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## Staff Council Standing Committee Minutes

**Committee Name:** Career Development Committee  
**Regular Meeting time:** 4th Wednesday of each month, noon to 1:00 p.m.  
**Meeting Date and Place:** November 17, 2010 Faculty Staff Club, Room 101 (week changed to avoid Thanksgiving week)  
**Members Present:** Marsha Baumeister, Deb Battin, Suzanne McConaghy, Penny Hogan, Joyce Krantman  
**Members Excused:** Kay Jantz, Ginger Ritcher, Veronica Gonzales, Barbara Shortman, Judy Kay  
**Members Absent:** Natalie Bruner  
**Guests Present:** none  
**Minutes submitted by:** Suzanne McConaghy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting began at 12:04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Draft of the ERB Board’s proposed retirement plan changes</strong></td>
<td>Very, very bad. No grandfathering, unless employee has been here 22 years. Covers all regular staff, and faculty who switched from TIAA-Cref. Higher contributions, much higher age of retirement, years of service = 35 to retire at any age. This is a proposed set of recommendations to the state LFC, which will be voted upon on 12/10 at ERB’s Board Meeting, at the ERB’s office address in ABQ, which is open to the public. This just came out onto the ERB website yesterday; SC needs to become very involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Role, purpose, focus of the Staff Council</strong></td>
<td>We were shocked that the ERB’s proposed changes weren’t discussed at yesterday’s SC meeting, then after our meeting, discovered that it was only posted yesterday. (Good job on being up-to-date, Marsha!) Thus ensued an animated discussion about the discouragement some staff councilors feel about the role of SC. Some of the items discussed were also reflected in the results from the President’s communication survey of staff in general. This is not really our committee’s subject, but we all feel strongly about SC, and decided we should discuss this with Merle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Separation Policy</strong></td>
<td>Brief discussion—no urgency detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Next Meeting:</strong> 12-15-10 to avoid Xmas rush</td>
<td>Meeting Adjourned at 12:58 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>