MINUTES
UW-Madison Classified Staff Congress
9.15.14

All Representatives recorded as ‘present,’ with the following exceptions:

Excused Absent: D. Morris (107), J. Newton (137), J. Dederich (147), C. Ripp (154), S. Hook (189), B. Petters (CSEC – 3)

Absent: A. Schueller (134), P. Ivey (138), D. Dhondup (141), J. Moreno (143), A. Broan (166) M. Fay (168), D. Tesch (203)

In addition, 16 Alternates were present.

At 2:30PM the Secretary reported a quorum was present and Vice Chancellor Bazzell called the meeting to order.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized the Secretary of the Classified Staff for the purpose of clarifying the changes to the meeting Minutes of the August meeting that resulted in a second draft. The Secretary explained the changes to the attendance roster and to the section covering Q&A. Vice Chancellor Bazzell entertained a motion to approve the August meeting Minutes. Motion was made to approve. Second was heard. Discussion was called for, but none heard. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell called upon any members of the public to approach the microphone if they had any comments they wished to make. None sought recognition.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell proceeded with his report to the Congress. Vice Chancellor Bazzell informed the Congress that the Board of Regents has now released a proposed budget and he reviewed the key points of that budget. Vice Chancellor Bazzell also presented the details of an exercise that calls upon Deans and Directors to plan for scenarios in which a 2, 4 and 6% cut to their budget is necessitated. Vice Chancellor Bazzell concluded on this point that once a State budget is introduced the administration will be able to determine which model is the most appropriate response.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell continued his report with a review of the possibility of the sale of State assets by the Wisconsin Department of Administration. Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted that power plants have been the focus of such conversations due to the publically stated interest of Madison Gas and Electric in regards to the power plants of the University. Engineers have been conducting studies of these facilities. Vice Chancellor Bazzell noted the multi-step process that would have to be executed to complete such a sale, which would include positive action by the State Building Commission as well as the Joint Committee on Finance.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell concluded his report to the Congress by announcing the process of hiring a permanent Secretary of the Classified Staff has been concluded with an offer being accepted by John Lease.
Vice Chancellor Bazzell paused for questions. Representative of District 164 asked if it could be clarified in regard to the critical compensation that if the Vice Chancellor’s remarks were in regard to this year. Reply was that the remarks were in regard to the current fiscal year that runs through June 30.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized the Chair of the Classified Staff Executive Committee, Mr. Russell Kutz, to provide the report from the CSEC.

Chair Kutz began by introducing Ms. Nancy Hilmanowski, who now serves from Seat 9 on CSEC and replaces Mr. Gary Mitchell, who retired.

Chair Kutz informed the Congress that the recommendations of the Committee on Committees regarding appointments to Chapter 6 and other committees have been confirmed by the CSEC and reported to the appropriate parties. Chair Kutz thanked the Committee on Committees for their work and explained that these nominees were not forwarded to the Congress for a confirmation vote due to the tight deadlines involved. Chair Kutz acknowledged it was concluded that in the next round of appointments the process should begin earlier so Congress has the opportunity to review and act on the list of nominees. Chair Kutz called upon Committee on Committees Chair, Mr. Giles X. Hietpas III, to offer remarks in regard to the process. Mr. Hietpas informed the Congress that the committee invited applications from the classified staff via the use of first class mail reply, surveys, and email. Mr. Hietpas noted that over 200 people responded for fewer than 40 appointments that were available.

Chair Kutz reported the Grievance Policy Committee is undertaking to review a draft of the proposed grievance policy and called upon the Chair of the Grievance Policy Committee, Mr. Erik Twaroski, to offer remarks. Mr. Twaroski informed the Congress that the goal of the committee is to have an approved draft available for their consideration by November and stressed that the committee is dedicated to fairness in its review of the draft. Chair Kutz offered Mr. Patrick Sheehan of the Office of Human Resources the opportunity to offer remarks in regard to the policy, and that those questions be directed to his office.

Chair Kutz reported that the CSEC approved the Animal Care Investigatory and Disciplinary Standards Policy Clarification. Mr. Sheehan stated the policy provides additional clarity for both employees and supervisors regarding their responsibilities.

Chair Kutz announced the Shared Governance Reception will take place at Gordon Commons on 7 October from 3:00pm to 5:00pm. The event will feature remarks by Chancellor Blank.

Chair Kutz informed the Congress that upon the conclusion of the meeting copies of the 2014 Fall noncredit catalog of Continuing Studies will be available for them to pick up and share with their constituents.

Chair Kutz reminded the Congress that appointments are available for seats representing classified staff on the search and screen committees for Dean of the Graduate School and Director of the Wisconsin
Veterinary Diagnostic Lab. Statements of interest in serving in this capacity are due by September 17, 2014.

Chair Kutz reviewed recent CSEC motions, including, formation of a Congressional Committee on By-Laws and a Congressional Committee on Communications. Each would consist of five members of Congress and a single member of CSEC, who would serve as an ex-officio, non-voting, member.

Chair Kutz invited questions at this time.

Representative of District 199 raised objection to the draft Leave Policy based on its vagueness and inquired if this policy would be reviewed by Congress and what the turnaround time of it reaching Congress might be.

Reply was that the Leave Policy was formulated and approved by CSEC prior to the existence of Congress. Mr. Patrick Sheehan of OHR commented that the drafting of the document was a collaborative effort and is currently in the feedback gathering stage; once that it is completed it will be returned to CSEC.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell proceeded to the next action items on the agenda for Congress, and recognized Mr. Russell Kutz for the purpose of introducing the items listed on the agenda.

Chair Kutz introduced the document, ‘Ground Rules for Congress’ and made a motion to approve the document. Motion was seconded. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kutz made a motion to approve the most current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order for use in parliamentary procedure at Congressional meetings. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 127 asked if it was proper for the Chair of CSEC to make the motions on the Congressional Action Items. Reply from the Vice Chancellor was that it was appropriate as CSEC members are also voting members of Congress.

Representative of CSEC seat 5 stated that rules of procedure can be amended or suspended by the body when and how it sees fit.

Representative of District 130 spoke in favor of adoption of Robert’s Rules as long as it is not used as an instrument to inhibit discussion. The Vice Chancellor clarified that the intent of Robert’s Rules is to protect speech and debate at meetings.

Question was called. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kutz introduced and moved to approve the document, ‘Congress Orientation’. Motion was seconded.

Representative of CSEC seat 5 stated that the larger body is typically listed first, but in the orientation packet presented previously to Congress a chart was included that listed CSEC as first among the shared governance groups for classified staff. Reply was that the chart was not intended to represent an order
of authority. Representative further stated that Congress should have its own representative present at CSEC meetings where agendas are finalized.

Representative of CSEC seat 4 stated her agreement with the remarks of the previous speaker.

Representative of District 162 stated that he understood a definition of the role of the Congress was discussed as early as January, but never approved by CSEC. Representative further stated that the drafts of policies to be reviewed should be provided further in advance of the meeting.

Representative of District 127 moved to postpone action on the document. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 102 stated that the document requires more clarification.

Representative of District 171 asked if the approval of the document is postponed, how would changes to the document get made, and suggested it would be proper to amend it now.

Representative of District 199 called the question to postpone. The Vice Chancellor ruled that the majority of the members had voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kutz introduced the document ‘FAQs’ and stated that since the information in the document made the document under item ‘G’ on the agenda redundant and that items ‘D’ and ‘G’ be taken together. No objection was heard. Chair Kutz moved to approve documents ‘FAQ’s and ‘Meeting Schedule’. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 108 suggested the time frame for meetings be changed to 2:15pm – 3:45pm.

Representative of District 130 expressed concern that the language and phrase “without loss of pay” is too vague. Reply was that the leave policy will address that specifically.

Representative of District 149 stated that he is paid by job numbers (which are billed) and asked if a special job number would be created for meetings such as these which could be billed. Reply was that questions such as these could be addressed and worked out by the employee’s supervisor and OHR.

Representative of District 149 asked if there is a number for billing in this regard or if it is off overhead. Reply was that if the question is if the campus is funding this activity then the answer is no.

Representative of District 151 stated that he is having difficulty getting approval from his supervisors to leave work for meetings. Reply was that once a leave policy is introduced it will be helpful to managers, but also stressed that supervisors have an obligation to allow employees to participate in shared governance in the same manner that employees have an obligation to inform supervisors of their shared governance schedules and time they will be absent. In the meantime the Vice Chancellor suggested information regarding such difficulties be sent to CSEC and to OHR.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 suggested that the phrase “without loss of pay” should be replaced by “in pay status” as that phrase has been used in earlier conversations regarding attending shared governance meetings and appears in the Minutes of meetings regarding this topic.
Representative of CSEC Seat 5 moved to amend the document to replace the language “without loss of pay” with the language “in pay status”. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 145 spoke regarding the schedule of the meetings and noted that the parking pass made available for workers on his shift is of no use during the time of day that Congress meetings are held.

Representative of District 201 made a motion to amend the document to change the time of the meeting to ‘2:15pm to 3:45pm’. Motion was seconded.

Representative of CSEC Seat 1 spoke in opposition to the motion noting that the class that occupies the room prior to the meeting does not conclude until 2:10pm, making the time frames between the two prohibitive.

Representative of District 130 spoke in opposition to the time change and in favor of the change of the language to ‘in pay status.’

Representative of 190 spoke in opposition to the time change saying it is not appropriate based on the availability of the room.

Representative of District 109 asked if Bascom Hall Room 272 is not available, are there other rooms available. Reply came from the Vice Chancellor that it cannot be definitively stated that a room of appropriate size and location is reliably available at the requested dates and times.

Representative of District 167 asked for clarification regarding the proposed amendments. Reply came from the Vice Chancellor that a vote would be called first on the proposal to change the meeting times. Vice Chancellor ruled that those who had voted ‘No’ were in the majority.

Representative of District 190 spoke in opposition to the amendment regarding pay status language change noting that vacation time and sick time could be interpreted as ‘in pay status.’

Representative of District 149 stated that Act 10 has clarified what ‘in pay status’ means.

Mr. Patrick Sheehan of OHR spoke to clarify the language that classified staff, managers, and supervisors should understand that employees are allowed to attend meetings without loss of pay and employees should be in pay status while at meetings. If not, they should make arrangements to flex within their normal scheduled work hours, and employees should work with their supervisor to modify their schedules.

Representative of District 130 spoke in favor of the amendment.

Question was called regarding amendment to change language to read in pay status. Unable to determine the outcome from a voice vote the Vice Chancellor requested a display of Representative credential cards. Secretary reported that 47 members had vote in favor and 25 members had voted against. MOTION CARRIED.
Question was called on the document as amended. Vice Chancellor ruled that those who had voted ‘Aye’ were in the majority. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kutz introduced the document, ‘Role of Alternates’ and made a motion for its approval. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 104 asked to clarify the ability of Alternates to address the Congress. Reply was that during sessions of Congress at which an Alternate is not acting in the stead of a Representative, an Alternate may address the Congress under the Agenda item, ‘Public Comments’.

Question called. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kutz introduced the document, ‘Charge of the Congress’ and made a motion for its approval. Motion was seconded.

The Vice Chancellor noted that the Provost will serve as his designee in the event he is not able to preside at the meeting.

Representative of District 111 asked in reference to Congress being the largest shared governance body, what the other bodies of classified staff were. Reply was that the Executive Committee is made up of nine members; standing and ad-hoc committees are typically between five and nine members and thus are smaller than the Congress.

Representative of District 199 moved to postpone approval of the document until a classified staff leave and participation policy is finalized.

Representative of District 161 spoke in favor of postponement based on the language in the Charge that referenced CSEC creating the agendas for Congress meetings.

Question was called to postpone approval of the ‘Charge to Congress’. Vice Chancellor ruled that those who had voted ‘Aye’ were in the majority.

Chair Kutz introduced the document, ‘Standard Sample Congress Agenda’ and made a motion for its approval. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 113 moved to amend the document to include ‘Approval of Minutes’ as the second item on the standard agenda and to renumber the other items appropriately.

All in Favor. MOTION CARRRIED.

Representative of District 164 asked if members of Congress could utilize the ‘Public Comments’ portion of the Agenda if no one from the public sought recognition. Reply was that it would be inappropriate to do so as this time is reserved specifically for anyone not serving in a voting capacity.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 pointed out that the agenda being used included a notation under public comments that the time allotted and number of speakers allowed could be waived if Congress
determined there was a demand. The Secretary and the Vice Chancellor responded that it is the intention that language be included on all future agendas.

Representative of District 109 moved to amend the document to include an item just prior to adjournment, stating “Request of future agenda items”. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 183 spoke in favor of the amendment stating that it is standard meeting practice to seek input from the body regarding what will appear on the agenda of the next meeting.

Representative of District 200 asked who decides what suggestions for agenda items would be included on the next agenda. Reply was that as it currently stands, suggestions for agenda items are advisory to CSEC, who will prepare the agenda.

Representative of District 161 stated that rules should be in place that state that Congress creates its own agenda and altering the sample agenda isn’t enough to achieve that goal.

Question was called on the amendment to include the language “Request for future agenda items.” Vice Chancellor ruled that those who voted ‘Aye’ were in the majority. MOTION CARRIED.

Question was called on the motion to approve the “Standard Sample Congress Agenda” as amended. Vice Chancellor ruled that those who had voted ‘Aye’ were in the majority. MOTION CARRIED.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized Ms. Mary Czynszak-Lyne, Representative of CSEC Seat 1, for the purpose of introducing the document, ‘Performance Management Expectations for Managers and Supervisors’. Ms. Czynszak-Lyne provided background as to the functions of the work groups and the dialogue with the Academic staff that was involved in the history of the document. Mr. Patrick Sheehan spoke as one of the co-authors of the document and highlighted the inclusion of a mid-point conversation and the consequences for non-compliance components.

Ms. Czynszak-Lyne moved to approve the document. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 201 moved to postpone. Motion was seconded.

Representative of District 109 commented that Representatives need the opportunity in advance of the meeting to comment on the drafts. Reply was that comments should be sent to the Office of the Secretary in order to have them forwarded to the proper parties involved.

Representative of District 104 spoke in favor of postponement. Representative stated that they had distributed a copy of the draft to their constituents but did not have enough information regarding it to answer questions they might have. Reply was that questions could be directed to the office of Patrick Sheehan.

Question was called on postponement of the document “Performance Management Expectations for Manager and Supervisors.” Vice Chancellor ruled that those who had voted ‘Aye’ were in the majority. MOTION CARRIED.
At 4:00PM, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made. Motion was seconded. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: J. Lease / Secretary