All members recorded as ‘present’ with the following exceptions:

Excused Absent: S. Strang (103), A. Yingling (128), L. Zeimet (131), A. Schueller (134), S. Frey (139), T. McCabe (136), J. Moreno (143), T. Callaci (167), E. Plato (171), T. O’Brien (172), J. Cooper (185), B. Koerber (188), A. Rosas (192), R. Pond (CSEC-8), S. Fowler (174)

Absent: G. Hietpas (110), D. McNicol (114), C. Larson (130), R. Childs (140), J. Santoyo Zamora (144), J. Dederich (147), P. Dowd (148), M. Diebold (149), J. Bergeman (150), A. Broan (166), A. Wilson (193), D. Esquivel Vindas (206)

In addition, 6 Alternates were present.

At 2:30PM, Vice Chancellor Darrell Bazzell declared a quorum was present and opened the meeting.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell invited any of those who were qualified under the rules, and wished to do so, to make public comments. None sought recognition.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell opened the ‘action items’ section of the agenda and recognized Ms. Mary Czynszak-Lyne of CSEC Seat 1 to brief the Congress on the draft of the Temporary Employee policy.

Ms. Czynszak-Lyne gave a history on the policy and the background of the process and moved to approve the submitted draft. A second to the motion was heard.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 inquired if it was proper for the person making the presentation to offer a motion.

Parliamentarian Jake Smith confirmed that the motion was properly made.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 noted that the original draft of the temporary policy contained a special exception for the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics and asked for clarification of the absence of it from the current draft.

Mr. Zubin Mufti of OHR responded that that section was taken out prior to the policy draft being submitted to the Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee as those portions were deemed to be procedural rather than policy focused. Mr. Zubin continued saying that the Athletic Department had an existing plan to convert their LTEs and by honoring their request, OHR took out the exception of the policy.
Representative of CSEC Seat 5 asked if the jobs converted will be posted for the whole campus to apply for.

Mr. Mufti replied that that question had more to do with the Recruitment, Assessment and Selection policy.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell responded it has been in the past practice.

Representative of District 113 raised what he said has been an ongoing concern about people who essentially become permanent LTE’s and inquired if any protections are being offered to prevent this.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell responded that such instances were addressed in policy changes a decade ago and stated that he understands the question of protections and prohibitions of the policy.

Representative of CSEC Seat 1 stated that there is a recommendation to form an advisory committee to review the HR policy and the LTE policy that is included.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted that there was a section of the policy that contained the legitimate uses of that type of appointment.

Mr. Mufti cited Section 8 of the policy regarding “consecutive appointments” in regard to this concern.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 asked if there was an arrangement with Athletics that their LTE employees will become permanent employees.

Mr. Mufti replied in the negative and noted Athletics have submitted a plan to convert the current LTE positions, not necessarily LTE employees, to become permanent.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 asked regarding the waiver not open for recruitment and no longer in RAS and considered as a procedure.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted that it was the Temporary Employee policy under debate, not the RAS policy.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 noted that she was simply responding to the comments of OHR made during the debate underway.

Mr. Mufti noted that an agreement with athletics was a five-year conversion plan submitted to the VCFA and would not be altering the timeline of the conversion for five years.

Representative of district 176 moved to eliminate the words “when practicable” from Section A 1.d of the draft. A second was heard.

Representative of District 151 spoke in favor of the amendment.

Representative of District 194 noted that temporary employees are sometimes used to fill in for permanent employees who are on leave.
Vice Chancellor Bazzell called for the Ayes and Nays. Ayes were ruled to be in the majority and an abstention was recorded. MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell called for the Ayes and Nays on the approval of the document as amended. All in favor with the notation of an abstention. MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized Mr. Zubin Mufti of OHR for the purpose of briefing the Congress on the University Appointment Type draft policy. Mr. Mufti noted that this policy will change the term ‘classified permanent’ to ‘university ongoing’ and ‘classified project’ to ‘fixed term finite’.

Representative of CSEC seat 1 moved to approve the policy. A second to the motion was heard.

Representative of district 113 asked what the rationale was behind the term, ‘fixed term finite’.

Mr. Mufti replied that the term reflects language from the academic staff.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell called for the Ayes and Nays. All in favor with the notation of an abstention. MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized Ms. Susan Buculik for the purpose of briefing the Congress on the Recruitment, Assessment and Selection draft policy.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 moved to reject the policy in its entirety. A second to the motion was heard.

Ms. Buculik proceeded with her briefing, informing the Congress that the draft was an effort to combine and align policies of classified staff and unclassified staff and noted in particular that the biggest change was the manner of recruitment which is to be separated from the existing State process.

Representative of district 113 made a procedural inquiry regarding what motions would be proper after the vote was taken on the motion to reject.

Parliamentarian Smith noted that if a motion to reject were unsuccessful, then the policy draft would be adopted without the opportunity to offer amendments.

Representative of district 113 objected to the opinion of the Parliamentarian and stated his understanding of procedure that if the motion to reject were successful, then the issue was over, but if unsuccessful, then debate would resume and motions to approve or to amend would be in order.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell in his capacity as Chair ruled that if the motion to reject were to fail, new motions in regard to the policy could be made and would be acceptable.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell asked the Representative of CSEC Seat 5 to clarify his motion.

Representative of CSEC seat 5 moved to reject the policy draft in its entirety. A second was heard.
Representative of CSEC seat 5 stated that there was a significant difference between the RAS policy draft released to the Congress on 10 April and the one now before the body which was provided on 23 April. Representative noted that he thought the procedural portions of the draft document were relevant and that civil service rights were in jeopardy.

Representative of District 102 asked for clarification of the permissive transfer being allowed and whether subjected to the third party and search firms hires.

Ms. Buculik replied that a third party recruiter could be used in the right circumstances such as in a high level position.

Representative of district 151 stated that he liked how the current recruitments were being conducted and felt that it is fair to have to interview for positions.

Representative of CSEC seat 4 spoke in favor of the motion to reject the policy saying that it lacked checks and balances and encouraged cronyism.

Representative of district 142 noted that his constituents have related experiences to him in which they try to change jobs or take jobs on different shifts but complain that new people are often hired instead.

Representative of CSEC seat 5 asked if full time as LTE can be waived to a full-time employee since the LTE policy conflict with being hired to a full-time position.

Ms. Buculik stated that a LTE part time would be working for a full year and that only a permanent employee is allowed to do the blue collar multi-shift.

Representative of District 191 said that while he was generally in favor of the policy so that everyone could have a level playing field he felt the ‘direct hire waiver process’ was too vague and created a giant loophole.

Representative of CSEC Seat 7 stated that the policy is for everyone and there will be no more WiscJobs postings after 1 July so a policy needs to be in place.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 stated that the direct hire waiver process is a cause for concern.

Representative of CSEC seat 5 stated that this policy would allow each department to create their own hiring system and oversight of such a system would be difficult.

Representative of district 176 asked to explain why policy covers everyone from faculty to 3rd shift custodians.

Ms. Buculik stated that they have received feedback that two polices create confusion both for those who are trying to implement it and those who are trying to understand it.

Representative of district 168 stated that he did not believe the Vice Chancellor would allow a policy draft to proceed if he didn’t think it was possible to provide the proper oversight.
Representative of district 113 asked why this draft under consideration was submitted in place of the draft originally submitted.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted that there were consistencies with other policies and that OHR tried to distinguish between policies vs operating procedures with the original draft to form the new draft. Mr. Bazzell also stated that the commentaries about the procedures are fair to question as procedures may have implications to exercise discretion about the policy.

Representative of district 161 stated that while OHR was under pressure to produce policies OHR was persuading shared governance to proceed in a timely manner and to adopt a document as close as possible to the original draft. Representative noted that the concerns expressed at the committee level to OHR were in regard to the portions of the policy now removed from consideration. Representative of district 161 urged support of the motion to reject.

(Applause heard in the hall)

Representative of district 133 noted that civil service system may not be perfect but that it served to create a ranking and a baseline.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell asked for the Ayes and Nays. Ayes were ruled to be in the majority and an abstention was noted. MOTION CARRIED.

At 3:25pm, Vice Chancellor Bazzell entertained a motion to adjourn. Motion was heard. Second was heard. All in favor with the notation of an abstention. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: J. Lease / Secretary