



**HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 17, 2010
8:30 A.M.**

**BOARD ROOM
WELLS FARGO PLACE
30 7TH STREET EAST
SAINT PAUL, MN**

Please note: Committee/Board meeting times are tentative. Committee/Board meetings may begin up to 45 minutes earlier than the times listed below if the previous committee meeting concludes its business before the end of its allotted time slot.

Committee Chair Clarence Hightower calls the meeting to order.

- (1) Minutes of September 15, 2010 (pp. 1-2)**
- (2) Human Resources Update
- (3) Update on Searches (3-4)
- (4) Succession Planning (pp. 5-8)
- (5) Executive Search Process (pp. 9-13)
- (6) Follow-up to OLA Evaluation of the System Office (pp.14-17)

Members

Clarence Hightower, Chair
Thomas Renier, Vice Chair
Cheryl Dickson
Dan McElroy
David Paskach
Christine Rice
Scott Thiss

Bolded items indicate action required.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
September 15, 2010**

Human Resources Committee Members Present: Clarence Hightower, Chair; Thomas Renier, Vice Chair; Cheryl Dickson; Dan McElroy; David Paskach; Christine Rice; Scott Thiss

Human Resources Committee Members Absent: None

Other Board Members Present: Jacob Englund; Alfredo Oliveira; Louise Sundin; James Van Houten, Michael Vekich

Leadership Council Committee Members Present: Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, and Jim Johnson, President, Minnesota State College-Southeast Technical

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Human Resources Committee held its committee meeting on Wednesday, September 15, 2010, at Wells Fargo Place, 4th Floor, Board Room, 30 Seventh Street East, in St. Paul. Chair Hightower called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

1. MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2010

Chair Hightower called for the motion to approve the minutes of the Human Resources Committee meeting on July 20, 2010. The minutes were moved, seconded and passed without dissent.

2. HUMAN RESOURCES UPDATE

- Vice Chancellor Lamb spoke about the direct budget cuts being made to the Human Resources division in the Office of the Chancellor. Part of the discussion included questions about credentialing. She explained that campuses will be able to conduct their own credentialing. The HR division will handle the oversight and assist campuses as appropriate.
- Vice Chancellor Lamb briefed the Board members on the first meeting of the search advisory committee for the chancellor search, which was held on September 8, 2010. The search consultant has been conducting meetings with various constituent groups.
- She reported that the fall human resources conference is scheduled on October 13 and 14, 2010, at Arrowwood Conference Center near Alexandria. It is the annual professional development conference for all HR staff across the system and will focus on the launch of the HR strategic plan.

3. AUTHORIZATION OF LEADERSHIP EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENTS

Vice Chancellor Lamb stated that this is a standard annual item that delegates authority to the Chancellor to enter into employment agreements with the presidents and vice chancellors whose agreements end in 2010-2011.

The Human Resources Committee recommended that the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the Chancellor, in consultation with the Chair of the Board of Trustees and Chair of the Human Resources Committee, to enter into employment agreements with presidents and vice chancellors whose agreements expire in 2010-2011.

The motion passed without dissent.

4. REPORT ON BOARD EARLY SEPARATION INCENTIVE FOR FY 2010

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities is required by statute to report to the legislature on the use of the BESI program. Vice Chancellor Lamb stated that we have done so, and the report was in the board packet for trustees' information. Additional information included cost savings as a result of the use of the program. Trustee Paskach asked for further explanation about Winona State University; Vice Chancellor Lamb will follow-up.

5. PAY FOR PERFORMANCE

Vice Chancellor Lamb explained the history and background related to the pay for performance provisions that exists within the employment agreements for the chancellor, presidents and vice chancellors. It was noted that Attachment B was missing from the documents provided in the board packet; Vice Chancellor Lamb will follow-up with the trustees on that document.

6. STAFFING REPORT

This item was a continuation of the staffing reports that have been developed for review and discussion by the trustees. Chair Hightower asked trustees how often they would like to receive this report, because the data does not change significantly month to month. Vice Chancellor Lamb suggested that a mid-year staffing report could be provided to the board, followed up with a year-end report. Also, the Demographic Report, which will be presented in January 2011, will provide good summary information on FY 2010. Trustees responded that an annual staffing report with analysis will be acceptable.

7. DISCUSS AND SELECT COMMITTEE GOALS

In response to the Board of Trustees' request to develop goals and measurable outcomes for the year, the Human Resources Committee offered six areas from which to choose one or two priorities for primary focus in FY 2011. President Johnson led the conversation with the trustees. In the end, the committee identified bargaining contracts and succession planning as the goals for this fiscal year. Chair Hightower asked Vice Chancellor Lamb to proceed accordingly.

8. ORIENTATION FOR NEW EXECUTIVES

For trustees' information, Vice Chancellor Lamb provided an outline of the orientation process for system executives (e.g., presidents and administrators). Trustee Sundin noted that a voice from the bargaining units is missing in the orientation process. Chancellor McCormick added that students might be considered to be part of the process.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

Submitted by,
Vicki Schoenbeck, Recorder

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Human Resources Committee **Date of Meeting:** November 17, 2010

Agenda Item: Update on Searches

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:
Pursuant to Board Policies 1A.4 and 4.2, the Board appoints the Chancellor, presidents and other system executives.

Scheduled Presenter(s):
Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

- Outline of Key Points:**
- Chancellor's Search
 - Southwest Minnesota State University
 - Anoka Technical College and Anoka-Ramsey Community College
 - Century College
 - Saint Paul College

Background Information:
Searches are underway. Vice Chancellor Lamb will provide an update on each of the above listed searches.

1 **BOARD OF TRUSTEES**
2 **MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**
3

INFORMATION ITEM
UPDATE ON SEARCHES

4
5 **BACKGROUND:**

6 Pursuant to Board Policies 1A.4 and 4.2, the Board appoints the Chancellor, presidents and other
7 system executives. Updates on searches underway and pending include:
8

9 Chancellor's Search

10 The search for the new chancellor is in the intense recruiting phase. Advertisements are out and the
11 consultants are actively recruiting for the position. The Search Advisory Committee meets on
12 November 30, 2010 to narrow the candidate field for initial interviews. Initial interviews will be held
13 on December 13 and 14, 2010. After that, the Search Advisory Committee will refer names to the
14 Chair of the Board of Trustees for further action. Finalist interviews are scheduled before the full
15 Board of Trustees on February 2, 2010.
16

17 Presidential Searches

18 Southwest Minnesota State University – President David Danahar has announced his decision to
19 retire effective June 30, 2011. The Chancellor has determined that it is appropriate to conduct a
20 thorough study of the regional educational needs in southwest Minnesota. This study will include
21 consideration of whether it is appropriate to consider some type of alignment of educational services
22 between Southwest Minnesota State University and Minnesota West Community and Technical
23 Colleges. A study will begin immediately and include consultation with the community stakeholders
24 in the 18-county region in southwest Minnesota, as well as all campus constituents. A final
25 recommendation will likely be available in spring or summer 2011. The Chancellor has also
26 determined that given the time needed to properly study this issue, it will be most effective to appoint
27 an interim president at Southwest Minnesota State University for a one-year period. The Chancellor
28 will bring to the Board of Trustees a recommendation for an interim president in Spring 2011.
29

30 Anoka Technical College and Anoka-Ramsey Community College – Both colleges presently have
31 interim presidents whose agreements expire on June 30, 2011. The Chancellor has reviewed whether
32 it would be in the best interest of the colleges and system to align these two colleges under the
33 direction of one president. Following consultation with both the surrounding communities and
34 campus constituencies, the Chancellor has concluded that alignment of the two institutions under one
35 president will better serve students and will allow for administrative efficiencies. As such, a search
36 process for one president to lead both institutions starting July 1, 2011 will be initiated.
37

38 Century College – President Larry Litecky has announced his decision to retire effective June 30,
39 2011. A national search for a new Century College president is being initiated.
40

41 Saint Paul College – President Donovan Schwichtenberg has announced his decision to retire
42 effective June 30, 2011. A national search for a new Saint Paul College president is being initiated.
43

44 *Date Presented to the Board: November 17, 2010*

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Human Resources Committee **Date of Meeting:** November 17, 2010

Agenda Item: Succession Planning

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Policy Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Approvals Required by Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Approvals | <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring |
|
 | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information | | | |

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:
The Human Resources Committee identified succession planning as a primary goal for this fiscal year.

Scheduled Presenter(s):
Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Anita Rios, Director, Talent Management
Todd Harmening, Director of Planning

- Outline of Key Points:**
- Objectives for FY11 work plan on succession planning
 - Essential components of a succession planning program
 - Benefits
 - Board's role

Background Information:
At the request of the trustees, Vice Chancellor Lamb and her staff have begun work to develop a succession planning framework to identify, develop, and promote leaders who can ensure the success of the system.

1 **BOARD OF TRUSTEES**
2 **MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**
3

INFORMATION ITEM
SUCCESSION PLANNING

4
5
6
7 **BACKGROUND:**
8

9 To sustain and grow Minnesota State Colleges and Universities into the future, it is imperative that
10 we fill the pipeline with high-performing people. To this end, the Human Resources Division is in the
11 initial development of a succession planning framework to identify, develop, and promote leaders
12 who can ensure the success of the system.
13

14 Objectives for the FY11 work plan include:

- 15 1. Promote importance and opportunities for succession planning
- 16 2. Identify definitions, key elements and parameters of a succession planning framework
- 17 3. Assess implications of retirements and competition for and development of system leadership
18 in key/linchpin positions
- 19 4. Obtain input on best means of support, barriers, and readiness for succession planning
20

21 A copy of the FY11 Succession Committee work plan is attached.
22

23 To help set the context for a discussion on succession planning, a set of frequently asked questions
24 (FAQs) adapted from William Rothwell's "Effective Succession Planning" (2005) can be accessed
25 at http://www.hr.mnscu.edu/training_and_development/staff_development_ne.html
26

27
28 *Date: November 17, 2010*

FY11 Workplan – Talent Management, Human Resources Division, Office of the Chancellor

Mission: provide system leadership to attract, retain, and develop employees to meet current and future educational needs.

Goals/Purpose	Activities / Strategies	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Outcomes: What's different?	How is it measured?
<p>Priority 8: Develop a Strategic Approach to Succession Planning</p> <p><i>(supports System Strategic Direction 4; Goal 4.1 –build org. capacity, Goal 4.2 – draw upon the talents and expertise of faculty and staff</i></p> <p><i>HR Strategic Goal 1: Attract, retain, and develop employees, Objective 1F1(S)</i></p>	Promote importance and opportunities for succession planning across the system and within institutions	Todd Harmening, Succession Planning Committee, Talent Management Steering Committee	June 2011	Communication plan on critical workforce needs and importance of succession strategies Engagement of leadership among exclusive representatives	Communication plan established Conversations held among key stakeholders
<p><i>HR Strategic Goal 1: Objective 1F2(S)</i></p>	Identify definitions, key elements and parameters of a succession planning framework, including developing criteria and metrics for optimal mix of internal and external candidates for positions.	Same as above	June 2011	Agreement on key elements and parameters	Succession plan documented and communicated that includes key elements , parameters, retirement implications, linchpin positions, and readiness for change assessment.
<p><i>HR Strategic Goal 1: Objective 1F2 (C)</i></p>	Identify definitions, key elements and parameters for defining an effective succession planning model(s) for the system and institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge differences and alignment with collective bargaining agreements 	Same as above	June 2011	Agreement on key elements and parameters	
<p><i>HR Strategic Goal 1: Objective 1F3 (S)</i></p>	Assess implications of retirements and competition for and development of system leadership in key/linchpin positions	Same as above	June 2011	Completed analysis of workforce data	

FY11 Workplan – Talent Management, Human Resources Division, Office of the Chancellor

Mission: provide system leadership to attract, retain, and develop employees to meet current and future educational needs.

Goals/Purpose	Activities / Strategies	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Outcomes: What's different?	How is it measured?
<i>HR Strategic Goal 1:</i> <i>Objective 1F4 (C)</i>	Obtain input on best means of support, barriers, and readiness for succession planning among HR Directors and other key campus leaders	Same as above	June 2011		
<i>HR Strategic Goal 1:</i> <i>Objective 1F5 (S)</i>	Affirm core elements and parameters of succession planning framework for the system	Same as above	June 2011	Stakeholder input and improvement over initial recommendations	
<i>Chancellor's 2010-2011 Goal #4</i>	Develop list of "high potential" senior leaders for interim/open position referrals	Lori Lamb Anita Rios	May 2011		

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Human Resources Committee **Date of Meeting:** November 17, 2010

Agenda Item: Executive Search Process

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

To update the trustees on improvements made to the executive search process

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Outline of Key Points:

- An overview of improvements to the executive search process

Background Information:

One of the goals selected by the Chancellor for the coming year is to improve the executive search process. Vice Chancellor Lamb will present information on improvements to the executive search process that have already been implemented, and those that are planned for implementation in Fiscal Year 2011.

1 **BOARD OF TRUSTEES**
2 **MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**
3

INFORMATION ITEM
EXECUTIVE SEARCH PROCESS

4
5
6
7 **BACKGROUND:**
8

9 One of the goals selected by the Chancellor for the coming year is to improve the executive search
10 process. Vice Chancellor Lamb will present information on improvements to the executive search
11 process that have already been implemented, and those that are planned for implementation in the
12 Fiscal Year 2011. The attached matrix outlines these improvement initiatives.
13

14
15 *Date: November 17, 2010*

Executive Search Process Improvements

November 4, 2010

Concern	Potential Remedy	Pros	Cons	Implementation
Implemented for 2010:				
<p>Insufficient candidate information at finalist stage (final three candidates)</p> <p>-Chancellor did not develop rapport with candidates</p> <p>-Candidates did not get experience of knowing who their supervisor would be</p>	<p>One on one meetings with Chancellor and candidate in process (with Vice Chancellor for HR); includes behavioral based interview questions</p>	<p>Chancellor gets to know candidates better</p> <p>Candidates get to know their future supervisor better</p> <p>Interview questions designed to elicit better decision-making information</p>	<p>Time constraints during interview day</p>	<p>Implemented for FY 2010 searches and ongoing</p>
<p>Inadequate interview data to make valid decisions</p>	<p>Structured interview format; behavioral based implemented consistently for all candidates; more conversational</p>	<p>Consistency and fairness</p> <p>Better decision-making information available</p>		<p>Implemented for FY 2010 searches and ongoing</p>
<p>Insufficient candidate information at finalist stage</p> <p>-Did not use best practices in executive assessment</p>	<p>Utilize executive assessment instrument designed around system leadership competencies</p>	<p>Additional data to be considered in selection process</p> <p>Designed to specifically address leadership competencies deemed essential to success in this system</p> <p>Forms the basis of professional development plans for the new hire</p>	<p>Newer concept; feels like psychological testing to some</p> <p>Cost (\$2,000 per candidate)</p> <p>Candidate reaction</p>	<p>Implemented for FY 2010 searches and ongoing</p>
<p>Lack of consistent web presence</p>	<p>Update web site; create new Executive Search web page</p>	<p>Better communication with consultants/candidates/Campuses</p>	<p>Resources</p>	<p>Implemented for FY 2010</p>
<p>Number of searches increases because of demographics; need to dedicate resources to improve and manage the processes</p>	<p>Hire Director of Talent Acquisition</p>	<p>Better communication/coordination</p> <p>Ability to staff more searches</p> <p>Better coordination of campus level work on searches</p>	<p>Resources</p>	<p>Implemented for FY 2010</p>

Concern	Potential Remedy	Pros	Cons	Implementation
Under consideration for 2011				
Lack of diversity in finalist pools and in ultimate hiring decision -Campus committees do not adequately reflect diverse interests/needs	Ensure diversity is represented on search committees	More diversity on committee may encourage more diversity in finalist recommendations	Lack of campus autonomy	Implement for FY 2011
Lack of diversity in finalist pools and in ultimate hiring decision -Too much authority at campus level to eliminate diversity (not only cultural but also in nontraditional background and experience)	Conduct initial screening at the Office of the Chancellor with well trained screening committee that consists of appropriate and qualified campus experts; refer to campus the short list for initial interview and campus interviews	Better assurance that diversity and affirmative action obligations are being given appropriate consideration Better quality candidates in finalist pools Time saving for committee/campus resources	Lack of campus autonomy and involvement in the process	Conduct pilot in FY 2011
Lack of appropriate community consultation and buy-in	Thorough consultation on community representation	More community buy- in		Implement for FY 2011
Lack of appropriate input by trustees in final decision	Require a trustee to sit on search committee	One additional trustee involved (three trustees already involved under Board policy)	Time consideration for trustees Campus may feel its role/voice is diminished Chancellor's role is diminished	Do Not Implement
Lack of appropriate input by trustees in final decision	Require finalists to interview in front of full Board	Additional trustee involvement	Time consideration at Board meetings Chancellor's role is diminished Candidates discouraged from applying because of public nature of final interviews	Do Not Implement
Current system presidents face difficulty in applying for positions within the system	Create process for sitting presidents to apply outside of normal search procedure	Mobility of existing presidents Retention of existing presidents	Failure to do national search Failure to obtain appropriate campus buy-in Does not solve issue that candidacy is public	Do Not Implement

Concern	Potential Remedy	Pros	Cons	Implementation
Increased costs of conducting searches	Use one search firm for more than one search (e.g. for two community college searches)	<p>Better assessment of fit with institutions and candidate</p> <p>Candidates can easily apply for more than one position</p> <p>Process efficiencies</p> <p>Candidates have better experience</p> <p>Better and more consistent branding/messaging of system as an employer</p> <p>Reduction in cost</p>	Depending on firm, may not get as many candidates to choose from	Conduct pilot in FY 2011
Increased costs of conducting searches	Use videoconferencing for initial interviews (interviews are only 1 hour or 1 ½ hours)	<p>Save travel costs of approximately \$25,000 per search (paid by campus)</p> <p>More flexibility for candidates results in easier scheduling, more streamlined process for both sides, and not losing strong candidates during the search process.</p> <p>Demonstrates using current best practices in interviewing</p>	<p>Technical issues</p> <p>Quality issues</p> <p>Experience of candidates is not “face to face” (committee will need training)</p>	Conducted pilot in FY 2010; conduct further pilots in FY 2011
Lack of Information for candidates on Process	Develop “what to expect” tool for candidates	<p>Candidates get better information sooner</p> <p>Less confusion at end of process</p>	Resources	Implement in FY 2011

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Human Resources Committee **Date of Meeting:** November 17, 2010

Agenda Item: Follow-up to OLA Evaluation of the System Office

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

To update the trustees on progress made regarding credentialing and classification

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Linda Skallman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Outline of Key Points:

- Classification
- Credentialing

Background Information:

These two issues were assigned to the Human Resources Committee from the OLA evaluation of the System Office.

1 **BOARD OF TRUSTEES**
2 **MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**
3

INFORMATION ITEM
FOLLOW-UP TO OLA EVALUATION OF THE SYSTEM OFFICE

4
5
6
7 **BACKGROUND:**

8 Two issues were assigned to the Human Resources Committee from the OLA Evaluation of the
9 System Office: Classification Delegation and Two-Year Faculty Credentialing. Vice Chancellor
10 Lamb and others will update the Board of Trustees on the progress on these issues. Attached are
11 summaries of the response to each issue.
12
13
14

15 *Date: November 17, 2010*

Response to Faculty Credentialing Recommendation

Office of the Legislative Auditor

OLA Recommendation:

The MnSCU Board of Trustees should pursue changes in Board Policy 3.32 and the college faculty bargaining agreement to provide a more flexible, timely way to ensure the quality of two-year college faculty. (p. 67)

Response:

Agree that changes to move the decision-making process closer to the colleges and to make the process more flexible and timely are desirable. Some changes are a matter of policy only, others require modification to the MSCF (college faculty) contract and are therefore, subject to negotiation and agreement by MSCF.

Process and Timeline

A task force of college and Office of the Chancellor academic affairs and human resource staff was formed to examine the credentialing process and make recommendations for making it more flexible and responsive. The task force began meeting in June, 2010. Conversations with MSCF were also begun. The goal was to have most credentialing decisions made at the colleges in time for spring semester, 2011. Those changes which involve contract language will be part of bargaining for the 2012-2013 contract.

Deliverables

1. Make use of Paid Verification Form optional for colleges - Complete
2. Enter into discussion with MSCF about desired changes to policies and practices – Initial discussion have begun and are on-going
3. Discuss with presidents, CAOs, and CHROs the training and procedure development necessary to handle credentialing at the campus level – Complete
4. Proposed changes to Board policy 3.32 to policy council in November
5. Move credentialing determinations for unlimited full-time/part-time faculty to colleges in January, 2011
6. Continue to engage in discussion with MSCF about further changes to credentialing process to make it more flexible and responsive

Response to Classification Delegation Recommendation

Office of the Legislative Auditor

OLA Recommendation:

The MnSCU Board of Trustees and Chancellor should delegate authority to classify employee positions to campuses that can demonstrate they meet system-specified standards of quality, efficiency, and consistency. (OLA Report, page 31)

Response:

Agree that further delegation is desirable. System Human Resource staff have developed a process and timeline for delegating further authority to college and university HR staff who can demonstrate they meet system-specified standards of quality, efficiency, and consistency and who want further authority. System HR does not have authority from Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB) to delegate all such positions.

Delegation Process and Timeline

Development Phase: March to September 2010 - Complete

Develop delegation criteria, revise policies and procedures, and develop evaluation, quality control and training materials.

Pilot Phase: September to December 2010 – In process

Determine, review, train, and evaluate staff at pilot sites. Pilot Sites identified based on staff readiness and recent job audit volume levels: Century College, Inver Hills Community College, St. Cloud State University, and Southwest University.

System-wide Implementation Phase: January 2011 and ongoing

Schedule based on Campus interest and job audit volume. Review, train, evaluate and confer job audit delegation certification of individual staff.

Project Close: July to October 2011

Review lessons learned and present final report to Vice Chancellor for Human Resources.

Deliverables

1. Processes developed for: selecting classes for delegation, audit delegation readiness and certification, audit quality control, audit tracking;
2. Updated delegation classification procedures;
3. Training materials;
4. Operational, quality and service metrics for evaluating the delegated job audit process.

Classifications:

- Authority for 18 classifications (30% of non-faculty positions) had already been delegated
- Authority for an additional 37 classifications (15% of non-faculty positions) is included in this project
- Remaining classifications are either subject to MMB or BMS review, are administrative in nature, are covered by bargaining unit contract procedures (e.g. MSUAASF), or are under continuing study and might be appropriate for delegation once that study is complete.