

Summary of Substantive Changes to HR Design Strategic Plan November 19, 2012

Note: Page numbers refer to the November 19, 2012 plan version.

Below is a summary of the substantive changes made to the plan since it was presented to the campus for comment on September 21, 2012. These changes are based on feedback from campus governance bodies and other stakeholders.

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Emphasize the value UW-Madison places on internal equity as a campus climate and retention strategy.	The revised plan emphasizes the importance of internal equity in both base compensation and compensation adjustments. The plan also emphasizes that internal equity will be integrated into the methodology of the job title and total compensation analysis (pages 25, 26, 27, 31).
Modify the frequency of the use of “equity” and “market” in the plan to ensure equal distribution between the two and, when they are mentioned in tandem, order them so that they take turns appearing first and second.	Where market and equity are presented as factors which need to be balanced, the word order has been changed to emphasize the importance of internal equity (pages 4 and 24 in addition to the pages identified above). We believe that the plan has therefore elevated the importance of internal equity. The number of times the words “market” and “equity/equitable” appear is roughly equal but this is less important than how we now characterize the importance of equity.
Clarify the role of governance in a way that is consistent with state statutes and Faculty Policies and Procedures.	The revised document reflects the active participation of governance in HR Design decision-making and policy development. The plan also emphasizes that governance groups will be actively engaged in the ongoing development of the new HR system components. Specific changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authority of governance (pages 12, 22) • The ongoing role of governance (pages 15, 28, 40, 54, 58, 61) • Specific governance roles with regard to compensation (pages 24, 27, 29, 32) • Specific governance roles with regard to benefits (pages 34, 57)
Explicitly affirm commitment to quality in education.	The plan now includes a statement that explicitly references the university’s mission and clarifies our commitment to quality in education (page 10).
Clearly state the need to train faculty, chairs, and deans to appropriately determine compensation packages, retain employees and help them be productive. Call for a campus-wide discussion on how best to create incentives for faculty to learn how to perform effectively in management roles.	The revised plan recognizes the complexity of compensation planning, analysis and decision-making. The plan defines the responsibility for providing guidance, resources, information and consultation to faculty, deans, chairs and managers so that they can use a range of compensation mechanisms to create positive incentives (page 27).

<p>Discuss the use of market criteria in interdisciplinary settings with relation to maintaining equity.</p>	<p>The revised plan acknowledges the inherent complexity of faculty compensation in an interdisciplinary environment and calls for ongoing engagement about recognizing the value of contributions from across disciplines (pages 7, 27).</p>
<p>Consider adjustments to specific plan components which could negatively impact job security or employee movement for university (classified) staff.</p>	<p>The revised plan includes several changes/clarifications about the rights of university (classified) staff. These changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring mandatory placement within divisions for university staff (classified staff) who have been laid off (pages 4, 41). • Allowing a 30-day right of return for university staff who take a new position (page 42). • Providing options for transfer within UW-Madison (pages 43, 45). • Allowing employees who are reclassified from non-exempt to exempt positions to choose whether to remain in the university staff category or become academic staff (page 21). • Allowing probation to be waived for internal movements (page 41). • Eliminating the word “indefinite” from university staff appointments (page 40).
<p>Governance bodies should be consulted about the content of the request for proposals (RFP) for a vendor to assist with the job title and total compensation analysis, and also be involved in the review of the RFP responses.</p>	<p>The revised plan now clearly recognizes the role of governance bodies in developing the RFP and evaluating the responses – as well as being actively engaged throughout the project (page 31).</p>
<p>Clarify what is meant by market with regard to classified employees in the clerical/technical and blue-collar bargaining units.</p>	<p>A market is the designated group or category of employers the university competes against for talent. Markets will differ by job type, level and function. For the purposes of making a relevant analysis, the market should reflect the scope of recruiting for a particular job.</p> <p>The plan has been modified to specify that, for clerical/technical and blue collar positions, the university recruits locally (e.g., Dane County), so the market analysis would focus primarily on local employers. For these same jobs, the university would also compare itself primarily to other government employers that have similar needs and service expectations. The definition of the appropriate market should be explicit and used consistently. We expect to work with governance groups – in this example, university staff governance – to develop these definitions (page 26).</p>
<p>UW-Madison needs to pay contractor employees workers at least a living wage.</p>	<p>Plan has been revised to state that the campus will continue to study and work with governance groups and other stakeholders to determine the consequences of applying the living wage to contractor employees whose work is conducted for the benefit of UW-Madison, on university premises.</p>

<p>Revise the table listing the work teams' 155 recommendations to make it easier to determine whether each recommendation was accepted, rejected or deferred.</p>	<p>The table of recommendations, Appendix H (page 73), has been revised to enable the reader to tell at a glance the status of each recommendation.</p>
<p>Governance bodies should participate in the creation and implementation of the campuswide engagement and inclusion survey and in framing the goals and direction of the survey. In addition, the survey should be deferred until 2014.</p>	<p>The plan has been revised to state that governance bodies will participate in framing the goals and direction of the study (page 54). A decision on the timing of the survey will be made early in 2013.</p>