

MINUTES  
Personnel Policies Procedures & Communications Committee  
1.10.24

MEMBERS PRESENT: P. Haney, K. Schultz, B. Shore (by phone)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: T. Akey

MEMBERS ABSENT: K. Schehr

OTHERS PRESENT: Nancy Lynch, Jaimee Gilford, Leah Reinardy, Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Brian Vaughan, Megan Dzyuba, Lauren Hasselbacher, Terry Fritter

At 2PM, Chair Haney called the meeting to order and requested that the Secretary note all of those present.

Chair Haney recognized a public comment submitted via email that had to do with UW hiring practices which involved requesting applicants to provide their current supervisors' contact information. The comment suggested that this policy was not in line with the best hiring policies and wanted to draw the committee's attention to this. Chair Haney asked if there were any other public comments. Mr. Terry Fritter commented that this week in 2003, TSA baggage handlers and screeners lost their bargaining rights, which were subsequently restored by President Obama.

Chair Haney mentioned that the Minutes from the previous committee meeting required some corrections, and they would be presented at the next meeting.

Chair Haney invited the guests to talk about what the key changes to the HIB policy were. Ms. Lynch offered to start the conversation and stated that the key idea was to take three policies that already existed and turn them into one institutional policy which is a university standard. Ms. Lynch recognized the hard work of all those who participated in drafting the policy and stated that it was discussed and shared with Chancellor, Provost, OHR, deans, directors, and various shared governance groups. She stated that this policy would supersede all the current UW HIB policies and that the investigations would be conducted by the Compliance Office once the policy is implemented.

Ms. Gilford summarized all the changes made to the document such as rationale, definitions and scope.

A question was raised about the reason for moving the investigation process to the Office of Compliance and whether more resources would be needed. Response came that one of the main reasons for this was consistency across campus and the fact that the Office of Compliance was best equipped to handle investigations. The resource request had been made and the policy would not become effective until all the necessary resources were in place.

A question was raised about the language of definitions in a new policy. Response came that it originated from the three existing policies and was rephrased to become more familiar to the investigators.

A question was raised about how the lines would be defined between the offenses that fall under the other UW policies that are in place. Response came that with all the investigations coming in the same office it would be easier to determine what policy the offense would fall under and whether it has to do with conduct or protected class.

A question was raised regarding what happens if a disciplinary action taken against an employee was later found to be part of pattern of HIB initiated by a supervisor. Response came that every time there is a disciplinary action against university staff, OHR makes sure that all or majority of the Seven Steps of Just Cause are met before the disciplinary action is issued and university staff has grievance rights within the time periods allowed by the policy.

A question was raised regarding the timeline for the implementation of the new policy. There was no clear date when the policy would be adopted, and the date will be decided once the resources are allocated and will depend on workload and whether enough investigators are assigned.

Discussion was heard in regard to a concern that university staff representatives were not involved in the discussion and drafting process of the new HIB policy. Discussion was heard in regard to where the grievance process would fit in under the new policy. Response came that grievance was an independent process that would be initiated after HIB investigation was completed.

Discussion was heard in regard to how the policy would be rolled out to 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> shift employees that are not English speakers.

Discussion was heard in regard to protections available against vendors and outside contractors. Discussion was heard in regard to risk mitigation measures in place to protect against potential retaliation actions against employees. Ms. Hasselbacher explained in detail what steps the investigation process involved.

A question was raised in regard to the existing remedial measures before a formal investigation is initiated. A concern was raised in regard to safety and what actions could potentially be taken if there were safety concerns. Reply came that there were no templates for that kind of situation.

Ms. Schultz thanked everyone involved in preparing the draft of the policy.

A suggestion came to include a link to the Office of Compliance website in the HIB Policy. A question was heard in regard to who a “decision maker” was. Reply came that it would depend on who complainant and respondents were. A suggestion came to reference University Staff Discipline and Dismissal Policy under the Referenced UW-Madison Policies.

At 3:24PM, Ms. Schultz moved, seconded by Mr. Shore, to adjourn the meeting. All in Favor. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: J. Lease / Secretary