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

Excused: S. Strang (103), D. Morris (107), A. Seeger (113), A. Schueller (134), T. McCabe (136), S. Frey (139), R. Childs (140), M. Fay (168), T. O’Brien (172), S. Hubing (173), J. Kind (178), J. Cooper (185), B. Koerber (188), B. Schenkel (190), A. Rosas (192), A. Arnold (194), S. Genske (201), D. Esquivel Vindas (206), L. Meinholz (CSEC 4), R. Pond (CSEC 8)


In addition, 8 Alternates were present.

At 2:00PM, Vice Chancellor Darrell Bazzell called the meeting to order and noted that a quorum was present.

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

Vice Chancellor Bazzell recognized Mr. Bob Lavigna, Director, Office of Human Resources, to review the status of Congressional Amendments as they related to HR Design Policies as reviewed by Congress.

Mr. Lavigna presented a power point presentation with emphasis on the amendments offered by Congress. Mr. Lavigna noted that he had previously reviewed the status of these amendments and the OHR disposition towards them, with the Executive Committee and in the interest of transparency it was felt the Congress should receive the same presentation.

Mr. Lavigna stated that designing an HR System provided an opportunity and a challenge to balance employee protection with management flexibility. Mr. Lavigna stated the goal to be a workforce that is engaged, diverse and adaptable. Mr. Lavigna noted that the engagement that took place last year was the beginning of a continuing conversation and that thus far at least 76 stakeholders were involved and that this was not counting the campus forums which hundreds of employees were engaged at a time.

Representative of District 164 inquired as to the definition of an ‘operational area’.

Reply came that it is a program area within a division, college or school.
Representative of District 170 requested that the power point slides be distributed to members of Congress.

Representative of CSEC Seat 1 thanked OHR, the Congress and the Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee for their work regarding HR Design.

Representative of District 167 noted that the majority of Congressional Amendments received a negative recommendation from OHR and inquired as to what the percentage was compared with the other governance groups that reviewed the policies.

Reply came many more changes were suggested by Classified Staff as most of the policies had a greater direct impact on them.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell replied that it is highly unusual for the other bodies to offer floor amendments as they follow a different process so comparisons are difficult.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 praised the democratic process of the Congress and noted that according to Board of Regents policy, all employees should have input on policies and procedures. Representative stated that the Congress did not receive the procedural portion of the RAS policy to debate. Representative inquired how those without computer access might apply for positions.

Reply came that OHR will strive that job announcements will be posted beyond the online posting and will make provision that you can apply in a manner beyond just online.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 stated that the compensation and title study should include representatives chosen by classified staff shared governance.

Reply came that a decision has not been made as to how to structure the study but that OHR is committed to working with shared governance.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 inquired how will the presentation to the Executive Sponsors will be organized.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell responded that the he will communicate and the information to the Provost.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 stated that if a formal meeting were to take place, Representatives of Classified Staff shared governance should be present.

Vice Chancellor Bazzell responded that while no formal meeting is scheduled as of yet, he would be willing to meet with representatives of classified staff shared governance.

Representative of CSEC Seat 5 moved to create a 5 person Congressional Committee on HR Design Policy, open to members of Congress or CSEC, in time to meet with Executive Sponsors regarding implementation of HR Design and communicate Congressional views on proposed amendments. Second was heard.
Vote was called. Ayes were ruled to be the majority. MOTION CARRIED.

Representative of District 111 stated that formatting regarding gender should be reviewed concern was expressed over the title and compensation study cost.

Reply came that gender language will be examined.

Representative of District 109 inquired as to why they were not given copies of policies as voted on and amended.

Reply came that HR will communicate with the secretaries office to determine how to send that kind of information.

Representative of District 109 expressed concern over computer access and the needed for a usage policy.

Reply came that OHR could not comment on the scheduling of employee time regarding computer usage or availability of equipment. It was noted that forums had been scheduled during off-shifts and that they had been successful.

Representative of District 133 inquired why the language of “should” was used as opposed to “will” in the Performance Management Policy draft.

Reply came that imposing requirements that if probationary employee has not met requirements they should be informed in writing.

Representative of CSEC Seat 3 noted that CSEC has been discussion overall communications strategy in general and computer usage policy specifically.

Representative of District 104 inquired as to the difference between permissive transfer and the current policy.

Reply came that in permissive transfer, title and pay range can transfer between positions and hires can be made without need for a civil service exam. In the future, there will not be a transfer concept except between shifts for blue collar jobs. It was noted that some future recruitments may allow for an internal recruitment within a college.

Representative of District 104 inquired if there would be any sort of tests administered in recruitments.

Reply came that people will still be evaluated based on qualifications in keeping with civil service.

Representative of District 122 inquired as to who “we” was referring to.

Reply came that the “we” referred to Office of Human Resources.

Representative of District 122 stated that in regard to increasing communication, the Housing Department has a one on one computer kiosk, hands on training, with a policy of set aside access time.
Representative of District 151 inquired as to why staff cannot use computers that are not currently in use by staff.

Reply came that staff should be provided with as much access as possible.

Representative of District 196 noted that titling for Financial Specialists took a year.

Reply came that the study on wages and titles will be comprehensive but it is not possible to answer at this time how long the process will take.

Representative of District 170 inquired that if in the future if a problem aspect of a policy is identified how it can be pursued.

Reply came that feedback is welcome from shared governance on how to fix problem areas.

Representative of District 170 asked if that needs to be formalized.

Reply came that the process would be to request adding an agenda item for discussion and then action at the proper shared governance level.

Representative of District 102 made an inquiry regarding Chapter 230

Reply came that the statute covers civil service and that the campus administration is now authorized by the Legislature to create its own system apart from Chapter 230.

Representative of District 139 made an inquiry regarding how increases in the Living Wage would be made.

Reply came that the Living Wage is tied to the Living Wage instituted by the City of Madison, reviews of which will be made each January.

Representative of District 139 made an inquiry regarding back pay.

Reply came that there will be no back pay as it relates to the implementation of the Living Wage. Further comment was made that concerns regarding compression were understood and that individual units will have flexibility in this regard.

Representative of District 176 related their concern over the titling study and that shared governance would have an opportunity to voice their opinion on those amendments that were not accepted.

Reply came that a study will involve collecting data from all employees.

Representative of District 164 inquired if a vendor had been selected to conduct the study.

Reply was in the negative.

Representative of District 164 inquired as to where approved HR Design policies can be found.
Reply came that the HR website will have a link to those policies.

Representative of District 109 inquired about policies and procedures on offenses, complaints and conflicts, in reference to the OmBuds Office.

Reply came that questions should be pertaining to HR Design policies and other questions should be addressed in future Congress agendas.

Mr. Bob Lavigna and representatives of OHR thanked the body for its questions and concluded their presentation.

(applause heard in the hall)

At 4:00pm, Vice Chancellor Bazzell entertained a motion to adjourn. Motion was heard, as was a second. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: J. Lease / Secretary