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


Absent: G. Hietpas (110), D. McNicol (114), C. Larson (130), M. Monroe (135), R. Childs (140), D. Dhondup (141), J. Moreno (143), J. Santoyo Zamora (144), R. Linley (146), J. Dederich (147), P. Dowd (148), J. Bergeman (150), J. Haas (184).

In addition, 7 Alternates were present.

At 2:30PM, Vice Chancellor Bazzell called the meeting to order and noted that a quorum was present.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell entertained a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of 20 April and 27 April. Motion was heard to approve both sets of Minutes. Second to the motion was heard.

Representative of District 113 asked that an addition be made to clarify the Point of Order that he made at the meeting, but was not included in the draft Minutes.

Secretary confirmed he could add such a notation to the Minutes prior to publication.

Vote was taken on the motion. All in favor with the exception of an abstention. MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell paused to accept public comments. None sought recognition.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell used his remarks to the Congress to call for a reflection upon the work over the last academic year noting that the classified staff activities on campus are key to the success of the mission of the university. Vice Chancellor Bazzell also noted the successful completion of four EID forums and thanked those members of Congress who participated, particularly in the 11pm session, which was the best attended. In regard to the State budget, Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted that the university portion will likely be debated in the next two weeks. Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted that the Public Authority option is no longer under consideration and reminded those present to check the campus website devoted to the budget for further updates.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 inquired if there was any information in regard to the construction that will take place in Room 272 Bascom over the summer.

Secretary responded that the work will consist of an update to the audio system. Secretary further reported that an alternate meeting space for the Congress has been secured.
Representative of District 142 noted that he will not be serving in the next Congress and extended his thanks to the Congress and to his co-workers and reminded the body of the responsibility and challenges ahead.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell thanked the Representative of District 142 for his service.

(Applause heard in the hall).

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized Mr. Russell Kutz for the purpose of providing a report from the Classified Staff Executive Committee.

Mr. Kutz informed the Congress of the availability of the new ‘Continuing Studies’ course catalog, now available in the office of the Secretary of the Classified Staff. Mr. Kutz also informed the Congress of upcoming HR Design information sessions, brown bag events, and a webinar.

Representative of District 104 requested that details of the HR Design events and appropriate online links be sent to members of Congress so that they might inform their constituents.

Mr. Kutz recognized Ms. Mary Czynszak-Lyne, CSEC Ex-Officio non-voting member of the Congressional Bylaws Committee. Ms. Czynszak-Lyne informed Congress that the committee has completed its first read through of the initial draft of the Congressional Bylaws, and invited those who wished to participate in a focus group regarding the document to forward their names to either herself or the committee Chair, Ms. Kristine Hommen.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell introduced Mr. Bob Lavigna of Human Resources, to provide an overview of the Transitional Compensation Policies draft.

Mr. Lavigna stated that the Office of Human Resources is utilizing a variety of communications methods to conduct outreach to campus regarding HR Design. Mr. Lavigna informed Congress that the Transitional Compensation Policy will complete the movement of classified staff to university staff. Mr. Lavigna described the policy as “transitional” until a title and compensation study is completed.

Mr. Lavigna recognized Ms. Megan Owens and Ms. Catherine DeRubeis for the purpose of briefing the Congress on the specific sections covered by the policy.

Ms. DeRubeis and Ms. Owens covered the following sections: University Staff Additional Pay Components, Craft Workers, Extraordinary Salary Ranges (ESR), Overloads, Pay Adjustments, Compensation Structure and Pay Upon Appointment, University Staff Overtime, Continuous Service, Faculty Movement from Limited Position, Sick Leave, Vacation.

Representative of CSEC Seat 1 stated that in regard to catastrophic leave there has been conversation about creating a ‘bank’.

Reply came that changes are not coming now and in regard to catastrophic leave it has only been used a handful of times but such a ‘bank’ concept could be considered.
Representative of District 170 asked if continuous service dates are in reference to July 1?

Reply came that it would be in effect July 1\textsuperscript{st} and that HR cannot make it retroactive.

Representative of District 151 inquired if the UW would be able to match the compensation provided to parking enforcement personnel of the city of Madison.

Reply came that such wage structures will be examined and it was emphasized that a ‘Living Wage’ will be instituted.

Representative of District 200 made an inquiry in regard to section two of the overtime policy where it states “except for law enforcement officers” and asked where the idea came from to separate out law enforcement officers on payment over 40 hours.

Reply came that this policy came from the University System Administration Policies. Reply further came that an adjustment so as to read: “may be paid” is under review presently.

Representative of District 200 asked if a final draft of the policy will be available by the next meeting.

Reply came in the affirmative.

Representative of District 200 stated that it would be a poor idea to separate law enforcement from the rest of the employees.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 asked for clarification on the change in the policy as it relates to UWPD.

Reply came that police would receive overtime on 80 hours over two weeks rather than over 40 hours in a single week.

Representative of CSEC Seat 1 noted that the Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee of Classified Shared Governance has reviewed the policy and is preparing amendments.

Representative of District 134 inquired as to what the rationale was behind differential pay, stating that a change has not occurred in at least 10 years.

Reply came that nothing will be changed going forward until a title and compensation study can be completed and reviewed.

Representative of District 109 inquired as to how long such a study would take and when it would commence.

Reply came that OHR is in conversation with UW-System, and preliminary conversation indicates it would be a 12 to 24 month period of study, with much of that time devoted to collecting feedback from governance groups and from employees. Reply came that it was uncertain in terms of start time as bids have to be reviewed for the services.

Representative of District 111 asked why the study would not take place using in-house personnel.
Reply came that such as study has not been done in 20 to 30 years and that while campus personnel will be utilized it will be done in conjunction with an outside organization that has the expertise necessary.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 asked for clarification of how it was decided which policies would and would not be changed. Representative cited the change in regard to police overtime and the change in overload and noted that it was stated that differential cannot be changed until a study is completed.

Reply came that in terms of overload, employees now meet a new definition due to change to ‘university staff’. Reply further came that there are two reasons for changes. One, to begin integration of two systems and two, to honor the commitments that were made in the HR Design strategic plan.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 expressed concern about wage compression and stated that the decision makers are too far removed from the working poor and underemployed on campus. Representative called for leadership in order to change the lives of the lowest paid employees.

(Applause heard in the hall)

Representative of District 151 stated agreement with the remarks of the previous speaker, and stated that the wages on campus are not competitive with those offered by the City of Madison.

Representative of District 109 asked for the implementation date of the Living Wage.

Reply came that it will be implemented on 1 July and will increase in unison with the City of Madison adjustments to it.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 noted that the establishment of a Living Wage does nothing to help those who are already earning just above it.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 stated that even though the administration has the ability to write its own policy, some of it reflects what he referred to as “Scott Walker language”.

Reply came that a lot of things could change but the approach is to primarily make changes that were outlined in the strategic plan, but fundamental changes should wait until a comprehensive study can be conducted and reviewed.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 inquired if ‘continuous service’ is in reference in benefits rather than seniority.

Reply came that continuous service date will go with the employee when they go to other State agencies and those in State agencies would bring their continuous service date with them if they came to the university.

Representative of District 124 commended those who attended the night session of the EID and related how she has trained employees who were making only .75 cents less than she was. Representative stated that she hopes a wage and title study provides some clarity as to the discrepancies on campus.
Reply came that pay adjustment policy makes adjustments based on market and equity available on July 1, although availability of financial resources is unknown.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 stated her concern that a salary study will result in hiring outside applicants at higher wages while long term employees remain stagnant. Representative stated she views HR Design as an expensive effort dominated by HR professionals who draft policies favorable to HR without taking into account those struggling employees who are now worried about layoffs.

(Applause heard in the hall)

Reply came that in additional to flexibility in hiring above the minimum there is flexibility to compensate in the current policy for things like equity and market that allows compensation to current employees.

Representative of District 133 asked if Congress cannot amend the document why is the body examining it. Representative noted that Right to Work law will be bringing down wages throughout the State and so a wage study will be of little use.

(Applause heard in the hall)

Reply came that the UW will be compared to similar organizations for purposes of a wage study, not to entry level positions in retail organizations.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 noted that this session of Congress was dedicated to discussion and questions and answers and Representatives will have adequate time to prepare amendments for consideration at the next Congress meeting.

Representative of District 113 stated that the type of job he holds does not translate to the private sector and inquired how such a position would be evaluated in a wage/title study

Reply came that positions will be compared to other public sector and higher education institutions.

Representative of District 113 inquired if there would be a flex time policy.

Reply came that HR is in the process of preparing a tool kit on flexibility. There no current policies that are planned for a change, but HR wants to make sure supervisors and employees understand current policies in regard to flexibility, and the understand the value of those policies so that they get used.

Representative of District 109 inquired how employees can prepare themselves to respond to the wage and title study, so that a proper case can be made regarding inequity in the workplace.

Reply came that employees can always talk to HR and an individual HR study will include outreach to individual employees to seek out concerns regarding equity. It was also noted that the Ombuds office is also accessible to employees.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 asked if there is money for equity in market adjustments.
Reply came that it comes down to individual departments as of now and the budget is not final at this point.

Representative of CSEC Seat 4 stated that we may have tools to make adjustments, but not money, and as new hires are brought in at higher rate it will create more compression as the years go on.

Reply came that it will apply across the board but the question remains as to whether or not departments have the resources.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 noted that short term employees could make more than long term employees. Representative asked if a person training someone who makes more than them, could be temporarily adjusted to make the same amount as the person they are training while they are training them.

Reply came that definition of temporary adjustments relates to if a person takes on more work based on a change in duties.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 stated that people who take on extra work never get money for that extra work.

Reply came that if work is appropriate to title then the PD should be examined to determine if the work could meet requirements for an adjustment.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 stated that people take on duties of supervisor when supervisor is absent and that they should be compensated.

Reply came that pay adjustments will be an option after July 1, which was not allowed previously.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 asked for an explanation of ‘overload’.

Reply came that non-exempt staff currently get overtime which will continue as it is now. An overload would be available if you take on work that is not in your title.

Representative of District 133 gave an example at his prior position in which there were numerous job duties he performed, which were not in his job description, for which he was not compensated. Representative characterized ‘overload’ as a good idea, as long as it is followed through on.

Representative of District 120 inquired as to who is in charge of PD updates, as many do not bear any resemblance to current duties being performed in jobs.

Reply came that the responsible party is the supervisor working with HR and that it is in the interest of everyone to have updated PD’s.

Representative of District 103 inquired if the comprehensive wage and title study would be across campus to include faculty and academic staff.

Reply came that it would not include faculty but will include other staff.
Representative of District 103 inquired about the survey underway that is related to Financial Specialists and asked about when the results would be available and how they would be analyzed.

Reply came that it is anticipated that the study will be complete by 14 June.

Representative of District 104 inquired if HR Design forums notices will be sent to everyone.

Reply came that it is on the website and has been posted and distributed widely, HR recognizes the importance of these particular forums as they are the final ones before implementation.

Representative of District 194 offered her thanks for the opportunity to have an open dialogue with subject matter experts in regard to the policy draft.

(Applause heard in the hall)

Representative of District 191 inquired about if an employee could be automatically moved to academic staff based on a title change that came as a result of the wage and title study.

Reply came that no employee will ever be automatically moved, only a vacant position could be moved over if it’s title changed to make it academic. The choice option will begin January 2016 and will not have an end date.

Representative of District 170 inquired if there is a list of things being examined to judge if policies implemented are accomplishing goals.

Reply came that such policies are being built for the long long term and that an evaluation is planned for a year after implementation and this would include consultation with governance groups.

Representative of District 200 thanked HR for the work put into creating the policies that the Representative described as “imperfect” but also as “a big step forward”. Representative concluded that he was hopeful that power can be put into hands of divisions which would allow for issues to be addressed more quickly.

Reply came that the challenge is to provide flexibility and ensure employees are protected.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell thanked the representatives of HR for their participation.

(Applause heard in the hall)

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized Congressional Liaison Jake Rebholz for the purpose of taking requests on future agenda items.

Congressional Liaison Jake Rebholz opened by thanking the HR Representatives and inquired of the Congress if there were any district reports. Hearing none, Rep. Rebholz asked if there were any recommendations for future agenda items. No one sought recognition in this regard.
Vice Chancellor Bazzell entertained a motion to adjourn. Motion and second were heard. All in favor with the recording of an abstention. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: J. Lease / Secretary