University Staff Senate
Special Meeting Minutes: January 21, 2016
Wyman Education Building 116/117

Council Members Present: Deb Schwab, Kathy Young, Kay Corey (for Mary Foster), Connie Fassino, Robert Rust, Missy Davis, Greg Elliot, Heather Wittkopf, Linda Matzek, Deb Toftness

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:06pm by USS Chair Missy Davis.

Seating of Substitutes:
• Kay Corey for Mary F

New Business

Wage Adjustment Proposal presentation (Greg E., subcommittee chair)

• Greg explained that the subcommittee came into existence as a result of a meeting of the USS Exec committee with the Vice-chancellor for Business and Finance (Elizabeth Frueh) in October of 2015.
• Greg also outlined other activities that are in process relating to pay plan development at a state level.
• The recommendation includes the following elements:
  o Exclusion of the following groups: trades & craft workers (who have a union contract), exempt university staff (to avoid providing a disincentive to move to academic staff) and financial specialist senior positions (which recently received a pay adjustment)
  o Consideration given to job titles with a history of problems with recruitment and retention; other campuses have already raised pay of their lowest paid workers
  o Recommends priority for wage adjustment be given to the lowest paid workers and work up the pay scale from there
  o Cost to implement the proposal is about $140,000 to cover all on the list
• Greg thanked the subcommittee members for their work on developing the proposal.

Discussion/Questions

• Are all titles supposed to be on the table provided?
  o No, the table consisted of sample data and not actual people; it was not totally representative, but all titles would be affected.
  o There are roughly 100 people below the average that the proposal aims to bring up.
  o The amount available will affect how many people are actually able to be covered by the proposal.
• How is seniority taken into account when deciding who is getting covered? Why does a newly hired person at the bottom who knew what they were going to make get a pay increase?
  o The formula for determining the new pay rate takes seniority into account, but seniority isn’t a factor in deciding who gets raises first.
  o The proposal isn’t perfect.
• Why isn’t everybody getting a raise out of this?
  o That would make it a pay plan and we cannot propose a pay plan.
• Could the difference between deviation from mean and lowest paid be clarified?
  o The lowest paid simply determines who gets a wage adjustment first.
• The Chancellor indicated that there may be an increase in enrollment for Fall 2016. This proposal should not be sufficient under those circumstances. Cost of living should also be a factor rather than just bringing people up to the mean.
  o This is is not a stopping point for pay increases.
• Those in the middle are getting squeezed out; new hires may potentially get more than staff in similar positions. How many groups are covered by the first 100 titles/people?
  o The proposal includes roughly 140 people.
  o The proposal does not bring everyone up to the mean but rather tries to move everybody up with an emphasis on those who are furthest from the mean.
• Is there opportunity to revise the proposal?
  o Yes, but the Exec Committee was given a deadline of February 1st to have the proposal to the Chancellor
  o We know we can’t make everybody happy but acknowledge that everybody has a personal stake in this.
  o There were lots of comments regarding a need for increased emphasis on seniority.
• A guest, after explaining his hiring history with the University, asked that the University be honest with people we hire regarding future prospects for wages and benefits.
• If further funds become available in the future, will the next people to get adjustments exclude people who received adjustments in an earlier cycle?
  o The intention is to continue down the list and not start over each time.
• Has any thought been given to tabling the proposal and waiting until administration can provide a meaningful proposal?
  o Our expectation is that if we don’t provide a proposal, the funds will be used for someone/something else.
• Are all departments/classifications included?
  o Supervisors and other exempt staff are not included under the proposal.
• Is there consideration for training needs to do the job?
  o Examination of particular job duties was not included in the proposal.
• What is the time frame for the proposal?
  o If we have the proposal to the Chancellor by February 1st, they will have something in effect by July 1st. There is a possibility of further funds after July 1st.

Closed Session
• The meeting went into closed session for further examination of details.

Opened Session
• The meeting was re-opened.
• The decision was presented to accept the proposals rate calculations but order by seniority rather than start with lowest paid first.
• Since the decision does not match the rationale provided with the proposal, another meeting will be required to revise the rationale/justification document.

**Walk-on Items**

• Veterans Committee
  - Motion to forward Suzie Zimmer’s name as University Staff representative: Kathy Y./Heather W. - MC

Move to adjourn: Deb T./Kay C. - MC