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### Scope

The employee categories work team will review the current set of employment categories to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. The team will then propose a new set of categories for university personnel that support the vision of the project and its parameters.

The employee category of “Faculty” will remain and will continue to represent only the four titles currently assigned to it. This will not have any impact on Faculty governance rights or tenure. The employee category of “Academic Staff” will remain, though the definition of it and/or titles represented by it may change. This will not have any impact on Academic Staff governance rights. Employees currently in the Classified Service, Limited/Executive, Employee-in-Training, and Student employee categories are within the scope of the project.

**NOTE:** This project does not create any new authority for the creation of FTEs.

### Summary of Current State

**Summary of Current State:**

Two primary employee categories, which are actually two separate personnel structures defined by state statutes:

- **Classified**, which is under the direction of the State of Wisconsin, Office of State Employment Relations (OSER).

- **Unclassified** (with sub-categories Faculty, Academic Staff, Limited, Student Assistant, Student Hourly, and Employee-in-Training), which is under the direction of the UW Board of Regents. As stated above, the Faculty category will remain as currently defined, in accordance with the project parameters.

In the current system, both classified and academic staff categories include exempt and non-exempt positions. This is a distinction required by federal law (Fair Labor Standards Act or FLSA) and will, therefore, remain in any new model. In general, exempt staff members are usually considered "salaried" and do not receive additional compensation for working more than 40 hours per week, whereas non-exempt staff are considered "hourly" and receive additional compensation (overtime) for
hours worked over 40 per week. Exempt or non-exempt status is determined based on characteristics of a position.

Currently faculty, academic staff, and students have governance rights that are defined in state statutes; Classified Staff do not. Non-Represented Classified Staff formed the Council for Non-represented Classified Staff (CNCS), but this group does not have governance rights provided by state statutes.

Historically, a majority of Classified Staff have been represented by unions, with bargaining rights covering a wide range of employment relations subject areas. Most recently, with the enactment of Act 10, bargaining has been limited to wages and requires each designated bargaining unit to certify annually (approval by 51 percent of those eligible to vote). Because of these changes, official representation has been reduced to a minority of Classified Staff.

The right of Faculty and Academic Staff to bargain collectively was repealed by Act 10. Prior to the repeal, UW-Madison Faculty and Academic staff did not choose to be represented by a union. While Teaching Assistants and Project Assistants have the right to collectively bargain, at this time, they have not recertified. Research Assistants (RAs) also continue to have the right to bargain, but have not chosen to be represented by a union.

**Current Strengths**

**Current Strengths:**

It was the team’s perception that, to a substantial degree, staff within each group (Academic Staff, represented Classified Staff, non-represented Classified Staff) felt they had a voice—Academic Staff through governance, represented Classified Staff through unions, and non-represented Classified Staff through the CNCS.

While certain features/aspects of Classified and/or Academic Staff have been identified as strengths (e.g., Academic Staff promotional title series, Classified Discretionary Merit Compensation); those features are more relevant to other work teams. No strengths have been identified with regard to having these two primary categories, in and of themselves.

The following are a few examples of aspects within each of the two categories that many people may perceive as strengths:

**Academic Staff:** Ability to set pay based on market; some titles have comparable titles at other universities, enabling more effective market comparisons; initial sick leave allocation; immediate employer contribution to health insurance premiums; ability to increase salary rate through the rate/title change process (e.g., promotion, change of duties, equity, market).

**Classified Staff:** Ability for employees to transfer between employing units and/or between state agencies; increased paid vacation over time; broad-banded pay ranges, some ability to grant/receive merit based increases through DMC awards.

One of the challenges in identifying strengths is that there are aspects within the two categories that are perceived as strengths by some, but as weaknesses by others. For example, seniority is very important to many Classified Staff, but other staff and managers perceive that there is a disproportionate emphasis on seniority as a factor in hiring consideration, transfer rights, pay increases, vacation scheduling, etc.
Current Issues

Perception of hierarchy/perceived status difference between the Academic Staff and Classified categories, as well as between the “Faculty” category and other categories

A strong desire by many Classified Staff employees to retain their ability to collectively bargain now and in the future.

A sense among some Academic Staff that substantial changes in the staff they represent would do harm to their ability to effectively participate in shared governance.

A concern among some Academic Staff (particularly within Academic Staff Governance) that any broadening of the Academic Staff category would encourage decoupling of faculty and academic staff for future pay plan increases.

Inconsistent policies and procedures between Classified and Academic Staff (e.g., recruitment, benefits, salary/compensation administration, job security, employee relations), which are administratively inefficient and difficult to manage, can create divisiveness within work groups, and often have negative effects on employee morale.

Overlap between Academic Staff and Classified Staff positions performing similar duties and the difficulty in distinguishing the differences that lead to selecting one designation over another, which often results in unlike or unequal treatment of individuals performing similar duties.

Rigidity of the two personnel structures; inability to move between them without onerous review, conversion and approval processes.

Lack of career paths/mobility within and between employee categories.

Utilization of two separate personnel structures is difficult and inefficient, as well as confusing to potential job applicants and current employees.

Difficulty in identifying what is “unique to higher education” to distinguish between Academic and Classified Staff, as well as difficulty justifying a degree requirement for all Academic Staff positions.

Current dual-structures model creates incentives for—and facilitates/enables “gaming the system”—in order to place people in whichever system is viewed by the individual and/or the manager/supervisor as more advantageous.

Executive Summary of the Recommendation

Our recommendation is to have seven employee categories:

- **Academic Staff**: Positions determined to be exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act that do not fit the definition of Executive-At-Will, Faculty, Post Degree Training, Student Assistant or Student Hourly
- **University Staff**: Positions determined to be non-exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act that do not fit the definition of Executive-At-Will, Faculty, Post Degree Training, Student Assistant or Student Hourly
• **Executive-at-Will:** Employees acting on behalf of the university in directly formulating, interpreting, monitoring, and directing the implementation of policies and/or major programs or the administrative officer with whom such policies and/or program directions originate; leading the development of the organization’s long-term needs, strategy and direction; steering the organization with strategic visioning and definition; employees serve at the discretion of the appointment authority.

• **Faculty:** Positions with instructional, research, and service responsibilities, either tenured or on the tenure track, and titled professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor.

• **Post-Degree Training:** Individuals whose primary purpose is additional training beyond completion of a degree in preparation for further education or entering a profession.

• **Student Hourly:** Individuals whose primary purpose is education, including undergraduate and graduate and who provide part-time and/or temporary administrative, clerical, laborer, technical or other general support to UW-Madison faculty and staff.

• **Student Assistants:** Graduate students who: hold a fellowship, scholarship or traineeship (e.g., Fellow); hold an appointment that is intended primarily to further the education and training of the student (e.g., Research Assistant); are employed to assist with research, training or other academic programs or projects (e.g., Teaching Assistant, Program/Project Assistant); and/or have been assigned teaching responsibilities in an instructional department under the supervision of a faculty member. In addition, Student Assistant titles (Undergraduate Assistant) are available to undergraduate students when: no qualified graduate student is available to perform a function that would normally be assigned to graduate Student Assistants; or when the terms of a supporting grant or contract preclude the use of other normally appropriate titles.

The category of Faculty was left unchanged since it was out of the scope of this work team. The categories of Limited and Employee-in-Training were re-titled (Executive-at-Will and Post-Degree Training, respectively) to what we believe are more descriptive titles, but the definition remained the same as there was perceived uniqueness to each of these groups. The categories of Students and Student Assistants were also maintained, since these categories reflect individuals who have a different primary purpose – that of education.

In addition, the work team recommends that as part of the HR design process, every effort be made to extend statutory governance rights to the new category of University Staff. If this is not possible, the work team recommends that the campus pursue institutional governance rights for University Staff in a manner that would not preclude collective bargaining. The work team also recommends that the university continue its practice of supporting the right of employees to decide whether to be represented through collective bargaining.

The work team believes this model cannot be successfully implemented without eliminating the current degree requirement for all academic staff. The proposed academic staff category as defined in this model will include a number of current exempt classified staff who do not have a degree and whose positions do not require a degree. While it is likely that a substantial majority of academic staff positions in this model will have the requirement of a degree, we recommend that the decision be based on the duties of the position rather than a category definition.
Recommendation Description

What it means:

- Governance: The current statutory governance is retained for the category of Academic Staff. Current exempt Classified Staff who remain exempt under any new titling structure would gain statutory governance rights via their move to the Academic Staff category. Institutionally-provided governance rights (similar to current CNCS) could be extended to University staff, with non-voting appointments on some campus committees. The possibility of extending statutory governance rights would remain, although this would require statutory changes that may not be easy or timely.

- Climate: Although the continuation of two separate categories for non-faculty, non-student employees does not help diminish the perceptions of differences in status, the work team believes that pursuing as much consistency as possible in other areas of HR design, i.e. compensation, benefits, recruitment processes, etc., could make a significant impact on improving campus climate.

- Collective Bargaining: Under current state statute, Academic Staff cannot collectively bargain and this would not change. Employees identified as University Staff would continue to have the opportunity to collectively bargain. Current exempt Classified Staff who currently have the right to bargain would lose that ability if it was determined that their positions should remain exempt unless changes occurred in state statute.

How it looks:
Advantages

- Incorporates clear, federally defined criteria to distinguish between two primary employee categories of University Staff and Academic Staff, and removes artificial distinctions.
- Reflects distinctions that already exist under federal law; does not create additional arbitrary distinctions.
- Preserves collective bargaining rights as they currently exist for a large majority of employees currently working within the Classified Civil Service.
- Maintains the current characteristics of shared governance on the part of the Academic Staff while adding the possibility of extending shared governance rights to University Staff either by changes to statute in Chapter 36 or by institutional consent (similar to CNCS).
- Allows for the administration of positions that can be similarly categorized and identified throughout state civil service for the purposes of:
  - Internal recruitment at UW (from within Madison campus, System, and perhaps other state agencies)
  - Identification of positions for appropriate collective bargaining units
  - Potential transfer opportunities by UW employees to other state agencies (although not clear this will be possible)
- Provides consistency with UW System HR redesign proposal
- Provides for a more straightforward implementation process with respect to HRS; i.e., it uses a criteria already captured within existing HRS data to filter the categories and would require only one redesign effort for categories of HRS for both Madison and UW System.
- Can be administered in conjunction with the Titling Work Team’s proposal for a titling survey that would also review positions by FLSA exempt/non-exempt status
Disadvantages

- Would involve the movement of a significant number of Classified, FLSA exempt employees into the Academic Staff category. There would also be some movement of Academic Staff, FLSA non-exempt employees into the University Staff category. These changes may be perceived as significant to some of these employees.
- The potential perception among Classified, FLSA exempt employees who become part of the Academic Staff that they may have decreased job security.
- May result in loss of some benefits for Classified, FLSA exempt employees if the benefits system at UW-Madison remains unchanged (i.e., dependent upon Benefits Team recommendations); it appears very unlikely that the benefits system will remain unchanged.
- Reviews of titling and proper FLSA exempt status designations will have to be completed for all titles before placement in a category can be finalized.
- Composition of University Staff and Academic Staff categories is subject to change in the event the federal criteria for determining FLSA exempt status under federal law changes.
- Potential for work teams or future governance and collective bargaining decisions to recreate separate systems for each category.

How does the recommendation address significant current issues?

Issue: Overlap between Academic Staff and Classified Staff positions performing similar duties and the difficulty in distinguishing the differences that lead to selecting one designation over another.
- Placement within the two revised categories will be determined by the FLSA definitions that already exist and must be maintained. This eliminates a second level of differentiation based on an ambiguous standard of “unique to higher education.” This would be reinforced if the Titling team can develop title series with clear distinctions between exempt and nonexempt.

Issue: Rigidity of the two personnel structures; inability to move between them without onerous review, conversion, and approval processes.
- There is no need to have two different personnel structures solely for the purpose of distinguishing exempt vs. nonexempt. The opportunity to have a single structure for many aspects of human resource management for both exempt and nonexempt employees should be considered. Employees already move between exempt and nonexempt positions so no additional barrier should be created to move between these two categories.

Issue: Lack of career paths/mobility within and between employee categories.
- The FLSA definitions should not create a barrier for movement between categories as long as the university does not add policies or processes that create such barriers. The new categories would allow titling, promotion, recruitment, development of career paths, etc. to be based on job duties.

Issue: Utilization of two separate personnel structures is difficult and inefficient, as well as confusing to potential job applicants and current employees.
- There is no requirement that exempt and nonexempt employees be hired through different processes, have different performance management processes, require separate titling systems or different compensation principles or benefit structures. This model should allow for a single personnel recruitment structure for all employees. Policy and procedure can be unified so candidates and employees work under one set of guidelines. However, the work team has a significant concern that with different governance or representation structure, there is a high potential to diverge and recreate the disadvantages of the current system.
- University benefits and processes can be marketed to the public in a more consistent and clear manner. Confusion will be minimized due to fewer variations in policy and procedure, and maintenance costs should ultimately decrease.

Issue: Difficulty in identifying what is “unique to higher education” to distinguish between Academic and Classified Staff
- This artificial category definition, with significant opportunity for differing interpretations, is eliminated.
- Requirements for positions will be specific to the needs of the job rather than arbitrary criteria unrelated to the actual job duties.

Issue: Current dual-structures model creates incentives for—and facilitates/enables “gaming the system”—to place people in whichever system is viewed by the individual and/or the manager/supervisor as more advantageous.
- Category determination is based solely on the Fair Labor Standards Act requirements. If compensation, benefits, recruitment, performance management, and titling are all consistent across the categories of Academic Staff and University Staff, dual structures will be eliminated and therefore the perceived incentives to “game the system” are reduced. For consistency, it is critical that a central university unit determine the category, as even the FLSA leaves some room for interpretation.

Efficiency: Each process, step, or rule adds value and can be accomplished in a timely way.
- The new structure should be more efficient because determination of category is based on a single existing federal standard.
- This model will reduce the confusion and inconsistency that result from defining positions as either Academic Staff or Classified Staff based on a “unique to higher education” distinction when that distinction is not particularly clear or changes over time.
- This model should allow for a single personnel structure for all employees. This model enables other work teams to create recommendations that are uniform across categories.

Flexibility and Responsiveness: Processes can be adapted to a broad range of situations and allow for ongoing improvement.
- These categories provide the ability to recognize existing federally-mandated distinctions between employees while still allowing for greater consistency in overall policies and procedures.
- Redefining the basis for two separate categories to include only the mandated distinction decreases the number of factors that can complicate the creation of positions.
- This model maintains collective bargaining for the majority of staff who now have those rights and provides flexibility in the future if more robust collective bargaining rights are restored.

Alignment: Components of the design support one another across the employee lifecycle.
- This model would allow an employee to move between various jobs to the extent they are qualified and the needs of the institution dictates. In the current state, it is difficult for an employee to make such changes, particularly when the change involves movement between the current Classified and Academic Staff categories. Such changes currently also result in benefit changes for employees.
- This model allows for the development of a more consistent compensation, benefits, and merit structure across a larger group of employees compared to the current system.

Consistency: Policies and processes are common to as many employees as possible unless required by a business need.
This model allows employees to move from non-exempt to exempt status based on the FLSA definition only and links their category to this distinction.

**Transparency:** Processes are driven by guidelines that are clearly communicated.
- The definitions of each employee category have been written to make them very distinct and based on existing federal definitions and groups with perceived unique factors that are already part of our personnel structure. This should enable more clarity across the entire HR process.

**How does the recommendation promote our workforce and community of the 21st century?**

**Diversity:** We seek to create a community that draws upon the ideas, experiences, and perspectives of a diverse workforce and promotes an inclusive culture.
- This model provides flexibility via the ability to improve movement between what are currently Classified and Academic positions. In addition, category would no longer be a primary consideration, but would emerge instead as the outcome of FLSA determination for a specific position. If other aspects of the HR system further decrease distinctions between these categories, the potential to decrease the perception of status differences can be achieved.
- This model should allow flexibility in consideration of when a degree is relevant or required for a specific position, rather than an arbitrary standard applied to an entire category based on a “unique to higher education” difference.

**Engagement:** We seek to foster trust and commitment in employees and support their development.
- This model expands the number of staff members who have an active role in statutory shared governance. It will be important to invest considerable time early in the process to explain the protections afforded Academic Staff under current policies. This may reduce some concerns regarding those who move to the Academic Staff category.

**Right Talent and Fit:** We seek to attract, develop, and retain talent needed to sustain and continually improve a world-class university.
- This model may also improve our external marketability, as it may be more transparent to prospective employees outside the university. This could make us a more attractive employer.
- This model should allow for a single personnel structure for all employees because there is no requirement that exempt and nonexempt employees be hired through different processes, have different performance management processes, require separate titling systems or different compensation principles or benefit structures. Eliminating the need for multiple recruitment structures would streamline the hiring process and at the very least allow us to be faster in capturing talent before it is employed elsewhere.

**Adaptability:** We seek to create a culture that fosters a shared ability to embrace and respond to change.
- The implementation of clear employee categories will enable other HR Design Teams to create structures that can respond to emerging trends, innovations, and changing market needs.
- Removal of unnecessary barriers allows focus to be placed on designing flexible solutions.

**What major alternatives were considered?**

Alternative 1: Six employee categories, combining the current categories of Academic Staff and Classified Staff into a single category of Academic Staff.

This model was strongly supported as the model that best met the majority of objectives established in the team charge and best positioned the institution for the future. However, two key factors led the
work team to conclude that this model would not be successfully implemented at this time: 1) The inability to guarantee collective bargaining rights for the majority of individuals who currently have those rights; and 2) the lack of acceptance of such a model by the leadership of various governance and constituent groups.

Alternative 2: Keep the current state, i.e. Academic Staff would continue to be restricted to positions determine to be unique to higher education. This model would retain the current state but change the name of Classified Staff to University Staff.
Concerns with this model included:

- Perceived classism would not change. Perception that one category is better than the other would likely remain.
- Although current institutionally-provided shared governance (e.g. CNCS, with non-voting appointments on some campus committees) could be continued and expanded to all University Staff, full shared governance rights would require statutory changes that may not be easy or timely. Barriers would remain in place for career mobility between Academic and Operational staff.
- This model would retain more potentially gray areas as positions with the same title may have more academic duties in one department and fewer in another.
- Team was concerned about what would happen to current Classified Staff whose titles and roles are currently unique to the university, e.g. student status examiner, instrument makers, etc.
- Perception by some Classified Staff of additional flexibility arbitrarily given to Academic Staff and not to University Staff, e.g. how hours are worked and recorded, use of “comp time”.
- This model would also require the university to create a personnel system for the Operational Staff.
- The current issues described above would not be resolved or improved.

**Were there dissenting opinions?**

Two members of the team provided the following dissenting opinion to reflect the perspective of their constituent groups:

As our discussions evolved and we received an increasing amount of feedback from stakeholder groups on campus, it became apparent that while there are modifications that could and should be made to our current merit-based (non-patronage) personnel system it is a system that has demonstrated its viability and responsiveness.

The return of robust collective bargaining and a commitment to expanding shared governance to employee groups that do not now enjoy it will do more in breaking down “caste” barriers and improving the work “climate” than changing employee categories.

In fact, dividing employees based on eligibility for overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act will only further divide a more natural recognition of employee “families.”

In discussing the various options, several members of the work group provided a perspective from the constituent groups being represented that expressed the strong opinion that any option forwarded as a recommendation include a **requirement** that any finalized Human Resources Design plan include enabling language for collective bargaining.

Acknowledging the historical context of this project, coming on the heels of a major moment in union history, any recommendation that implies that the Unions would forfeit the right to collective bargaining would be to deny the obvious.

The union representatives want to be clear that they not only believe it is imperative to protect workers’ rights as existed before Act 10 and Act 32 became law, but that they are also interested in expanding and enhancing those rights through inclusion in UW-Madison’s shared governance system.
The group also discussed the challenges in making such a significant change with so many unknown factors. This is reflected in the extensive sections on implementation challenges and change-management issues.

**What are the dependencies and interdependencies with other work teams?**

A primary concern discussed at length by our team and echoed repeatedly in feedback received throughout this process has been the perceived differences in status between employee categories, a perception that is reinforced by inequities between current employee categories. Although this involves several categories (e.g., Faculty, Academic Staff, Classified staff), modification of the Faculty category is outside of our scope. We therefore focused our efforts on the particular concern that has been observed and expressed regarding Classified and Academic staff, and the inequities between the two categories with regard to recruitment processes, compensation structures, and benefits (e.g., paid leave accrual and use). Although it may not be possible to completely eliminate this concern, after considering a number of proposals, we believe the recommended model sets the stage to address these issues. Success in this area is highly dependent on the work of several other teams, e.g., the Titles work team in developing titles and title series that are clearly defined and provide opportunities for movement within and between title series, career advancement and professional growth; the Recruitment & Assessment and Competencies teams in developing straightforward and consistent recruitment processes and job criteria; and the Compensation and Benefits teams in developing structures that are consistent among employee categories, including opportunities for pay increases based on expanded duties, performance, etc. We would encourage these teams to recommend variations in these areas only when necessary due to legal requirements (e.g., FLSA) or compelling business needs.

Conversely, our work provides the framework for the work of the other teams. Throughout our discussion we were cognizant of the need to avoid creating employee categories that would impose artificial barriers to the effective work of the other teams.

**What development or implementation challenges do you anticipate?**

This model would move some employees into a new employment category which could change their governance rights and collective bargaining rights. As all the HR design changes are considered, it will be important to communicate with all individuals, but particularly those who may experience a change in employment category, to help address concerns and clearly articulate the perceived benefits and costs of these changes. This model would also require modification of the criteria used to determine whether an employee is Academic Staff. The impact of this change in employee categories would be highly dependent on the outcome of the other work teams. This makes it difficult to fully predict outcomes and clearly communicate the impact based on this recommendation alone.

Some staff may want a choice on whether they move from Academic Staff to University Staff or University Staff to Academic Staff. While the work team discussed this as possible option, the actual implementation of such a choice seemed unrealistic and thus was not included as part of the recommendation.

The term Academic Staff has a specific meaning to some employees beyond the current definition that is linked to a particular educational experience and/or status. The requirement to keep this category name may create problems in implementation as the definition is revised to reflect different criteria.
What change management challenges are anticipated?

Three perspectives on change were used to assess the impact on our organization. Considering strategic, political and cultural lenses assists with examining various challenges we face when implementing change. It is critical to understand that the current political and cultural climate at the university would require special attention to support our recommendation.

Strategic

While the selected model is not the model that the team perceived as the most strategic in meeting the majority of criteria that were part of the committee charge, it does further some of our strategic goals. A focus on integration of the categories model, along with technical implementation, will be key. Without collaboration, training, and customization to engage campus staff we will face some resistance that could serve as a roadblock to effective implementation. On the other hand, if the timing of reaching decisions does not allow for proper subsequent communication and execution, we will lose connection with staff. The pace of reaching decisions and creating structure must move rapidly, to ensure ample time to educate and engage staff regarding the new vision and direction. A clear picture or vision is needed that staff can be excited about. Balancing inclusiveness, governance, potential future collective bargaining changes, and agility in decision making will continue to be critical to continued progress in the right direction.

Cultural

While many parts of the campus appear to conceptually support change, much of the culture seems quite resistant to implementing a change if there is any perceived negative impact on an individual level. This mixed message could create significant roadblocks to successful implementation. The campus culture also creates a strong bias toward inaction if the proposed action encounters any level of resistance. Since it is unlikely that any redesigned HR system will have the full support and endorsement of all constituent groups, dealing with this cultural bias will be a major challenge.

Political

The political structure on the campus will require significant communication with various governance and constituent groups as well as external stakeholders and governing bodies. Many perspectives, as well as spoken and unspoken objectives for each of these groups, must be considered. The recommended changes may be perceived by some as connected to the larger issues at play in the state government. This may have an impact on the public image of the institution.

Communication/Training

Communication and training will drive the ability or inability of staff to engage in this process and ultimately understand and support the new structure. Considering the three lenses above (Strategic, Cultural and Political) will provide focal points to address various sticking points encountered when implementing change. Resources must be provided for ongoing efforts to communicate with and train staff throughout engagement, planning and implementation phases. Identified areas of particular importance include:

- Overall HR Design objectives
- High-Level structure explanations
- Understanding of the current state
- Importance and opportunities for governance/voice
- Clear understanding of new policies and procedures
- Policy differences among groups and rationale (if applicable)
- Avenues and processes available to make changes in the future
What is the impact of your recommendation?

Indicate the types and possible general impact (if known) that might be associated with your recommendation e.g., financial impact or operational impact.

- Fiscal impact would be costs associated with any necessary modifications to the HRS system to accommodate these changes. Since the recommendation is likely to be the same as the rest of UW System, the fiscal impact will not be as great as alternative 1 would have been.
- Operational impact of moving forward with any changes will be the greatest challenge. These changes would require educating those staff who have appointments that are changed to a different category and retraining all campus HR staff, as well as supervisors and others who interact with the HR system on these changes.
- If the recommendation for unified solutions by other work teams is achieved, we anticipate decreased Financial and Operational costs once stabilization is reached. One set of policies and procedures would result in efficiencies such as simplification or decrease in systems maintained (job postings websites, JEMS, HRS), decreased administrative costs managing movement between categories and other similar changes.

Open Questions

Future consideration is still needed regarding compensation, job security, shared governance, possible future collective bargaining situations and workplace conditions that may exist for those in the Post-Degree Training and Students categories. It is recommended that the institution develop work place rules and procedures to address this void.

If some current Classified employees are moved to a structure with the potential for non-renewal, issues related to changes in job security may arise. It is the team’s understanding that this will be addressed by the Transition and Succession Work Team.

Attachments

Please list and attach any additional documents (data analysis, models, benchmarks, survey results, etc.) that support the recommendations.

Attachment 1: 2010-11 Data Digest Faculty and Staff FTE

Attachment 2: Benchmarking Data
## University of Wisconsin-Madison

### 2010-2011 Data Digest

#### Faculty and Staff FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2,007.0</td>
<td>2,000.0</td>
<td>2,076.2</td>
<td>2,094.2</td>
<td>2,056.3</td>
<td>2,054.0</td>
<td>2,033.9</td>
<td>2,016.8</td>
<td>2,022.4</td>
<td>2,027.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Staff</td>
<td>426.7</td>
<td>436.1</td>
<td>451.2</td>
<td>454.7</td>
<td>456.6</td>
<td>453.0</td>
<td>-41.2</td>
<td>466.3</td>
<td>457.9</td>
<td>476.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Academic Staff</td>
<td>1,323.1</td>
<td>1,371.6</td>
<td>1,376.6</td>
<td>1,420.6</td>
<td>1,456.8</td>
<td>1,466.9</td>
<td>1,400.4</td>
<td>1,555.4</td>
<td>1,601.5</td>
<td>1,625.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Staff</td>
<td>3,906.5</td>
<td>4,063.7</td>
<td>4,145.6</td>
<td>4,219.5</td>
<td>4,196.6</td>
<td>4,220.1</td>
<td>4,187.8</td>
<td>4,377.0</td>
<td>4,703.0</td>
<td>4,631.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>4,828.4</td>
<td>4,859.3</td>
<td>4,902.6</td>
<td>4,958.1</td>
<td>4,914.6</td>
<td>4,916.1</td>
<td>4,744.4</td>
<td>5,004.9</td>
<td>5,140.8</td>
<td>5,173.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees-in-Training</td>
<td>635.3</td>
<td>657.1</td>
<td>648.6</td>
<td>699.6</td>
<td>725.5</td>
<td>731.6</td>
<td>734.0</td>
<td>785.4</td>
<td>894.3</td>
<td>911.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>2,022.9</td>
<td>2,016.9</td>
<td>2,033.7</td>
<td>2,111.2</td>
<td>2,511.6</td>
<td>2,423.4</td>
<td>2,380.5</td>
<td>2,318.6</td>
<td>2,381.6</td>
<td>2,487.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,998.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,769.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,021.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,287.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,328.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,256.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,057.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,968.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,343.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Octobers Payroll. Notes: LTES, Student workers, and Unclassified hourly workers excluded.

---

**2001 Faculty & Staff FTE**

- **Faculty: 13%**
- **Limited Staff: 3%**
- **Instructional Academic Staff: 9%**
- **Other Academic Staff: 25%**
- **Employees-in-Training: 4%**
- **Classified Staff: 31%**

**2010 Faculty & Staff FTE**

- **Faculty: 12%**
- **Limited Staff: 3%**
- **Instructional Academic Staff: 14%**
- **Other Academic Staff: 27%**
- **Employees-in-Training: 5%**
- **Classified Staff: 30%**

---

**Academic Planning & Analysis, Office of the President**

**Office of Budget, Planning & Analysis**
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# Public Peer Employee Categories Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Faculty Primary Categories</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>University of Iowa</th>
<th>University of Nebraska</th>
<th>University of Minnesota</th>
<th>Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Institutional Officer</td>
<td>Managerial-Professional</td>
<td>Academic Professionals and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Professional and Scientific</td>
<td>Office-Service Staff</td>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>SEU/Healthcare</td>
<td>Union Represented Staff</td>
<td>Union Represented Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Called “Job Roles”)</td>
<td>Merit – Non-Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merit – AFSCME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Merit category is broken down into clerical, technical, blue collar, security, and supervisory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Categories</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>University of Iowa</th>
<th>University of Nebraska</th>
<th>University of Minnesota</th>
<th>Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>Tenured and tenure-track</td>
<td>Regular (tenured/tenure track)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Tenure Track</td>
<td>Clinical Track</td>
<td>Regular non-tenure track</td>
<td>faculty are engaged in teaching,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Clinical Instructional</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>research, and service. Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Lecturers</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral</td>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
<td>faculty are engaged in one or more of these functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research, Courtesy, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Visiting Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Research Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Research Scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Research Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Librarians, Archivists, Curators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represented Labor</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>University of Iowa</th>
<th>University of Nebraska</th>
<th>University of Minnesota</th>
<th>Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFSCME</td>
<td>AFSCME</td>
<td>Nebraska is a “right-to-work” state</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOUE</td>
<td>COGS (Graduate Students)</td>
<td>and the University does not have</td>
<td>Crafts and Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>SEIU (Prof. Tertiary Health Care)</td>
<td>any active labor agreements.</td>
<td>Service, Maintenance and Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Care Non-Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical and Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Families</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>University of Iowa</th>
<th>University of Nebraska</th>
<th>University of Minnesota</th>
<th>Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All non-faculty jobs are categorized into 20 job families with sub-categories called career bands.</td>
<td>Professional/Scientific jobs were recently organized into 18 families. (effective 2011).</td>
<td>Non-faculty jobs are categorized into 15 job families in the new NU Values program. Each family has four common levels: Assistant, Associate, Specialist, or Senior.</td>
<td>Current Job Family Classification project will define families for civil service and professional employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>University of Iowa</th>
<th>University of Nebraska</th>
<th>University of Minnesota</th>
<th>Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University senate represents faculty at a university system level. Governing faculties are in charge of the affairs of each college, school, or division.</td>
<td>Faculty Senate is the primary connection between faculty and University administration. Includes clinical and non-tenure track faculty. Staff Council advocates for P&amp;S staff.</td>
<td>UNL participates in shared governance through the faculty senate. Faculty senate consults with staff groups and student governance.</td>
<td>Five principle governance groups are active at UNL: Civil Service Senate, University Senate, Faculty Senate, Presidents and Administrators Senate, and Student Senate.</td>
<td>Academic Leadership Council and Faculty Senate participate in shared governance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Johns Hopkins

Roles

JHU’s job classification system is a role and contribution based system that assigns each job a **role, level**, and **market-based salary range**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations Role</th>
<th>Professional Role</th>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>An operations role provides support and services through practical application of processes, methods, and procedures. The emphasis is on performing job duties that support day-to-day operations of the business. This role typically focuses on what and how the work needs to be done. Operations roles can be either administrative/technical or academic/clinical/research.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A professional role provides expertise in a profession or discipline. It is concerned with applying principles, concepts, and theory. Advanced knowledge, skills and expertise is typically acquired through higher education. Professional roles can be either administrative/technical or academic/clinical/research.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A leadership role involves leveraging resources and staff to accomplish work. A leader translates broad vision and goals into long and short-range plans. The focus of leadership jobs is primarily on leading others.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://hmt.jhu.edu/payjob_system.cfm](http://hmt.jhu.edu/payjob_system.cfm)
University of Michigan
Job Rules

Categorizes classifications using criteria relating to the primary purpose of a job and the relationship jobs have to one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>categorizes UM Market Job Titles spanning the provision of operational support and service requiring training gained through on-the-job experience, vocational training, or job-related college courses such as those found in an Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>categorizes UM Market Job Titles responsible for providing leadership and professional expertise or service through leveraging the knowledge and skills of others. Job scope can range from: oversight for daily operations of a small unit ~ to ~ recommending the strategic direction and providing leadership in the operations of a large department ~ to ~ contributing to the overall strategy, direction and vision for several functional areas. Responsibilities include demonstrating measurable impacts on operational effectiveness, attainment of school, college, department, research, health system and/or business unit goals and objectives, and activities related to hiring, promotion, salary changes, performance coaching, training, application of policies, policies, disciplinary actions, etc.</td>
<td>categorizes UM Market Job Titles responsible for: • conferring with senior and executive officers in the identification of strategic goals; • leading the development of an organization’s long-term needs, strategy and direction; • steering an organization with strategic visioning and definition; • leveraging the knowledge and skills of leadership; • determining and assigning responsibilities for attaining objectives; • evaluating leadership performance and contributions; • planning, developing, and establishing policies; • reviewing activity reports and financial statements to determine progress and status in attaining objectives and revising in accordance with current conditions, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.hr.umich.edu/compclass/descriptions/jobroles.html
Job Standards within families fall into one of the categories below. Within each category, various job levels (with corresponding generic scope descriptions) ensure consistent application of levels across campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Supervisory/Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category includes support, operational, technical, skilled or semi-skilled positions, where the skills are typically acquired through vocational education and/or apprenticeships, certifications, specialized, or on-the-job training. Problems are typically solved through knowledge of past practices and procedural guidelines, or knowledge gained through a certification or licensing program. For levels 2 and 3, these positions require specialized knowledge of processes and procedures.</td>
<td>This category includes positions which require a theoretical and conceptual knowledge of the specializations. Problems are typically solved through analysis and strategic thinking. At more senior levels, incumbents may independently manage or administer professional or independent programs, policies and resources.</td>
<td>This category includes positions where the incumbent primarily achieves department objectives through the coordinated achievements of subordinate staff who report to the incumbent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://hrweb.berkeley.edu/compensation/classification/job-structure/categories-levels