



CNIC Peer Communications Group Meeting Minutes – December 16, 2005

Revised 1/27/06

Attendees: Paula Allen, DOR; Julie Bozzi, CNIC Project Office; Shawn Dawson, ODOT; Wes Ford, DHS; Dennis Green, Employment; Raelynn Henson, CNIC Project Office; John Hubbard, DOC.
Minutes by Cathy Hoffman, CNIC Project Office

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Committee Updates

Raelynn reported that the Change Management Work Group was scheduled to complete its tasks the end of December. They were asked by Mark and the Steering Committee to continue beyond December and conduct additional surveys. They will also be following up on support for line management.

Another meeting is being held on a regular basis, although it is not an official work group. It is called the Technical Work Groups' Cross Functional meeting. This gives opportunity for individuals from the various technical work groups to talk about issues that have an impact on more than one technical group.

Mark has indicated he would be open to thematic brown bag meetings and is seeking input from the group. Raelynn asked if there are any issues that need to be discussed. Shawn stated there are a lot that would like to attend the brown bags but they do not have the time. Their stress on the job is high and they utilize their lunch breaks to get away from work. It was stated that Mark is aware of that and understands. His intent with the brown bags was to provide an informal session where individuals could speak freely about SDC related topics.

The brown bags are well attended and a question was raised regarding the reason for the attendance: is it a "neat" thing to do; or are people not getting enough information elsewhere? The sense is that people are there to network. It is believed some attend because they are not sure what will come up at the meetings and don't want to miss the information. John reported on his experience with attending the brown bag sessions.

It was stated that Mark is honest about not always having the answers and checks into things when needed. Through these forums, issues can get back to the technical groups to begin thinking about the issues and address them.

Union Update

Dennis reported that leaders have met to strategize how to talk to Mark Reyer and Human Resources about the issues that have surfaced around in-scope staff and those in management service. A meeting is set for Jerry Korson, Mark Reyer, and Mike Halpern to discuss issues and come to an understanding on what is happening with staff and bring awareness.

Shawn reported his frustration with answers to questions about the need to revise the list of in-scope employees/positions and stated his questions are not being answered. There was discussion of the issue surfacing at the recent JLCIMT meeting and efforts under way to have agencies re-evaluate the list.

Concern was expressed that time is running out since hiring is expected to begin in February. Some members felt strongly that the in-scope list needs to be updated before that time. There needs to be some strategy for moving forward and allowing technically qualified individuals not currently on the in-scope list to apply for positions at the SDC. There needs to be a due date for a revised in-scope list.

Dennis reminded everyone that it is important for the right people to be at the table at the right time to have the issue addressed effectively.

Rumor: A rumor has surfaced that indicates the union is impeding the progress of the hiring because of the Letter of Agreement.



There was discussion of how the process for hiring has been changed since Mark was hired and that what he is trying to do makes sense. Dennis stated it is not the intent of the union to be a barrier to the completion of this project.

Discussion of the need for a grass roots effort to explain individual situations ensued. It was suggested that the Peer Communications create a communication on this issue that would explain the Peer Group is hearing concerns regarding the in-scope list. The scope has changed since the original list was developed but the in-scope list in the Letter of Agreement has not been revisited. There are employees who will have their duties moved to the data center but since they are not on the in-scope list, they will not have the opportunity to apply for a position at the data center. They need a forum for making their situation known.

Action: Dennis will craft a message to be given to the employees and send it to the Peer Communications for wordsmithing.*

There was extensive discussion of the appropriate avenue of distributing the message to employees and who should receive their responses. It was decided that Dennis would complete the task of drafting the message and he would receive the input from the Peer Group. The vehicle for distribution of the message will be determined at a later date.

** Note: Based on further discussion, the committee chose to take no action.*

Glossary of Terms Work Session

Due to time constraints discussion did not occur. Raelynn distributed an existing CNIC glossary that can be included in the discussions.

Round Table

There was a reminder that the legislative E-Board will be meeting on January 18.

Shawn asked if the video of the last All Hands meeting has been posted.

Action: Raelynn is to follow-up on the posting of the last All Hands meeting and send information to the Peer Group.

Rumor: The Governor says there will be a savings this biennium on this project. John indicated he has heard this rumor and is not sure of the validity of it. He will follow up and send the exact verbiage to Raelynn and Dennis.

Note 01/27/06: The above statement is unsubstantiated and this does not appear to be a widespread rumor. Peer Communications is taking no action to address it other than adding this note to the 12/16/05 minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.