning phase, 33 face-to-face, semi-structured, qualitative focus groups were conducted involving a total of 193 participants, including staff, faculty members, students, community service providers and others.

The following questions were posed: What sparked your interest to attend these focus groups on civil discourse? What does civil discourse mean to you? When and why do you think civil discourse breaks down? What activities, resources or events help to promote civil discourse on campus or in the community, and who are potential partners in collaborating or holding events?

From these meetings, it was clear that the topic of civil discourse resonated with participants. They were deeply concerned about the state of civil discourse (or the lack of it), whether in society, media, work, neighborhoods or in the classrooms and on campus. Themes emerged around myriad issues, including treatment of minority, disadvantaged and international students and other groups; how students feel they are treated by faculty and, in some instances, how faculty feel they are treated by students; feelings of exclusion by staff involving institutional decisions over basic issues like parking and healthcare; broader issues of uncivil discourse in culture, media and politics; and basic frustrations about how to manage uncivil roommate, classmate and coworker situations. It was also evident that a wealth of opportunities could be made available to engage on the topic through programs, events and conversations covering multiple perspectives, experiences and issues. (The full report on the focus group data is available on IUPUI’s common theme website at http://commontheme.iupui.edu).

Part of the common theme program entails the promotion of two featured books on the topic at hand. The books are promoted on the common theme website and are designated as required reading in certain first-year classes. The two books chosen for the civil discourse theme were *Saving Civility: 52 Ways to Tame Rude, Crude and Attitude for a Polite Planet*, by Sara Hacala, which addresses fundamental concepts, skills and attitudes for civil conduct and discourse, and *Beyond Forgiveness: Reflections on Atonement*, by Phil Cousineau, which delves into deeper issues around forgiveness, repairing broken relationships, and atonement in human relations, communities and global settings.

The capstone of the common theme program is a visit to campus by the authors of the featured books. Hacala visited the campus for two days last fall and, in addition to a keynote that was open to the entire campus, she co-facilitated a workshop for staff on issues involving workplace civility and also met with a number of student groups, classrooms and the EO council. Cousineau will visit the campus later this year to lead discussions on his book.

As the principal audience for each IUPUI common theme is first-year students, steering committee members whose roles involve curriculum development and instructional design work directly with faculty to support their efforts to incorporate concepts suggested by the theme and selected books into first-year-experience courses. The committee also works year-round to develop, plan and facilitate many other campus events, programs and conversations, large and small, around the theme. For the civil discourse theme, these events have ranged from short presentations to introduce the theme and encourage participation to longer training sessions on topics related to civility and civil discourse for student and employee groups. In addition to the author visits, other events involve formal presentations by invited speakers on theme-related topics.

The collaborative spirit that developed during the theme proposal process between EO council members and the faculty member chosen to serve as fellow for the duration of the two-year program has continued to evolve and has helped extend the reach of the theme beyond the primary audience of first-year students to embrace other campus community members. Many EO council members are also members of the common theme steering committee. And although the faculty fellow drives the programming for the initiative, because of their already-cemented commitment to civility and civil discourse, committee members share
buy-in and ownership in the shaping of programming. And steering committee members’ broad-based representation of constituencies beyond student populations has expanded possibilities that the ongoing conversation around civility and civil discourse may blossom into a community-wide conversation.

Building an Infrastructure and Leaving a Legacy
A common theme initiative such as Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice helps generate focused engagement on issues that matter to the campus community around a specific topic. Its format builds energy and excitement around conversations in a compressed timeframe and then concludes, making way for the next theme. The Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice theme will conclude in 2015. Then what? One hallmark of a successful common theme cycle, indicating that the theme is indeed something the campus cares about, is that it creates a legacy. What legacy will Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice leave and how will the focus on civility and civil discourse be perpetuated and survive the life of the theme?

The hope is that the civil discourse theme will be woven into campus culture like the 2009-11 common theme on sustainability has been. As a result of that initiative, IUPUI created an office of sustainability, whose mission is, in part, “to model wise stewardship of environmental resources across an array of campus decisions and activities.” The development of this office is directly connected to implementation efforts for the sustainability theme. The office now has a staff, operational support, a full committee structure, and a host of initiatives, strategies and programming in process.

And so far, the civil discourse theme seems to be following a similar path. In January 2013, the office for intergroup dialogue and civil community (IGD/CC) was formed. Although this office’s development is not directly connected with deliberations for the common theme, it has evolved concurrently with it, and many supporters of the common theme, including the EO office, were also advocates for the creation of this office. Organizationally, the IGD/CC office is jointly supported by the office of the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer and the division of finance and administration. As implied in its title, the IGD/CC office’s mission is twofold. Regarding intergroup dialogue, the campus has endeavored for the past five years to develop programming focused on improving intergroup relations through structured, sustained, facilitated dialogue processes among and across different social identity groups.

In discussions among various campus leaders about creating the IGD/CC office, it was agreed that a need for championing issues around campus civility and fostering a civil community was also important. As described in its mission statement, the IGD/CC office “supports IUPUI’s vision for an inclusive campus culture where all campus community members feel welcomed, supported, included and valued by the campus and each other. The office supports this vision through [intergroup dialogue and] ongoing efforts to promote campus civility, collegiality and civil discourse among all community members.”

The office is integrally involved in the civil discourse common theme planning and also develops and supports other programming and initiatives relating to fostering a civil community. Some examples include:

- Supporting EO council efforts to draft and advocate for a reinstituted statement on civility;
- Partnering with the EO office to develop and facilitate mediation training to develop individuals to serve as in-house mediators to address basic conflict issues and communication challenges within schools, departments and units;

Attend the concurrent session “Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice: A Campus-Wide Initiative to Foster Civility” at the CUPA-HR Annual Conference and Expo 2014 in San Antonio this fall to learn more about IUPUI’s civil discourse initiative. Visit www.cupahr.org/conference2014.

Unable to attend the conference? No worries! We’ll be live tweeting and blogging from sessions and events, so be sure to follow along! The conference Twitter handle is #cupahr14, and you can find The Higher Ed Workplace blog at blog.cupahr.org.
• Developing forums for civil discourse on important topics. The IGD/CC office partnered with the office of diversity, equity and inclusion to co-facilitate a forum on the aftermath of the Trayvon Martin case. It further convened multiple sponsors, including the LGBT faculty/staff council and other faculty and staff councils, to co-facilitate a campus forum on the significance of sexual orientation and gender identity at IUPUI.

The IGD/CC office is in the process of creating a more formal leadership structure, including a standing steering committee, to better ensure the sustainability of its efforts. These commitments by the office and its partners better ensure that issues surfaced through the civil discourse common theme receive ongoing institutional attention and that the civility theme leaves a strong legacy.

Learning From IUPUI’s Journey

IUPUI’s Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice initiative provides a promising path to ensure that a sustained focus on civility, civil discourse and civil community becomes embedded within campus culture. The institution’s journey demonstrates that sustained efforts of this sort develop from years of conversations among numerous campus constituencies wishing to work collaboratively to address common interests and concerns. It then takes planning, timing and the seizing of an opportunity to bring broader focus and attention to the issues involved. And the initiative’s long-term success depends on providing resources and infrastructure to ensure the focus is sustained once the initial energy and push subsides.

Daniel B. Griffith, J.D., SPHR, is director of the office for intergroup dialogue and civil community at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. He also serves as associate faculty in organizational leadership for the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at IUPUI. He can be reached at dgriffit@iupui.edu.

Khadija Khaja, M.S.W., Ph.D. is associate professor in the Indiana University School of Social Work. She concentrates her teaching, research and service on international social work practice, Islamic social service delivery, the impact of 9/11 on Muslim communities, interfaith peace building, ritual practices, children of war, human rights and women’s health. She also serves as faculty fellow for the Civil Discourse Common Theme Project. She can be reached at kkhaja@iupui.edu.
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Bringing the Right People on Board
How to Prepare Search Committees for Success

By Christopher D. Lee
Many searches are doomed to fail long before the first applicant ever applies for the vacancy. Whether the cause of the failure is not enough candidates, the wrong mix of candidates, losing good candidates due to delays, offers of employment that are turned down, or mistakes by the search committee that cause legal or ethical challenges, all of these mishaps can be prevented by following sound practices and procedures. Successful searches are virtually guaranteed when a solid foundation for rigorous and professional searches are set in place before any search commences.

The best part of building a good foundation for searches is that a college or university needs only to develop thorough procedures once so that they can use them over and over again. HR professionals are ultimately responsible for the employment matters, legal compliance and the overall quality of the talent hired within an institution. Unfortunately, HR cannot be in the room for every search committee meeting. However, HR can positively influence the quality of the search process and, therefore, the quality of every hire. This can be accomplished by laying the right groundwork and building the infrastructure for professional searches. This support system is the best source of quality assurance.

Building the Foundation for Successful Searches

The best method of developing sound procedures is to ask and answer a series of questions. Proper responses can assure a good start, a professional search and a good outcome. Areas that should be reviewed when building the infrastructure to support searches include:

1. Defining the position accurately.
2. Classifying the position appropriately.
3. Establishing a competitive hiring range.
4. Completing a labor market analysis.
5. Reviewing employment policies.
6. Incorporating diversity considerations.
7. Creating a recruitment strategy.
8. Establishing a timeframe.

These variables apply to all searches whether they be faculty, staff or administrative in nature. The operating principles they produce apply whether the searches are for regular, temporary, grant-funded, tenure-track, research-oriented or extension services positions.

They apply whether the searches are managed from the HR department centrally, if the authority is distributed to various units, or if academic positions are managed solely by a provost’s office. The universal nature of these activities is that they form the foundation upon which all rigorous, fair and professional searches are built. Getting the essentials right in the beginning ensures that the search committee cannot stray too far from the right path. If these basic elements are not accounted for, the risks are high that mistakes will be made — mistakes from which the search may not be able to recover.

Defining the Position: What Are We Really Looking For?

What is the first and most important step in producing successful searches? Gaining a crystal clear understanding of the institution’s needs. This is manifest in the title and description of the position in question. The specificity matters. A slight difference in perception or fact will lead the search in the wrong direction.

For example, there is no such thing as a generic assistant professorship. Professors at community colleges, colleges, comprehensive universities and research universities are fundamentally different. The focus of a professorship might vary even in a given department. One might be expected to teach online, another off-campus, and still another might advise a student group or manage the honors program. Whether academic or staff, if the position is not defined to a finite degree, it is impossible to accurately classify a position. Classification predetermines the salary range, how the position is trained, evaluated, promoted or tenured, and countless other decisions. These examples underscore the criticality of this first step of accurately defining the position. The definition can be accomplished by getting input from all stakeholders, with a little research, and with the assistance of HR representatives who have expertise in these areas.

Classification Predetermines Compensation

An institution seeking someone to lead the honors program can classify the position in any number of ways. It might be an administrative position, an assistant provost with teaching responsibilities, or a tenure-track appointment with collateral responsibility for managing the program. Whether academic or staff, if the position is not defined to a finite degree, it is impossible to accurately classify a position. Classification predetermines the salary range, how the position is trained, evaluated, promoted or tenured, and countless other decisions. These examples underscore the criticality of this first step of accurately defining the position. The definition can be accomplished by getting input from all stakeholders, with a little research, and with the assistance of HR representatives who have expertise in these areas.
who applies for the vacancy. It is incumbent upon the institution’s chief HR officer to have a role in ensuring that all positions are properly defined and classified before any search is commenced. Failing to do so will create the conditions for a failed search.

**The Labor Market Drives Certain Conditions**

Next, completing a labor market analysis is a matter of prudence. It is important to know the relative availability of astrophysicists or accountants before you go looking for them. The availability determines how many places to advertise the job, how proactive the recruitment must be, and how high the salary offer must be to attract candidates from a competitive market. It is unwise to wait until after the search yields very few well-qualified applicants to start considering market conditions.

The need to do market research is especially poignant when seeking any position requiring special talents, skills or backgrounds, such as languages, diversity, STEM and other factors affected by current supply and demand. Some level of research must be conducted for every search to determine how many professionals with the desired background are potentially available. Anything less subjects the search to chance. There are numerous sources that HR departments can use to find demographic information, such as state and federal labor market data, reports from professional associations and graduate schools, and forecasts from employment agencies. Job boards like Monster, CareerBuilder and HigherEdJobs.com also have repositories of data that can be utilized.

**Employment Policies and Search Procedures**

There are numerous policies that typically govern the employment process. How do we handle internal applicants? Can we promote Sue in accounting to the new assistant director position and forego a search? Can we place Sue into an interim role to see how well she performs? Do our policies guarantee Sue an interview if she is minimally qualified in an open search? Do we pay for overnight travel for candidates who are located within the state? Do we publish the entire salary range or just the expected hiring range?

In addition to these employment policies, most institutions have other policies and procedures that guide the search process, such as who can chair committees and what kind of training is required for those who serve on them. It is important that HR crafts policies to guide how the search process unfolds. Doing so ensures that each search is conducted in a professional manner.

**Diversity**

Is it fair game to consider gender when hiring campus police officers, considering there are few or no women police officers on staff? Since diversity is mentioned in the institution’s mission statement and it is infused throughout the curriculum, can it be used as a factor in selection? The new university strategic plan has globalism as one of its major tenets. Can we ask questions related to this in interviews? Are we governed by an affirmative action plan?

When training, orienting and charging search committees, there are a number of diversity-related considerations that must be addressed. It is important that the institution’s diversity officer, equal opportunity officer or an HR representative provide materials to search committees outlining the institution’s policies and procedures in this regard. A best practice approach is to give the committee a briefing on this topic at its first meeting.

**Recruiting and Advertising Protocol**

Where does the institution advertise and who is responsible for recruiting? Can we place ads wherever we want? Who pays for these ads — the HR department or the hiring department?

Attend the concurrent sessions “Successful Search Committees Guaranteed” and “The Diversity Advantage: Incorporating Diversity Principles Into the Selection Process” at the CUPA-HR Annual Conference and Expo 2014 in San Antonio this fall to learn more about how to ensure successful searches in higher ed. Visit [www.cupahr.org/conference2014](http://www.cupahr.org/conference2014).

Unable to attend the conference? No worries! We’ll be live tweeting and blogging from sessions and events, so be sure to follow along! The conference Twitter handle is #cupahr14, and you can find The Higher Ed Workplace blog at [blog.cupahr.org](http://blog.cupahr.org).
Institutions should have a standard protocol for how they advertise and recruit applicants. Placing ads in one printed source, one online source and one diversity-related medium for all searches is an example of a typical advertising protocol. A different, targeted or more exhaustive approach may be taken for hard-to-fill positions. Here again, HR’s governance and quality assurance mechanisms can be felt. For the best results, hiring managers should consult with human resources to determine the best ways to spend advertising dollars and seek assistance with recruitment techniques.

Astute organizations never stop recruiting and networking. They know that talent is a scarce resource and, therefore, they develop protocols that help them identify and select the best candidates regardless of when a position is advertised. They create printed and electronic brochures, flyers or position announcements about vacancies and give them to committee members to empower them to help get the word out. Using social media, word-of-mouth and networking to find candidates is more effective when HR instructs committees on how to better perform these outreach activities. Grassroots networking efforts are more successful when the search committee is involved early and their efforts are coordinated.

**Timeframe**

Considering that all search committee members are volunteers who have other responsibilities, it is important that their time is respected and used wisely in the selection process. Committee members should be aware of the timeframe, time commitment involved, the number of expected meetings and related matters before they agree to serve on a committee. This allows them to verify that they are both interested and available to participate in the search.

Respecting the time of search committee members, all search procedures should be planned and forecast in advance. Simple flowcharts, models, suggested schedules and outlines for an effective search can be developed and distributed by HR to help guide and empower search committee chairs. After all, unnecessary delays in the search process almost always cause the search committee to miss out on the best applicants who are likely to have multiple offers and will accept one if the search lingers on for too long.

**Building Success Step by Step**

Every search committee faces a daunting set of tasks. This ad hoc group of earnest professionals does their best to navigate all sorts of activities and processes in hopes of finding the best possible colleague. They participate on the committee in addition to their regular jobs. It is incumbent upon the HR department to develop systems to efficiently and effectively support their efforts.

The biggest challenge for HR is managing and monitoring multiple searches from afar. The best quality control method is to create a solid infrastructure to support all searches conducted across campus. A comprehensive and coordinated support system ensures that searches get off to a great start, that all necessary considerations are taken into account, that the committee is trained and oriented correctly, and that everyone is prepared to execute their responsibilities effectively. This approach positions the HR team as experts and as supportive internal consultants.

Every search can be successful when HR creates the platform for such success through the right systems, structures and activities.

Christopher D. Lee, Ph.D., is associate vice chancellor for human resources at Virginia Community College System and the author of Search Committees: A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Faculty, Staff and Administrative Searches. He can be reached at clee@vccs.edu.
In the wake of incidents of violence on American campuses in recent years, institutions across the country are wrestling with the issue of best practices to identify and manage persons and situations that might represent threats to the campus community. At many campuses, dealing with risk threats and consequences has historically been narrowly focused within specific divisions — student affairs deals with student issues, campus police handles potentially criminal issues, HR manages employee relations matters, academic affairs typically handles faculty issues.

With campuses trying to assimilate risk information about students, faculty, staff, contractors and visitors from so many different sources, the questions have become: What are best practices for gathering, assessing, tracking, sharing and managing resources to control risks presented by individuals? What tools can be used to evaluate potential concerns and what training is needed? How, in decentralized campus environments, is information shared and tracked, and how is such risk managed?

At North Carolina State University (NC State), we found that our separate campus divisions didn’t have the structures, or even the expectation, to regularly communicate with one another about individuals of concern. As a result, persons might be presenting risk behaviors in multiple environments, but that critical information might not be shared with relevant other units, leading to missed opportunities for risk identification and intervention. It was clear that the campus offices that dealt with behavioral risk issues needed better ways to collaborate.

Preventing Campus and Workplace Violence

What Sets NC State’s Risk Management Model Apart

By David Rainer and Barbara Carroll
An Integrated Approach to Risk Management

As a land-grant public institution and the largest university in the state, NC State enrolls more than 34,000 students and employs 10,000 regular and temporary workers on its 2,200-acre campus near downtown Raleigh, as well as in its extension offices and research stations located in all 100 counties in the state.

In order to identify and manage risk situations involving students, staff, faculty and others at the institution, in 2008 NC State established a formal violence prevention policy and adopted an integrated approach to behavior assessment and violence risk mitigation. Policies and protocols apply to all members of the university community, including employees, students and campus visitors. This approach was chosen to support consistent and comprehensive risk management practices that enhance campus safety and help identify any person who could represent a threat, whether they are affiliated with the campus or not. To facilitate this, the institution standardized its recordkeeping practices, established a behavior assessment process, and formalized operating procedures. A risk case manager position was created and criminal background checks are conducted on all individuals hired for employment (including faculty).

Many campuses around the country have established risk/behavior assessment teams, alert teams, safety intervention teams and the like to identify individuals who may pose a risk to the institution. Many campuses also have “care teams” to provide support to those individuals who pose a potential threat to themselves or others. There are various models and publications that discuss the organization and structure of such teams, including Balancing Safety and Support on Campus: A Guide for Campus Teams; Implementing Behavioral Threat Assessment on Campus; Workplace Violence Prevention and Intervention; and The Handbook for Campus Threat Assessment and Management Teams.

Like some other institutions, NC State has implemented several divisional threat assessment teams — one that primarily handles student issues, one that focuses on faculty, staff, temporary workers and non-affiliated individuals, and another that assesses the risk of accepting applicants for admission who have been convicted of a crime, dishonorably discharged from the military or have had pending criminal charges dismissed. Unlike many institutions, the teams communicate. The teams are also governed under a single regulation, Campus and Workplace Violence Prevention and Management (http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-04-05-02). This regulation describes violent behavior, the reporting responsibilities associated with observation of violent behavior, actions that constitute a violation, and institutional responses. Most importantly, the regulation designates a single individual, NC State’s associate vice chancellor (AVC) for environmental health and public safety (EHPS), as the coordinator for the overall implementation of the campus violence prevention and management program. As coordinator, the AVC for EHPS is delegated the authority to create and oversee an integrated system that identifies and mobilizes appropriate consultative resources to implement the program. As a result, NC State’s program of risk assessment and violence prevention intentionally encompasses faculty, students, staff and others on campus.

The AVC for EHPS worked with human resources and student affairs to develop a role that would serve as “mission control” for behavioral risk assessment and be a central point of communication. The group settled on a risk case manager position, which would serve as a central point person for the associated teams and would maintain a central tracking system of cases.

The university’s behavioral assessment team (BAT) is composed of a group of core multidisciplinary representatives who analyze potentially threatening situations and advise administrators as to recommended courses of action to mitigate risk. The AVC for EHPS or his designee acts as official chair of the BAT. The core team members serve on both the student and employee threat assessment teams to ensure overlap and communication, and include the risk assessment case manager, a representative from university police and a designated attorney from campus general counsel. In addition to the core BAT team members, the employee threat assessment team also includes representatives from HR employee relations and the office of institutional equity and diversity, as needed, and the student threat assessment team includes representatives from student conduct, student counseling and student housing.

The Stats

One of the clear limitations of many university risk assessment processes is that many threat assessment teams are student-centric, and campuses do not necessarily have clearly-defined processes to evaluate risks from faculty, staff and non-afiliates. Although data points are few, according to the Higher Education Mental Health Alliance (HEMHA), of 175 schools who responded to...
its 2010 survey on risk management responsibilities on campus, senior student affairs officers and counseling center directors most commonly served as chairs of behavior assessment teams, which seems to indicate that most BATs deal only with student issues. The HEMHA report does, however, acknowledge that “an important decision about the campus team’s scope and purpose involves how broadly or narrowly to define the population on which the team will focus. The behavior of any member of the campus community — students, faculty or staff — could become a concern of the campus team.” (See the full report at www.jedfoundation.org/campus_teams_guide.pdf).

Today’s reality is that targeted violence on campus comes from many sources, including domestic violence, stalking, disgruntled former students or employees, sexual assault, hazing and drug- and alcohol-induced attacks. Depending on the source, statistics indicate that violence is precipitated by individuals not affiliated with the institution 20 percent of the time, faculty and staff 11 percent of the time (50 percent currently employed, 50 percent former employees) and students 60 percent of the time (66 percent enrolled, 34 percent former students) (statistics gleaned from The Handbook for Campus Threat Assessment and Management Teams).

**Why the NC State Model Works**

A key element of the NC State program is that EHPS and HR recruited a licensed clinical social worker as the risk assessment case manager. The case manager has specific training in risk and threat assessment, including violence risk assessment, forensic interviewing, advanced threat management, advanced forensic sex crimes investigations, counterterrorism, domestic violence, and workplace violence assessment and management. The case manager is also responsible for writing the BAT’s standard operating procedures and selecting the assessment tools that are used. Some assessment tools we’ve considered for our program include the Behavioral Pathway Model (Fein and Vossekuij), MOSAIC (de Becker), the Assessment and Response Grid (Cawood), the Workplace Assessment of Violence Risk (WAVR-21), the Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment Guide (Kropp, Hart, Webster and Eaves), the Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (Van Brunt), and Dynamic Risk Assessment (Hoffman and Roshdi).

All of our threat assessment team members and BAT members have been trained in assessment protocols and how to use the specific assessment tools. Our goal has been, and continues to be, to assure that all team members receive consistent, high-level training, that they receive practice in using the assessment tools, and that they are trained to employ fact-based decision making based on a standardized risk ranking and rating system.

There are many other program elements that make our risk assessment initiative successful. These include a standardized application for NC State prospective students that includes six questions related to whether they have been convicted of a crime. The office of the university registrar has a process to review academically qualified candidates who answer yes to one or more of the six questions. As noted previously, HR conducts background checks on all new hires and on certain internal job transfer applicants. Training is provided for faculty, students and staff on the university violence prevention policy as well as classroom management, conflict resolution, dealing with concerning behaviors and working with student veterans.

And our violence prevention and threat management website (http://vptm.ehps.ncsu.edu) provides the campus community with up-to-date information about best practices and resources, opportunities for training, a link to the campus’s incident report form, findings from the latest research and copies of reports related to campus safety and workplace violence, and more.

Attend the concurrent session “Collaborating on Campus Risk Assessment and Violence Prevention” at the CUPA-HR Annual Conference and Expo 2014 in San Antonio this fall to learn more about HR’s role in keeping our campuses safe. Visit www.cupahr.org/conference2014.

Unable to attend the conference? No worries! We’ll be live tweeting and blogging from sessions and events, so be sure to follow along! The conference Twitter handle is #cupahr14, and you can find The Higher Ed Workplace blog at blog.cupahr.org.
Be Prepared
Establishing an effective risk assessment process for a campus requires breaking down silos while following several key guiding principles to move the program forward. These include:

• Reviewing organizational structure to assure overall administrative coordination of all campus health, safety, security and risk management programs.

• Establishing an overarching threat management process that encompasses faculty, students, staff and non-affiliates.

• Developing a comprehensive campus/workplace violence prevention and management program and training personnel so they understand how violence is defined and how and when to report potential threats or acts of violence (signs and indicators of violence; suicide risk and mental illness; when, where and how to report).

• Communicating with potential targets in a professional and confident manner and providing defined safety plans.

As we all know, violence knows no boundaries and follows no logic. Though there’s no guarantee that your campus won’t someday be touched by violence, your human resources organization is in a prime position to help mitigate the risk by partnering with other campus units to create a cohesive, comprehensive risk management and violence prevention program.

David Rainer is associate vice chancellor for environmental health and public safety at North Carolina State University. He can be reached at darainer@ncsu.edu.

Barbara Carroll is associate vice chancellor for human resources at North Carolina State University and chair-elect of the CUPA-HR board of directors. She can be reached at barbara_carroll@ncsu.edu.
Retiree MVPs
Keep Your All-Stars Engaged Through Retiree Organizations

By Trudy Fernandez, Sue Barnes and Janette Brown

As Americans continue to live longer and baby boomers face decisions about retirement, a “what’s next” reality looms for many employees. For college and university faculty members, it’s the “life after the world of academia” reality. The abrupt change in day-to-day interactions with colleagues and students and diminished opportunities to exchange and showcase intellectual interests can be rather harsh. But higher ed institutions are in a unique position to engage their retirees through academic, social and philanthropic opportunities.

With more colleges and universities recognizing the value of their retirees’ institutional knowledge and experience, many are offering programs to help faculty and staff bridge the transition to retirement. These programs are designed to continue the connection of retirees with the institution and engage their expertise and experience for the common good. Retirees can provide great value to important interdisciplinary and intergenerational initiatives that contribute to the institution and the local and global communities. And institutions that support their retirees experience higher levels of volunteerism and engagement in critical campus initiatives like mentoring programs and philanthropic projects.

**Types of Retiree Organizations**
There are three common types of retiree organizations in higher education: faculty and/or staff retiree associations, campus-funded retiree centers and emeriti colleges.

**Retiree Associations:** Funded primarily by member dues, these associations are usually affiliated with their universities but operate as separate entities. Many receive some sort of funding, staff support and/or dedicated office space. They often begin as social clubs or advocacy groups, providing valuable support in advancing the institution’s mission, and often engage in fundraising efforts. Associations may be comprised of both retired faculty and staff members, or may exist as two separate associations serving the unique needs of each constituent group.
Campus-Funded Retiree Centers: Retiree centers are usually housed within academic affairs, HR or development/advancement offices and serve as the activity hub as well as the office of records for retirees. Centers receive funding from more than one institutional entity. Budgets for these centers are typically augmented through fundraising efforts and/or fee-based programming.

Emeriti Colleges: Emeriti colleges are funded primarily by the institution but augment their budgets with fee-based programming and/or member dues. They are focused primarily on academic and/or research endeavors and often offer enrichment programs for mature adults and lectures for the surrounding communities. They also award research grants and publish scholarly journals.

What Should a Retiree Organization Offer? Regardless of the type, all retiree organizations have a common thread — they each offer a wide variety of programs and services to enrich the lives of retirees as they continue to enhance connections with the academic institution. Some examples of programs and services that are offered through retiree organizations are:

Volunteer/service programs: Retirees often look for opportunities to help their alma mater on a sporadic basis. Consider offering volunteer or service opportunities to engage retirees at their leisure — helping with commencement ceremonies, serving on a diversity committee, or mentoring students are just a few great ideas to engage them.

Fundraising: There will always be opportunities to raise funds for scholarships, local community agencies or an internal capital campaign. Many retirees welcome the opportunity to help with these types of fundraising endeavors.

Retirement planning programs: Retirement is a big decision. Don’t wait until your retirees leave to offer programs and services. Instead, consider offering a transition program that provides them with valuable information to help them ease into retirement.

Educational workshops: Continue to invite your retirees to lecture series and professional development programs that are open to the public, especially if they are free. If your state offers the opportunity to audit classes, make sure your retirees know about that as well.

Social programs: Consider holding special events or programs dedicated just to retirees, such as an annual retiree reunion or a special recognition event.

Consultants/advisors: Engage your retirees as expert speakers or invite them to serve in committee roles that may require a subject matter expert — after all, they are experts in their fields!

Living history/oral projects: Many universities develop recorded interviews for promotional videos about the university or for a living history project about a specific subject. Invite your retirees to participate in these types of projects, as they may be able to tell the story from a unique perspective.
AROHE
The Association of Retirement Organizations in Higher Education (AROHE) is comprised of over 100 member organizations representing more than 100,000 retired faculty and staff members. AROHE provides educational outreach and networking opportunities to assist higher education institutions with the creation, development and enhancement of retiree organizations and has developed a resourceful start-up kit to assist institutions with critical steps and insights from well-established organizations on how to start a retiree organization. AROHE also conducts research to gather information on national trends related to retirement issues and offers one-on-one mentoring for those interested in starting a retiree organization at their institution. To learn more, visit www.arohe.org.

Interest groups: Learn about your retirees’ interests through informal conversations and/or surveys, and invite them to form interest groups such as reading clubs, scrapbooking or travel buddies.

Newsletters/e-mail updates: Keeping lines of communication open with your retirees is critical. Offer monthly, quarterly or semi-annual newsletters to keep your retirees in the loop on your organization’s upcoming events as well as campus happenings.

Three Steps to Success
While there are many models and approaches to starting a retiree organization and/or enhancing existing services, here are some tips to ensure success:

1) **Know your audience.** First, survey your retirees to learn of their interests and desire to serve in various roles within a retiree organization. Due to budget constraints, you may need to rely more heavily on volunteers to make the retiree organization run smoothly. If you already have a retiree organization in place and are simply looking to revitalize your programs, your retirees’ feedback will be crucial — after all, these types of organizations exist to cater to their specific needs and interests.

2) **Seek support.** Meet with your supervisor, leadership team or other campus administrators to explore opportunities that will allow you to establish and/or enhance a retiree organization. It’s important to demonstrate the value proposition and benefits of such an organization. Building your business case and securing leadership support is critical.

3) **Collaborate.** Starting and growing a retiree organization takes time. You’ll learn very quickly what works and what doesn’t, and then you can improvise as needed. Take time to build relationships, not only with your retirees but also with your campus units. With so many academic and service units across campus, there is a wealth of resources and knowledge just waiting to be tapped. You might be amazed to learn of the many wonderful programs, discounts and services your retiree organization may be able to offer through collaboration and campus partnerships. Cultivating relationships is critical to the success of any organized program, and the investment of time and effort in developing partnerships will be well worth your while.

Engagement and Inclusion
As colleges and universities continue to navigate budget challenges, the return on investment in retiree organizations is multiplied many times over as retired faculty and staff continue to contribute to their institutions through teaching, research, service and financial support. By establishing a retiree organization on your campus, you’ll not only be contributing to the bottom line, but you’ll also be building a culture of inclusion by embracing retirees’ myriad contributions to the success of your institution.

Trudy Fernandez is director of human resources and the FIU Retiree Association at Florida International University and serves on the board of directors of the Association of Retirement Organizations in Higher Education (AROHE). She can be reached at Trudy.Fernandez@fiu.edu.

Sue Barnes is director of the University of California Davis Retiree Center and president of AROHE. She can be reached at slbarnes@ucdavis.edu.

Janette Brown is director of the University of Southern California Emeriti Center and Emeriti College and executive director of AROHE. She can be reached at jcbrown@usc.edu.
clear view of retirement, improving outcomes

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.
The Shared Business of People

Partnership Opportunities Abound for HR and the Business Office
In the next few issues of The Higher Education Workplace magazine, we’ll be exploring partnerships between human resources and other offices across campus – why you need them, how to form them and what benefits can be realized. First up: the business office. What do chief human resources officers (CHROs) and chief business officers (CBOs) stand to gain by collaborating? How do their paths cross? How can one contribute to the other’s bottom line? What competencies, skills and abilities do CHROs and CBOs need to best work together?

Closing the Divide
In many large organizations, HR and finance have long been siloed, and there often is a perceived power differential between the two. But several factors as of late, including ballooning healthcare costs, the uncertainty surrounding healthcare reform and anticipated mass retirements have created both the need and the opportunity for the two offices to work together in ways they never have before.

As Michael Mayher, senior vice president for administrative services and treasurer at Lakeland Community College, puts it, “Collaboration and communication between the head of HR and the head of the business office needs to be constant and ongoing. We need to recognize the impact each has on the other’s core roles and understand how we can contribute to one another’s work. When it comes right down to it, both offices’ business is all about people, and people are the largest resource in an institution. If our paths are not crossing and our work is not intersecting, there’s no way we’re doing our jobs effectively.”

How Can We Partner?
So how exactly should the work of the CHRO and the CBO intersect? In many ways, says Mayher. “Every decision an institution makes in some way, shape or form impacts its people, and the CHRO and the CBO need to work together to manage that impact. From facility moves to downsizing to putting in place a compensation structure to getting a budget enacted and so many other examples, the bottom line for us should be ‘how does this impact our people?’ And the leaders of HR and the business office are in a prime position to flesh out that impact together.”

Add Betsy Rodriguez, vice president for human resources at the University of Missouri System, “Our work often intersects on institutional strategic initiatives that require funding and people. It’s important that we work together to impact those discussions and to provide guidance and help set realistic expectations.”

Says Mark Coldren, head of human resources at Ithaca College, “We’ve just begun a workforce study on my campus where we’re trying to get a snapshot of what our workforce looks like today and what it might look like five years from now. I’ve engaged the CBO in this endeavor so that I can get a complete picture of both financial trends and trends related to talent. Without this collaboration and the CBO’s insight, I’d only have half the picture.”

Another area in which CHROs and CBOs would be well served to pool their expertise and resources is in compensation and benefits. Not only can the CHRO help the CBO predict workforce issues related to salary and benefits costs, but HR can benefit from the expertise on the finance side of the house. For example, the

For any given strategy, the chief business officer can help the chief HR officer better understand cost implications, and the chief HR officer can help the chief business officer better understand workforce implications.
administration at the University of Missouri System has been working for the past four years to put in place a new compensation structure. “We knew we were going to be below market in certain positions, so we worked closely with the CBO to determine the exact financial impact by funding source,” says Rodriguez. “We’ve also made some changes to our benefits program to try and better control costs, and we invited the chief financial officer and the controller to be a part of the benefits redesign committee.”

As for the work of the business office, Mayher says it’s essential for CBOs to engage CHROs in budget talks. “The chief business officer is responsible for creating a balanced budget for the institution. If there’s a mandate to, say, decrease expenditures by 5 percent, and 70 to 80 percent of costs are tied to people, most likely there will be an impact on people. So we need HR to help us determine what that impact may be. We need to engage the CHRO in crafting a strategy for cost cutting.”

Know Your Stuff
In short, for any given strategy, the CBO can help the CHRO better understand cost implications, and the CHRO can help the CBO better understand workforce implications. But only if each side does its homework. “In order for me as a CHRO to be an effective and value-added partner to my college’s chief business officer, I have to do my homework,” says Coldren. “I need to learn about the issues and challenges that are keeping my CBO up at night. I need to have a firm grasp on finance issues, on the business of higher ed, on emerging issues and trends that affect how our business office goes about its work. And I need to show how my contributions can help him get his job done.”

“And as a chief business officer, I need to make sure that I continually tap my CHRO for advice, hard data and brainstorming as to how financial decisions impact the workforce,” adds Mayher.

A Recipe for Productive Partnerships
What knowledge, skills and abilities do chief business officers need their chief human resources officers to possess? What competencies do heads of HR want to see in chief business officers? Members of the CUPA-HR/NACUBO task force weighed in on these questions, as did participants in a session on HR/business office partnerships at last year’s CUPA-HR annual conference.

According to the chief business officers with which we spoke, the ideal chief human resources officer will have:

- Financial acumen – able to understand the business of education and the broad short-term and long-term financial impact of decisions
- A willingness to help educate finance on HR issues, challenges and opportunities
- An understanding of the specific strategic and tactical challenges that the CBO faces
- The ability to think strategically about the broad view of the institution, not just HR needs

And according to the CHROs who weighed in, the ideal chief business officer will have:

- A firm understanding of how the budget impacts the workforce
- An understanding of the Academy and how higher ed differs from other sectors
- A recognition of the importance of supporting talent
- An open mind to HR issues and a willingness to work with and learn from their HR counterpart

Attend the concurrent session “Collaborating With the Business Office: Future Challenges and Opportunities” at the CUPA-HR Annual Conference and Expo 2014 in San Antonio this fall to learn how to strengthen the relationship between your institution’s HR organization and business office. Visit www.cupahr.org/conference2014.

Unable to attend the conference? No worries! We’ll be live tweeting and blogging from sessions and events, so be sure to follow along! The conference Twitter handle is #cupahr14, and you can find The Higher Ed Workplace blog at blog.cupahr.org.
I know something critically important about the candidate you’re about to hire...

...too bad you didn’t ask.

Pre-Hire 360® automates a new kind of reference collection and analysis to accurately predict success on each job. It helps you hire better people who stay longer and drive greater business results.

And we’ve got the data to prove it.
Learn more by downloading our Predictive Hiring eBook: go.skillsurvey.com/cupa2014.
Movers and Shakers

2014 CUPA-HR Region Awards Recipients

Peggy Carmichael, chief HR officer at West Virginia Northern Community College; Sandy Cooper, assistant vice president for HR at Oklahoma State University-Tulsa; Lisa Cowart, associate vice president for HR at Winthrop University; Linda Lieblong, associate director of benefits at Florida State University; Brian Roe, formerly of the University of Tennessee; Mimi Ruebsamen, executive director of HR at Louisiana State University; and Jennifer Smith, associate vice president for benefits at Arkansas State University System, received Southern Region Meritorious Service Awards.

HR Benefit Technology Reengineering Team at The Research Foundation for The State University of New York received the Eastern Region’s Excellence in HR Practices Award.

Michelle Keenan, director of employment at Rockefeller University, received the Eastern Region’s Member of the Year Award.

Wendy Lee, director of HR at Dominican University of California, received the Western Region’s Emerging Leader Award.

Barbara Lema, assistant vice president for HR at Wheaton College, received the Eastern Region’s Diedrich K. Willers Award.

Kevin Price, director of HR at Brigham Young University-Idaho, received the Western Region’s Hugh Avery Award.

Angela Smith, director of organizational development and career services at Burlington College, received the Eastern Region’s Emerging Leader Award.

Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center’s Human Resources Department received the Western Region’s Excellence in HR Practices Award.

University of Michigan Office of Human Resources received the Midwest Region’s Successful Practices Award.

University of Minnesota Office of Human Resources received the Midwest Region’s Excellence in HR Practices Award.

University of North Carolina at Charlotte’s Learning and Development Team received the Southern Region’s Excellence in HR Practices Award.

2014 CUPA-HR Higher Education HR Awards Recipients

California State University, Fullerton received the Inclusion Cultivates Excellence Award.

Waded Cruzado, president of Montana State University, received the Chief Executive HR Champion Award.

Nancy Grassel, former chief HR officer for Black Hills State University, and Donna Popovich, executive director of HR for the University of Tampa, received Distinguished Service Awards.

Texas A&M University HR Employee and Organizational Development; University of Florida’s Online Promotion and Tenure Team; and the Human Resources Team at the University System of Georgia Board of Regents received HR Innovation Awards.

Lauren Turner, associate vice chancellor for HR and equal opportunity and outreach at University of Massachusetts Lowell, received the Donald E. Dickason Award.

University of North Carolina at Charlotte’s Learning and Development Team received the Excellence in HR Practices Award.

Read more about these award recipients and their programs at www.cupahr.org/publications/press-awards.aspx.

 Been promoted? Retiring? Moving to another institution? Received an award? Send your announcements to communications@cupahr.org.
Congratulations to Our Newest Honorary Life Members

As a show of appreciation for their dedication to CUPA-HR over many years and a nod to their professional achievements, three former CUPA-HR volunteer leaders have been granted honorary life membership in the association.

Patricia Day
Pat Day served in a number of leadership roles in CUPA-HR over a 14-year period. She served on several CUPA-HR region and annual conference program committees, for eight years on the association’s Eastern Region board of directors (including a term as chair and three terms as secretary), for three years on the national board of directors, and on several association committees and task forces. Additionally, as chair of the association’s Knowledge Center Committee in 2004-06, she was instrumental in the creation and roll-out of the CUPA-HR Knowledge Center. She’s also been honored by the association in the past with two awards for distinguished service. Day retired in November 2013 from Johns Hopkins University after a 44-year career in higher ed HR.

Hosea Long
Hosea Long, whose higher ed HR career spanned more than three decades, is a long-time CUPA-HR member and was an active volunteer leader. His association leadership roles have included president of the Arkansas Chapter, member of the Southwest Region board of directors and member of the national board of directors. He also served on several national-level committees and task forces and received several CUPA-HR awards over the years recognizing his service to the association and his work in higher education human resources. Long retired from his position as chief human resources officer at the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences in January.

Paul Michaud
Paul Michaud has served in leadership roles at both the regional and national levels of CUPA-HR. He served for two years on the Southern Region board of directors, for five years on the Midwest Region board (including a term as chair), and on the national board of directors, as well as on several CUPA-HR conference committees. He has also presented at numerous conferences and contributed to several CUPA-HR publications. Over the course of his career, Michaud has received eight CUPA-HR awards for his service to the association and excellence in the field of higher education human resources. He served in HR roles at nine institutions over his nearly four decades in higher education human resources. He retired earlier this year from Georgia Southern University.
Welcome to CUPA-HR!

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

Institutional Members:
American Baptist Seminary of the West
Apex School of Theology
Bay DeNoc Community College
Brown Mackie College - Findlay
Cabarrus College of Health Sciences
Chemeketa Community College
City University of New York New York City College of Technology
Concordia Theological Seminary
Concordia University
Dakota College at Bottineau
Dar Al Hekma University
Divine Word College
Forsyth Technical Community College
Framingham State University
Gemological Institute of America
Hellenic College Holy Cross
Henry Ford Community College
Inter American University of Puerto Rico Central Office
Kansas City University of Medicine and Biosciences
Limestone College
Mountain State College
North Hennepin Community College
Northcentral University
Richland Community College
Rogue Community College
Saint Luke’s College of Health Sciences
Sussex County Community College
Tallahassee Community College
Texas A&M University - Central Texas
The Robert B. Miller College
The Wright Institute
University of Calgary
University of Maine
University of Maine at Presque Isle
University of Tennessee Health Science Center
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Waubonsee Community College
Westminster Theological Seminary in California
West Virginia State University
Wofford College

Student Members:
Scott Adair
Cynthia Broderick
John LeCounte
Jacquelyn Steele

Retiree Members:
Kim Jones
Tony Tymkow

Corporate Members:
401K Advisors
Dearborn National
EPIC Hearing Healthcare
FlashPoint
J.W. Terril
Lean Human Capital, LLC
Northwest Comprehensive, Inc.
Red Oak Relocation, LLC
Sentara Healthcare
SkillSurvey
The Human Resources Leadership Collaboration

Affiliate Members:
Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU)
Phillips Exeter Academy

With Gratitude

We would like to extend our sincere thanks and appreciation to the three board members who completed their terms on CUPA-HR’s national board of directors on June 30. These individuals gave freely of their time and talents, and each made tremendous contributions to the association over their past few years of service on the board. You will all be sorely missed!

Lynn Bynum
Chief Human Resources Officer
Bellarmine University

Brian Dickens
Chief Human Resources Officer
Texas Southern University

Lianne Sullivan-Crowley
Vice President for Human Resources
Princeton University
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.
Recommended Reading

**Faculty Retirement: Best Practices for Navigating the Transition** (by Claire Van Ummersen, Jean McLaughlin and Lauren Duranleau)

This book presents models from 15 colleges and universities on innovative and effective ways to help faculty transition into retirement. It offers clear messages about the need for greater transparency in addressing retirement and transitions, for better communication, and for close coordination between human resources and academic administrators, and provides a roadmap for HR personnel, senior administrators, department chairs and faculty members.

**In Search of Civility: Confronting Incivility on the College Campus** (by Kent Weeks)

The lack of civility is an increasing concern on college campuses, and higher ed administrators are wrestling with how to actively foster civility on campus. This book explores the issue of civility in higher education by weaving stories of four college freshmen at a large university with current research on civility issues and provides relevant context for the complex civility challenges facing students, faculty, staff and administrators.

**A Chance in the World** (by Steve Pemberton)

In this autobiography, Walgreens Chief Diversity Officer Steve Pemberton shares the powerful story of his childhood – rife with abuse, neglect and abandonment, but also filled with small acts of kindness that would help to change the course of his life. By focusing on education and lifelong learning and by embracing the concept of diversity and inclusion, Pemberton has risen above his hurtful past and now uses his story to inspire and motivate others. *Hear from Steve Pemberton at CUPA-HR’s Annual Conference and Expo 2014, September 28-30 in San Antonio.*

**Search Committees: A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Faculty, Staff and Administrative Searches** (by Christopher D. Lee)

Based on the most current research and on interviews with HR and diversity leaders in major organizations, this book examines strategies and tools for implementing a successful and sustainable talent management program. It also addresses common barriers to the development of synergistic HR and diversity strategies and presents a systematic approach to integrating HR practices and strategic diversity initiatives to create an inclusive, high-performing workforce.
THE SECRET TO
A STABLE
RETIREMENT?
A STABLE INVESTMENT PROVIDER.

Last year, TIAA-CREF paid out $4.3 billion in retirement income.¹ We help millions of people in nonprofit businesses plan and manage retirement, more than any other financial services provider.² It’s how we deliver Outcomes That Matter for your employees.

Nearly a century of lifetime income payments to get employees through retirement.³ Get started at tiaa-cref.org/lifetime.

¹ In 2012, TIAA-CREF plan participants received annualized payments of $4.3 billion through TIAA-CREF lifetime annuity contracts. ² Source: LIMRA, Not-for-Profit Market Survey, first-quarter 2013 results. Based on a survey of 29 companies. ³ Lifetime income is a guarantee subject to TIAA’s claims-paying ability. Investment, insurance and annuity products are not FDIC insured, are not bank guaranteed, are not deposits, are not insured by any federal government agency, are not a condition to any banking service or activity, and may lose value. TIAA-CREF Individual & Institutional Services, LLC and Teachers Personal Investors Services, Inc., members FINRA, distribute securities products. ©2013 Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA-CREF), 730 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. C11882

TIAA-CREF products may be subject to market and other risk factors. See the applicable product literature, or visit tiaa-cref.org for details. Past performance does not guarantee future results.