

**STUDENT UNION BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

**Meeting Minutes
February 2, 2022
3:00 PM**

This is a hybrid meeting.

**In-person: Student Union Inc. Building, Conference Room 6
Telecommute meeting by Zoom Video Conference.**

This meeting was facilitated in person and through an online Zoom format.

Voting Members Present: Isaiah Andrews, Kathryn Blackmer Reyes, Dr. Sonja G. Daniels,
Charlie Faas, Joshua Reyes

Voting Members Absent: None

Non-Voting Members Present: Tamsen Burke, Ryan Fetzer, Timothy Banks

I. CALL TO ORDER

Director Reyes called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Director Reyes asked Kelly Goldsmith to take the roll. Kelly Goldsmith completed a verbal roll call.

III. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 2, 2022 AGENDA

Director Reyes asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Director Andrews motioned to approve the February 2, 2022 agenda; Director Faas seconded the motion.

Vote on the Motion: 5-0-0 Motion Passed

IV. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 16, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

Director Reyes asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

Director Faas motioned to approve the November 16, 2021 Personnel Committee meeting minutes; Director Andrews seconded the motion.

Vote on the Motion: 5-0-0 Motion Passed

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Update on Student Wage Structure and FT Salary Survey

Ms. Burke provided a brief update on the survey and what data was used. She will also be looking at hourly wages as we build out the student wage metric. The hope is to have the survey completed in the next month. Once approved, each area will put together their budget based on the approved numbers and particularly student wages. Full-time wages will take longer and is a separate budget. Two years ago the decision was made by the Finance Committee to centralize the budget for full-time salaries. Budgets were moved out of each department budget and into the HR budget. The study is looking at how the positions are aligned and also recognizing where those positions are on the CSU structure.

The Board discussed the study and that across the whole CSU, salary studies are being done by the Board of Trustees on staff and faculty. They are anticipating going to the Board of Trustees in March or April. Most of the work that the Board of Trustees does is union based. Director Faas is anticipating the study will come back that SJSU is 15-20 percent under market due to the high cost of living in the area. Limited funding is provided for employee increases so he is anticipating that there is not going to be an adjustment at that rate.

Ms. Burke will be looking at the CSU study for jobs alike even though the Student Union (SU) positions are not unionized. Director Daniels stated that the SU positions have been discussed over the past two or three years. The discussions started due to some of the positions needing to be reclassified. She suggested not only looking at professional associations and what is happening in the state and Bay Area, but also consider the historical context. Ms. Burke briefly explained that some of the current positions came from a club operations mentality but this does not align with NIRSA (National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association) standards in title assignments.

Ms. Burke explained that once the survey is completed, it will be presented to the Personnel Committee for approval. The hope is to have it approved so when the budget is presented, the salary adjustments are included in the budget.

B. Recruitment Process for (2) New Board Traineeship

Director Reyes reviewed the open positions and the recruitment process that will be happening over the next two to three months. Once the application window has closed the applications will be reviewed, interviews will be scheduled, and the final selections will be presented to the Board for approval at the May 13, 2022 SUBOD meeting.

The Board discussed marketing dates, application deadline, and date to review the applications. It was agreed that a Special Personnel Committee meeting would be added on April 20 in order to have time to do the interviews. Interviews will be in-person and virtually and conducted in closed session.

C. Marketing and Recruitment Process for FY 22-23 Board of Directors

Director Reyes discussed what was on the flier that was used last year. Ms. Burke will update the Committee when the new flier is ready.

The Board discussed the possibility of offering an informational session for students who are interested in being on the board of directors. There was also discussion about two student Board of Directors creating a one to two minute information video for students.

D. Merit Increases for FY 22-23

Ms. Burke discussed what increases other auxiliaries are offering and how it aligns with the university. During April through May employee evaluations will be completed which will be part of the raise structure that would go into the budget.

Director Faas explained the difference between merit increases versus cost of living increases. Merit increases are over and above what a cost of living increase might be. He explained that the University does not do merit increases and recommended that the SU does not do them. Based on history, the typical increase has been 3% for everyone. The SU does not have to follow what the university does but he did recommend that they do.

The Board discussed not using the term “merit” or “cost of living” when discussing possible salary increases. Suggested terms included annual increase and salary adjustment. The long standing practice has been that the auxiliaries are in line with the same percentage as the university. The possible percentage range will be discussed in

Closed Session at a future meeting.

E. Executive Director Annual Evaluation Process

Director Reyes asked Director Daniels for her assistance in the review process. Director Daniels agreed to help and stated that it was important to also have a faculty member assist in the process. Director Blackmer-Reyes agreed to assist.

Director Reyes reviewed the process which included that the board members would be providing feedback on their experience working with the Executive Director. Director Daniels explained that the evaluation process went through an extensive retooling last year. Through those discussions it was decided to move from a quantitative type of evaluation to more of a qualitative evaluation format. In terms of strengths, areas of growth, and general comments or feedback, the qualitative format allows for a bit more narrative feedback from the board of directors and direct reports. The Executive Director also does a self-assessment which is reviewed by the Committee. It was also agreed to do a 360 every three years. The next 360 will come up in 2023.

The Board briefly discussed how the Associated Students Executive Director is evaluated and if it is similar to the SU process. Director Reyes will work with Director Daniels and Director Blackmer-Reyes on the evaluation process timeline.

Director Reyes recessed to Closed Session at 3:59 p.m.

VI. CLOSED SESSION

A. Personnel Matters

VII. REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION

Director Reyes reported that there was no action taken in closed session.

VIII. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Director Reyes asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Director Faas motion to adjourn the meeting; Director Daniels seconded.

Vote on the Motion: 5-0-0 Motion Passed

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

The Student Union Board of Directors is a public body, and members of the public have a right to attend and participate in its meetings. This schedule is established as a best approximation of how long each scheduled meeting will take to complete its business. Depending on the length of the discussions, which are not possible to predict with precision in advance, the scheduled meeting times indicated may vary widely. The public is advised to take this uncertainty into account in planning to attend any meeting listed on this schedule.