

- I) Call to Order – 1:16PM
 - II) Roll Call
 - III) Approval of March Meeting Minutes - Approved
 - IV) Approval of April Agenda
 - a. Motion to adjust Agenda to have VP and General Counsel Tara Evans address the senate under Guest Speaker.
 - b. Pass, speaking on Item VII
 - V) Elections
 - a. Taking place in May senate meeting
 - b. Nominations Deadline April 15th
 - VI) Confirmations
 - VII) Guest Speaker: Vice President and General Counsel Tara Evans re: Proposed changes by which UW community learn how to report concerns.
 - a. General Counsel; Freedom of expression implementation
 - i. How do we address complaints regarding FoE
 - 1. Fraud waste and abuse section was discussed last meeting
 - 2. Using report, a concern, we can handle all the concerns reported there.
 - a. This is an off cite portal that is anonymous.
 - 3. We are working on adding a tile that will address the FoE concerns
 - 4. We are working on a student complaint title.
 - b. Questions:
 - i. Senator Hand; what are you looking for? What is your timeline?
 - 1. Feedback on the tiles mentioned above can be given at the next meeting.
 - 2. Or reach out to the office present.
 - ii.
- VIII) External Liaison Reports
 - a. ASUW Kameron Murfitt, President
 - i. ASUW elections next week
 - 1. Enacted 4/30/24
 - ii. Holding a podcast and table to help find student concerns.
 - 1. State of the Union
 - iii. Passed a resolution to increase safety on 287 to be sent to the state government.
 - iv. Projects continue to be approved and funded.
 - b. Senator Hand; What is being placed in
 - i. Gateway center
 - c. Can you come to the accessibility meeting to share the findings of the concerns?
 - i. Yes
 - d. Faculty Senate Bob Sprague, Chair
 - i. Wrapping up meetings.
 - ii. Concerns with Reorganization and staff communication
 - iii. DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) concerns and actions
- IX) Administration Reports
 - a. President's Office Kelsey Kyne, Chief of Staff
 - i. Events; Coffee hour 4/11/2024; rendezvous;
 - 1. Spring convocation wed 4-24 2:30-4:30; ballroom
 - a. Pannel will be present for FoE

- 2. Social hour after
- ii. Staff appreciation
 - 1. Pres excellence award; Surprised by number of recommendation and will announce soon
 - 2. Emp of Q selected and will send out announcement soon
 - 3. Staff appreciation day; will be present
 - 4. DEI working group
 - a. Has changed a group to inventory all DEI functions at the Uni
 - b. Academic freedoms will not be affected
- iii. Presidential Leadership Institute; applications closed and launching in May
- iv. Senatore; Lafleiche; how many will be selected
 - 1. 20 – increase
- v. Senator Monahan; Talk about excellence in global engagement award? I helped build the survey.
 - 1. Global engagement drove this and organized this award.
- b. Academic Affairs Mandy Gifford, Chief of Staff
 - i. Provost did not tell deans to stand down; Has always encouraged them to communicate.
 - 1. The decision was made by the institute. We need to collaborate in implementation.
 - ii. Thanks to the staff working on new students' days.
 - iii. Working on next gen USP.
 - 1. On a timeline aiming for Fall 2026
 - 2. Seeking feedback this coming fall 2024
 - 3. 2025 will be professional development
 - 4. 2026 will be course development
 - 5. Reviewing low completion programs. Annually reviewed.
 - a. 6 months to respond to those changes
 - iv. Appreciation for adding admin and contract employees.
 - v. Senator Monahan; With evaluations, will there be reimplementaion of freshman seminar?
 - 1. As of now, saddle up, first year foundation will build on S-up
 - 2. Senator Hand: We are building the FYF, more along exploring yourself and being a better student.
 - 3. FYS is ok to have listed by colleges.
- c. Ombudsperson
 - i. Nellie Haddad
 - ii. Not much to report. Visitors are up, and requests for workshops are up as well.
 - iii. New office is operating well
- d. Research and Economic Development Division VP Parag Chitnis
 - i. Events
 - 1. Controlled environ 4/23-24; hosted by plenty
 - 2. climate resilience kicks off 4/23
 - 3. Art grants kick off; 4/25
 - 4. Another one 4/25
- e. Division of Budget and Finance VP Alex Kean
 - i. Not Present
- f. Human Resources AVP (Associate Vice President), Bob Link
 - i. Notice of new lower co-pay for mental help EAP
 - ii. Case for Change
 - 1. Pumping the brakes so we can hear the effected people.
 - iii. Senator Lafleiche; will this change the roll out date?
 - 1. Open in our conversations to change but still working towards the July 1 date;
 - iv. Pres Comau; Survey from staff senate; Open till the 9th of April
 - 1. Communications from that will be shared in the cabinet.
 - v. Senator Grosinger: What will the communication look like
 - 1. One on one meetings
 - vi. Senator Check; Who will be on the committee?
 - 1. The appropriate area
 - vii. Senator; what's the timeline?
 - 1. Committed to making sure everyone's voice i2 heard 3-5 weeks.

- viii. Senator Monahan; Staffing managers positions, timeline and comity?
 - 1. Not set yet and will be posted this week or early next week.
 - 2. Internal only – 7 days maybe 10 posting.
- ix. Senator Monahan; who will be the one-on-one be with?
 - 1. The impacted individuals.
- x. Senator Hand; Shared staff managers. What's the timeline for those positions?
 - 1. Defining the details and will post next week?
- xi. Review Questions
 - 1. All the positions with a particular title will be changed?
 - a. We are clarifying the position while maintaining workflow.
 - b. We will hear everyone with those titles.
- xii. Senator Check; are the new employees being told about the upcoming changes?
 - 1. Changes should be limited for some; The supervisors should be taking charge of notifying them.
- g. Division of Operations VP Bill Mai
 - i. Not Present
- h. Government Affairs VP Mike Smith
 - i. More details available upon request
 - ii. Budget was reached; please see the email sent out.
 - 1. Went well.
 - 2. Compensations; several million for that but delayed till July 25
 - 3. 1.8 mill for mental health
 - 4. 4 million for inflation
 - 5. 5 million for classroom technology
 - 6. 3 million for GA (Graduate Assistant) stipends
 - 7. Increase WAMY
 - 8. 10 million for foundation to match
 - 9. 2 million for trustees for matching cowboy joe
 - 10. 2.5 mill matching RMAO donations
 - 11. 2.5 mill for AI (Artificial Intelligence)
 - 12. 1 mill for library collections
 - 13. MArtch prog for flow through
 - 14. 1 mill for neltchy
 - 15. 62 million for maintenance
 - iii. A lot of joint committee meetings on campus are coming up.
 - iv. Internal budget meetings is started as well.
- i. Senator Krassin; Is there a way to see where those funds are being distributed (1.8 Mill for Mental health)?
 - i. Link will be sent to the president for clarification.
- j. Senator Nelson; CC for link?
 - i. Yes
- k. Student Affairs VP Dr. Kim Chestnut
 - i. Not present
- l. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion VP Zebadiah Hall
 - i. No reports
 - ii. Here for questions.
 - iii. Senator Monahan; regarding trustees meeting, AVP positions update?
 - 1. There will not be an AVP that will come onboard.
 - iv. Senator Hand; How are they defining DEI in their search for effected groups?
 - 1. We will create a policy that defines DEI so we can conduct the search
 - v. Senator Krassin; Services being offered, how will they be affected by the budget?
 - 1. Falling under title 6 it will go on; we just don't know where it will be funded with.
- X) Old Business
 - a. None
 - b. Legislation
- XI) New Business

- a. None
- b. Legislation
- XII) Executive Reports
 - a. President
 - i. Course Release Form feedback due Friday, April 5
 - ii. Promote the case for change survey to your constituents.
 - 1. Closes April 9th
 - iii. Senators need to sign up for a shift at SRD (Staff Recognition Day)
 - 1. Sheet available at the meeting,
 - 2. Signup on SharePoint
 - iv. Will be working on representing everyone appropriately
 - b. Senator Wheeler: how many responses have we had to the survey?
 - i. 350 as of 4/3
 - c. Senator Nelson; Is there stats on what the consensus is on?
 - i. Based on what we read last night. - Majority are concerned but there are some positive.
 - d. Vice President
 - i. Attended academic director meeting;
 - 1. Deans have been approved
 - e. Treasurer
 - i. none
 - f. Secretary
 - i. none
 - g. Member-at-Large
 - i. Appreciation to Tai Baker for filling in during the March meeting.
 - ii. This will be my last meeting and I will be stepping down.
 - h. Director of Outreach and Engagement update
 - i. Met again with Cigna; Mental health initiative has been moved to work through HR.
 - ii. Several endowments have been sent out.
 - 1. Cigna
 - 2. TIAA
 - a. Update to TIAA on SRD
 - iii. I will be retiring June 3rd
 - i. Legislative Affairs update
 - i. Not present
- XIII) Liaison Reports
 - a. Advisory Council on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Senator Teng)
 - i. Never been Contacted.
 - b. Athletics Planning Committee (Senator Teng)
 - i. No update; meeting in May
 - c. Campus Safety Working Group (Senator Moede)
 - i. No update;
 - d. DEI Review Working Group (NEED SENATOR)
 - i. Santor McGinley assigned
 - e. Enterprise Risk Management Advisory Committee (Senator Teng)
 - i. Meeting Once a quarter, next Tuesday
 - f. External Relation Connections & Communications Working Group (Senator Tai Baker)
 - i. Absent
 - g. Food Security Taskforce (Senator Monahan)
 - i. Giving initiative with matches. Check your emails.
 - h. Fraternity and Sorority Life Task Force (Senator Monahan)
 - i. Series of sub committees; next meeting week after next
 - 1. Increasing Uwyo PD presents
 - 2. Good Samaritan initiative
 - 3. Vision of alumni associations- and getting them engaged.
 - 4. Space allocations on Ivinson.
 - ii. April come make a recommendation

- i. Freedom of Expression Initiative (Senator Tai Baker)
- j. Green Dot Committee (Senator Hand)
 - i. Booster event last Thursday
 - ii. Reaching a saturation level where people are aware.
- k. Public Art Committee (Senator Grosinger)
 - i. No update
- l. Parking Committee (Senator Van Cleave)
 - i. Parking requests; 15th & Bradly
 - 1. Requesting the corner be changed to increase visibility approaching the corner.
 - ii. Psychology requesting permanent spot for clients.
 - 1. Approved
 - iii. Parking permits are going up but only by a few dollars.
 - iv. Minutes and changes available on SharePoint.
 - v. Brown Lot (104) changes to lines and making sure it functions?
 - 1. Will be presented.

XIV) Committee Reports

- a. Recognition Committee – Senator Moede
 - i. Tuesday; Finalized the food for the event.
 - ii. Voting on awards.
 - iii. Working on getting transportation setup
 - iv. Every person will get a ticket for the drawings.
 - v. 50/50 raffle and meat raffle.
- b. Staff Relations Committee – Senator Czech
 - i. Case for change discussed with AVP link
 - 1. Possibility of conflict with the buckets. HR sees no issues coming
 - 2. Remote work, Working the issue.
 - ii. HCM issues will be discussed in the next meeting.
 - iii. Half-acre summer hours being asked to support staff.
 - 1. Student workers reduce during the summer and affect the hours.
 - 2. May 13th will start the summer hours
 - 3. It does heavily rely on student availability for those hours.
- c. Governance Committee – Senator Hand
 - i. We have worked on creating a new districting model
 - 1. Will be distributed
 - ii. Encouraged to participate as an officer

XV) Public Comment April French

- a. April French
 - i. No intention of going against your work already done.
 - ii. Voicing concerns on how things have rolled out concerning the Case for Change
 - iii. Uni-Reg 34
 - 1. Transparent communication
 - 2. Proper communication while the decision being made not after
 - 3. Observation of an environment of fear.
 - a. More of a fear of a glass ceiling
 - b. Fear of retaliation
 - 4. Large power differential
 - iv. Requesting from staff senate take any staff feedback be shared with the folks in power.
- b. Pre Comau
 - i. Meeting cabinet tomorrow and will be presenting the staff senate survey on Case for Change
 - ii. Last week I presented the climate report to the cabinet.
- c. Senator Hand; I will be happy to examine the data to create a presentation for you.
- d. Senator Nelson;
 - i. Responding to staff senator being told to toe the line.
 - 1. We have not received that communication.
- e. French

i. No information on significant changes was shared, and we are distraught over the lack of communication.

XVI) Adjournment - 3:21PM

XVII) Public Forum

Respect full submitted

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jesse Grosinger". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "J" and "G".

Jesse Grosinger

UW Budget Narrative for Mental Wellness program:

PRIORITY # 2 – Addressing Mental Wellness at the University

A. EXPLANATION OF REQUEST:

When COVID-19 shut universities down, our college students, staff, and faculty lost access to resources, social support networks, and their sense of future stability. This caused social isolation, fear, and a loss of connection. With the ever-changing student, staff, and faculty demographics, it is emergent that resources be allocated to attending to the well-being of our greatest asset to the University of Wyoming: the people. According to the University of Wyoming's executive summary for the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), the number of employees seeking support has significantly increased from July 2021 to September 2021. Many students lost the opportunity for ongoing and continuous learning during the pandemic. Therefore, students need more skill development in navigating stressors, relationships, and academics.

Based on the number of student, staff, and faculty concerns around mental health, we propose creating a comprehensive Well-Being Center to support the campus community. This is not a one-size-fits-all approach to addressing individual mental health needs. Several techniques will be considered and implemented. This funding proposal represents an approach to help all university community members adopt a new way of learning, gaining the resources needed to address a pivotal situation and solution identification. Although this multi-layered approach will not remedy campus mental health in a single year, it provides a sustainable approach to addressing mental health. It will lead to healthier and more productive employees and students.

One of the main goals of the proposal is to create a culture on campus that helps people better position wellness at the forefront of their daily routines. We must infuse creativity, innovative thinking, and skill development to achieve mental health beyond one-on-one counseling. As an institution, we understand we cannot hire counselors to address all aspects of mental health. At the University of Wyoming, we want to ensure that mental wellness is a top priority, with resources readily available. As the Wyoming Well-Being Center becomes part of the university's everyday culture of mental health, we expect to see a shift in employee and student behavior; one that has individuals helping others in time of need, prioritizing their health needs, and overall living a healthier lifestyle.

Personnel (salary plus benefits):

- \$181,000/year for two full-time benefited Wyoming Well-Being Coordinators dedicated to outreach and education across campus and on-line, both for students and faculty/staff. These positions will be instrumental in coordinating the University Counseling Center, Half Acre Wellness Center, and Human Resources efforts to ensure individual needs are attended to.
- \$169,000/year for two full-time benefited Licensed Professional Counselors or Masters of Social Work professionals. These two positions would devote their time to faculty, staff, and students in confidential one-on-one settings. These positions would oversee mental health concerns related to mental health impacts for all of campus.
- \$150,000/year for a full-time Student Health Psychiatric Nurse Practitioner. The role of this position would be to administer diagnosis and medication management to students, faculty, or staff. This position will also help with other mental health needs by being available for those impacted by an acute crisis.
- \$55,000/year for two additional Psychology Clinic Graduate Assistants. These doctoral students would help supplement the clinic's wait list for seeing a psychologist while gaining valuable hands-on work experience.

Programming & Operating

- \$135,000/year funding for ongoing marketing materials, office supplies, website design, and professional development. These funds would also be used initially to co-locate a Well-Being Center in a central location on campus that is easy for the students, faculty, and staff to access.

- \$100,000/year to implement peer student mentoring programs across campus. These funds will ensure all peer mentors are well-equipped and capable of skill-building around motivation, stress management, self-awareness, and overall wellness practices.
- \$100,000/year to implement and support an accessible application available to all students, staff, and faculty. This application will offer various topics, including sleep practices, healthy eating, guided exercise, meditation, and focus tactics.
- \$10,000/year to implement the Apple Wellness tracker app. This health tracker will allow us to examine better how those who take advantage of our services are doing, what solutions are working for them now, and pivot if we see aggregate data suggest otherwise. This is not an identifiable tracker per individual; this would only be aggregate data based on the health assessment and behavioral questions. All individuals would have to supply their own devices, but we would use the data from those who opted in to track stress, motivation, heart rate, etc.

Expected Outcomes:

1. Increase access to mental health resources for students and employees at the University of Wyoming.
2. Increase student and employee's ability to identify and respond to mental health concerns in themselves and others.
3. Develop student and employee's practical application of knowledge and skills for increased motivation, self-awareness, and resiliency.
4. Decrease time away from work and school by practicing ongoing mental health skills.
5. Increase the number of students and employees trained in mental health first aid.
6. Designate a point of contact in each college for knowledge of mental health resources and mental health first aid training.
7. Using Apple Devices, track the number of stressful events and reduce stress-related indicators.
 - a. The organization benefits from a happier and healthier workforce by being able to baseline productivity gains, lower attrition, and reduce absenteeism. Increase student and staff retention through targeted training of organizational leaders in mental health awareness.
8. Increase the number of students and staff who utilize technology (like Apple Devices) to track stressful events and reduce stress-related indicators.

B. REQUEST BY OBJECT CODE, FUNDING AMOUNT & FUND SOURCE:

C. JUSTIFICATION / CONSEQUENCES: Priority #2 aligns with Objective 1: Enhance Student Success Commitment: Integrate best practices in teaching and learning to produce skills required for life, work, citizenship, and adaptation to the needs of a changing world and Objective 3: Provide a Supportive Community Commitment: Foster a culture of community that values and cares for students, faculty, and staff.

Additional Comments from Staff on the Reorg – April 3rd, 2024

-

Can more details be shared be the “mobility” of jobs. What does this plan look like and how is it supporting efficiencies

-

Please ask how HR & Upper Administration intends to ensure that staff have equal agency in the creation and implementation of the rollout plan based on the Deloitte recommendations.

- Communication has not gone well. Stakeholders were focused exclusively on the classification and compensation aspect of the Deloitte study, so there was no concern about restructuring that would come of the study. Some heard in December, others in January, but most did not find out until February 2024 – unacceptable to have such poor communication from HR.

- Deloitte does not understand our culture at UW. They came, gave a survey, and left. The survey itself is not statistically reliable. It was stated as an effort to “provide insight into the total amount of effort and resources (people & time) required to complete each process/activity.” In reality, it was not about that. It only asked what percentage of a long list of tasks each staff member does.

-

Given the high degree of administrative turnover at UW in the last decade, administrators need to stop saying in town hall meetings that a decision was made by their predecessor and that’s just where we are today. This response is not very emotionally intelligent, and it is dismissive of those they’re speaking to and the experiences they have been through. You’re in a leadership role now, own it and deal with the situation at hand. It’s a way to respect the work of those of us who have been here and intend to be here for the long term to build a strong community at UW.

- The Deloitte study and survey results are what they are. When you ask comfortable questions instead of hard questions, you will get the answers you expect. Without allowing staff to discuss workload on the survey you’re only seeing half the puzzle with job fragmentation data. You can “shift the deck chairs” to realign people to only HR or finance roles, but it doesn’t change the fact that even within more narrow roles many staff will still be stuck overworking and “doing the job of 2 people”. This would be the more difficult and nuanced questions that should have been asked on the survey.

- Given the above questions weren’t asked, the respectful thing to do, if this reorg goes forward, is to meet with each of the affected staff one on one, understand what actually goes on with their jobs and informally gather the right data that should have been asked for on the survey in the first place.

- Not mentioned at the townhall, but would like to raise this point for the compensation part of this exercise:

- When it comes to “phase 2-salary and compensation” it looks like we’re already headed down a path that is again myopic. Just because HR is in their happy place and feels safe relying on CUPA, they need to get out of their box. Years ago, the Staff Senate did a

meaningful and well thought out analysis of staff salary comparisons with our actual competitors, particularly the state government for professional staff and in some cases the school district. It is unlikely that a janitor or an office assistant is going to move to take a job at University of Illinois, so comparing those roles in CUPA is meaningless. Dig deeper and look at true peer comparisons/competitors that are meaningful and sensible.

- Here are my main concerns:

- o First, part of the incongruity that we as staff are experiencing is that we and our supervisors had been told and were thinking for well over a year that the Deloitte study was primarily / exclusively about getting our salaries up to snuff in an ongoing way with respect to market value. We were waiting and waiting for a positive outcome around classification

and compensation that would allow us to stay in our current positions but with the University actually valuing our work. Instead, the Deloitte report (Case for Change, primarily) ended up suggesting that there be a massive shakeup in many of our colleagues' positions and locations across campus. This has been a true shock to our system. The fact that an ill-conceived and absolutely confusing "survey" that Deloitte sent our way over a year ago was then used to "prove" that there is so-called "fragmentation" in our positions, resulting in HR deciding to change something that is not broken for the vast majority of employees, is exceptionally disheartening. And in the meantime, we are still in the dark about what this means for our salaries (which was the very thing we have been waiting to understand). It feels like a bait and switch!

o Second and equally disheartening is that this big shakeup is being forced on us based on an outside consultancy firm having a few focus group conversations with a few staff members and without anyone from HR or from our colleges / units really doing the work to have actual conversations with their employees to ascertain actual, individual workload challenges and trying to resolve them in a meaningful way, in full consultation with the staff members in question. Other than Staff Senate (very belatedly), no other staff members or their direct supervisors (Deans usually do not count as direct supervisors, and the "Dean" positions on campus have been so instable recently that it's been a revolving door) have been asked about how such moves would impact them or their units. In the name of "efficiency" and "standardization," staff voices are being squelched, and we staff feel even less valued. This is likely the very opposite of what was intended, but if in fact the royal "they" (whoever that is) intend for us staff to be better off and to feel more valued, "they" should take time to see whether Deloitte actually understood the situation at UW realistically by talking to the real people being impacted. I would very strongly recommend that this rollout NOT be implemented by July 1, 2024. This is for three primary reasons: 1) staff voices and the logical framework of UW's varied workplace needs should be paramount in the decision making; 2) there has been absolutely NO effective communication

plan for this thus far, and in order to get actual buy-in from staff members and their supervisors, that will require time; and 3) Link and company do not sufficiently understand the nuances of our workplaces, as demonstrated by this week's Town Hall session, and as such, staff members are losing confidence in their ability to lead us well through such a proposed change.

o This is a justice issue for me. If you say you value your employees, then actually have real and meaningful conversations with them as full-dimensional and very intelligent fellow humans who understand the inner workings of this institution in ways that the HR leadership and upper administration do not.

o Do you know where the number of impacted employees' figures are coming from? On cursory inspection, there are more like 270 people with job titles that correspond to the provided list.

o Additionally, we never really got an answer regarding who is supposed to pick up tasks that aren't strictly HR or Finance & Budgeting related. Some examples with our shared service model:

- website and listserv maintenance
- course scheduling
- room scheduling and building access
- entering department admissions decisions in Sales Force
- Facilities requests
- assigning GTAs in Banner
- faculty meeting minutes
- student evaluations
- managing main phone line and departmental email inboxes
- managing departmental mail & packages

- asset/inventory management

- event planning

- o We currently have these (and other similar duties) spread across several staff members in addition to their finance and/or HR tasks. There is no one “mission-driven” position in our office because we are all serving UW’s mission by supporting our faculty, staff, and students in every aspect of our jobs.

- o Lastly, I’d like to know why they won’t commit to not decreasing people’s current salaries. They can always fill positions at the potentially lower rates as vacancies occur and their current reticence is sending the message that they aren’t above taking punitive financial measures against us, despite the fact that we’ve done nothing wrong and have had virtually no input on this decision that’s being made for us.

- As I’m thinking about the Case for Change, I’m feeling like the “Case” was pretty much closed before any of us really knew what was happening. The Deloitte survey we completed almost 1 ½ years ago is not an accurate reflection of people’s job satisfaction.

We were under the impression the survey was measuring how the work we do aligned with the compensation we’re paid and relative to market value. But, in reality, that appears not to be the case, and we’re just learning that now as the Case for Change is already in motion.

- Many of us at UW are highly satisfied with our positions. It would have been much more meaningful to ask questions about satisfaction, and I think the data would have been very different. This change, even if it doesn’t affect our own positions, affects everyone across campus.. ople’s teams are being broken up, working relationships are changing, and the functionality and efficiency that we already have will be lowered as a result of this. Morale is low because we feel something is being done to us which is out of our control, and it doesn’t feel like our voice is really being heard. The \$11 million (or whatever it cost) spent on a Deloitte survey – that money could have gone so much further to boost morale and increase productivity within UW. Instead, it’s had the opposite effect.

- A much better approach would have been to survey the departments and then work with those departments who were struggling and leave the highly functioning departments alone. Or perhaps a short Qualtrics survey??

- Many of us may now consider leaving – looking for other positions that may not fall into the centralized “buckets,” looking for positions off campus, or more seriously considering retirement if we’re at that age. Many good people who, although normally very adaptable, may not want to go through another change, even though they still love the jobs they do and feel happy/content and appreciated in spite of their duties being “fragmented.”

- I think as the information about the Case for Change is finally being communicated, it’s clear that this may not be the best path forward. Wouldn’t it be prudent to at least slow things down before proceeding with a plan that seems obviously flawed?

- Main Problem with Standardizing – Job Descriptions!

- o UW’s HR already requires a standardization of job descriptions in such a way that really delimits what a unit can hire to. I would venture to say that very few staff on campus do the actual work that they were hired to; in fact, their jobs are much more involved than what is written on paper. [this is not necessarily the negative that this is painted to be in the CC report] But as far as I understand it, there is little freedom in straying away very far from what is written in the job description. While I am glad to hear that job descriptions are being UPDATED (with updated language ... the “Academic Advising” job descriptions use out of date language, for example), I would strongly recommend that the updated job descriptions would allow for at least some flexibility within positions and units.

- o Along those lines, you all should most definitely anticipate some tears and anger in this process. While it was good that Deloitte was talking with focus groups (though spending that much money for THEM to do so, rather than for YOU all to do so was not necessarily a good fiscal decision), there has been a mystery around

what the report would show, and now that the report is being unveiled, it seems that things are already fully decided. Anticipate that people who love certain aspects of their positions but are working in a “job family” that will no longer include such aspects will be very emotional around the changes that you seem to be proposing and moving forward with.

- I don't feel that our concerns were taken as seriously to the Board of Trustees as many of us have stated at the meetings and that it was kind of brushed over with our needing to “buy in”. This affects our lives, our happiness, and where we spend the majority of our time during the week. I have made many choices since starting at UW in 2008 (of promotion and also stepping down from an upper Administrative position) to be in a department I have respect for and from and I am not supportive of a pooled model. I also already support 2 departments, which have been working out quite well, I cannot imagine throwing in another/more departments and having to track their intricacies, it will just become thoughtless processing instead of mindful management.
- I really think we should not just focus on the “people who are affected” because we are ALL going to be affected – this is as big as the College Reorg, if not more so. A sea change for the entire structure and operation of the University and shouldn't be taken lightly, or with such poor planning and forethought.
- Also, I wonder about the full-time benefitted staff part, so if there are part-time staff doing accounting etc. in units, will they stay and report within the units? They are likely reporting to people who will be in the Shared services model won't they? How the heck will that work?
- Another interesting thing that has occurred to me is that those of us that are Admin Staff have been excluded from Staff Senate and therefor have no idea and have had no opportunity to hear any of these presentations it sounds like Bob has been presenting to Staff Senate.
- Our department has been talking about the way this all started, and how current job satisfaction among staff wasn't really part of the data collected. This administration tends to pride themselves on being data driven, so I wonder if a survey to capture this aspect could be useful in either supporting the 'case for change' or slowing/stopping a change that will have a net negative effect.
- Pay Matrix Update Options:
 - o My main concern, due to the sheer amount of estimated financial output required for Options 3 and 4, is that UW will choose Option 1 or 2. We absolutely need a clear ladder model (which I think would be part of Option 3 or 4). Just age updating the FY2019 matrix (Options 1 or 2) will really not solve our problem.
 - o I can't see anywhere any consideration for education level in options 3 or 4, either. For example, when a staff member with a PhD was making the same amount as someone starting their job right after their bachelor's graduation, that was truly demoralizing for them to realize.
- Bob Link needs to quit talking about the "people who will be affected" because the ENTIRE campus will be affected. Here's another list of wonders: how will they mix the funding sources? Grant, state money, self-generated funds, are there any internal reporting lines or will everyone from Acct Assoc Sr's to Directors of Business Operations report to the Shared services managers? What about people with very specialized skills and requirements - for instance Student Health? What about Reception in offices? We already struggle with that.
- They don't seem to understand that all the positions with the same title doing a bunch of different things, WAS the philosophy of a different HR, that was a plan! It's not a fault. Sigh. I am SO annoyed by this.
- I just want to say to you, and any other staff that is afraid to say anything for fear of being fired, or harassed for speaking truth to power, and/or advocating for staff rights, is a wonderful lawsuit in the making.
- RE: Bob Link with Staff Senate 2/2/24: “On such-and-such campus, there were 750 jobs on campus, and they narrowed that down to 200.” Using this as an example makes it seem like you are looking to reduce staff positions. That does not increase our confidence in the decision-makers involved.

o Later in the video there was a discussion with Bob Link saying that no reduction in force would take place. Then why use that example?!!

o “Shared-service business partners”? What if people like to do the transactional pieces and can still handle the rest of their jobs? If this were to be implemented, it would absolutely require significant communication between these shared-service business partners and the units they serve, and the units they serve would need to have a say in decision making around the tasks being done, in some situations. I can anticipate some real challenges in this transition.

o I share similar concerns with the folks who were discussing how employees would be expected to complete specific professional development. We would need to allow for variability, but still be able to reward people who didn't jump through hoops, but who are excellent workers and can be given greater responsibility. [Of course, certain tasks do require specific trainings; that goes without saying.]

o While removing certain transactional tasks from people's plates can definitely free up the mind for additional professional development and can provide “more time to do your current job better,” my concern is that people who have had specific tasks removed from their positions are actually being pillared into limitations (regardless of the amount of professional development / continuing ed they might take part in), because they are not using multiple parts of their brain and are not developing a full range of skills and competencies to include within their resumes.

o I absolutely agree with the senators who are saying that the entire campus needs clear communication regarding stages in this transition.

o Yes, please do “get your transparency back on track”!

o “Shared service model – 3 units (HR, Budget & Finance, & Research)” – solid vs. dotted reporting lines – “need to take down the siloes and work together” à I agree with this, and I hope that there is not only specific training available, but I also hope that those who are reporting up would have a say in the way this transition goes.

- There is no communicated plan, and it seems like Bob Link doesn't know what it is either. First, they report no one will move physical space in the staff senate sessions. Then for the Q&A session staff need to be mobile! Where will the people be? Will they have to have two offices? How are Business Directors reporting to shared services managers? won't those of us who are “lucky” to be left with our areas have to shoulder a lot more work because we are the only ones there? Staff who spoke in the Q&A were spot on! What is this solving?

- Plus no one on this campus does actual Research Administration except for Pre-Award Services and Sponsored programs so I don't even know what they are talking about with that one.

- And there wasn't one word about the other areas we've heard will be affected - marketing and communications, advising, etc. This is a ridiculous mess, and they are going to flop this. We've all spent this last year moving people to consolidate our units - and now they are moving people away from them, but also, will they be with us sometimes? This makes no sense at all.

- 2/26/24 Bob Link with Staff Seante: “not centralizing, but making sure people have a more defined role”: in the discussion around Bob Link's current way of distinguishing between standardizing and centralizing roles, things were feeling pretty circular to me ... this would absolutely need to be fully clarified (IN CONSULTATION WITH THE STAFF WHO WOULD BE AFFECTED) as soon as possible ...

o “If we try to compare it to current day, current day doesn't exist” – What?!! In fact, current day DOES exist, and staff will need to have a clear understanding of what will be required of them to shift from the current day to whatever is being envisioned.

o I also anticipate that with this, some people might be “moved down” into the Finance I position, for example ... or will no one's salary be lowered, and many others will be increased?

o define “mission driven” versus “budget & finance” better to everyone; I didn't understand Link's response to the

Senator asking about the day-to-day tasks was insufficient and showed a lack of understanding of staff realities.

o “In communities of practice, nothing changes” ... that’s the first time I had heard / started to understand that. And by the way, Academic Advising ALREADY has

an advising summit every year and multiple professional development meetings throughout the year. As such, please ask Bob Link to start using them as an example to be emulated, rather than saying that we would need to implement such things from scratch.

o “All kinds of ideas” for how the career ladder would work for communities of practice? which idea will be landed on? How soon will that be communicated to staff?

o the example Bob Link is using about advising training doesn’t work; every single advisor (no matter what level) must have the baseline knowledge that would be required of an “Advisor I,” as discussed for example ... again, please consult with the advisors on campus around how you would define these ladders ... experience (not just in years, but also in case load) really matter in this position.

o Also, the discussion of custodians expanding into student success makes absolutely no sense ... that’s not part of their position!

- When they did this with IT (Information Technology), they had a building, and pulled all the people, when they did this with HR, they just took the duties away from people in the units, now a lot of duties have been pushed back because HR couldn't keep itself staffed, why are we trusting them to do this?

- Do they just not want people to work here anymore?

- Just saying the words “position that will be affected” floors me. How do we roll out a re-organization plan and no one knows what is going on.

- This really feels like “upper administration” knows what’s best for all of us “lower-level employees”. Honestly, that is what it feels like.

- I'm not sure why this is getting under my skin. It just feels wrong. And I have spoken with some of the “higher ups” across campus and they don’t have a clue what is going on. Someone needs to put the brakes on this and still use the Deloitte survey information but not as a re-organizational tool, but as a tool to better our staff's situation for all. How that works I don’t know because none of us have seen the Deloitte survey. I find that very interesting. Did Staff Senate get to see it?

- You know all we are saying is pump the brakes a minute and let us figure this all out, then let’s implement something that makes sense to all of us. As you can see by my signature brand “One Wyoming – One State – One University – ONE TEAM”.

- How will we know when HR plans to visit with us? --How/when will we know if we are even part of the "impacted" staff?

- No one really knows why some are not affected and what their reasoning is behind it all. If you are the same title in the Foundation or Athletics, why are you not having to be ReORG'd? The staff under finance & HR duties are not contract employees as Bob Link is reporting. I know because I work in these units.

- With Case for Change staff are scared about their access to the My Team, Recruiting, and Expenses delegates vanishing at the end of the day and then the new people appointed to

different roles not having the access they need. It’s a major concern in my office and one of my constituents brought it up too.

- Problems with the recommendation to “standardize” positions: “The top-line takeaway is that Deloitte is

recommending "standardizing" positions. I cannot help but admit that this brought some initial distaste for me; part of the problem at this institution is the much-too-rigid standardization within staff job descriptions (i.e., the lack of flexibility in creating staff job descriptions, since each college/division/department is unique). Further standardization, to my mind, will not resolve that issue, but will make it even more entrenched. The "job families" solution also seems that it will create some rather significant headaches at the departmental level, since most staff have multiple tasks from multiple families, and it would make no sense – fiscally or in terms of (lack of) efficiency – to hire five people for five separate job families for a single unit." [In other words, "wearing multiple hats," while it can be overwhelming, can actually be rather efficient, while also allowing a worker to gain additional skills for ongoing future career development. The problem would be the sheer number of tasks within each skill/task, and this is something that each unit would need to address in a meaningful way with clear communication and each staff member's best interest at heart. (CC, p. 2, "people")]

- Will staff and their units actually have a say in whether their position is "standardized" or will it be imposed on them? "As a person who knows and loves staff colleagues across campus, my distaste is centered around the decisions / suggestions made about colleagues throughout campus without consulting them about what would actually be realistic." [I do acknowledge that Bob Link has been in conversation with Staff Senate members in February.]

- Accuracy of quotes in the CC report?

- o "Reading between the lines in the report, it initially seemed that folks might be using the HR department as 'guinea pigs' of sorts to implement their suggested changes, but HR is quite different from a college-based department. That said, on the 'post-implementation' page of the CC report, none of the four quoted even work at UW, or at least I can't find them using People Finder. It seems like fake projected quotes from non-existent folks ... or perhaps folks who used to work at UW, but no longer do. So perhaps this is all hypothetical?" [Fake anecdotal data do not inspire confidence.]

- Problematic disjunction concerning the way the survey question was asked and the way it was presented in the CC document ... thereby making the data in the report highly problematic:

- o The Administrative Activities Survey – which I filled out in mid-January 2023 – forced us to answer every task (you could use zero) and everything had to add up to 100%. I found it difficult to quantify what percentage of my position entailed each task. Many of these tasks cannot be avoided within any staff person's role. No nuance was allowed for in this survey.

- o To then use these data to say that our roles are scattered and therefore inefficient and we should therefore be put into "job families" with more pillared tasks really does not make sense, especially for each unit, which cannot afford to hire one person per job family, even if they need the tasks that each job family provides. The reason "staff members with the same job title appear to have fragmented roles and responsibilities that are inconsistent" is that each unit has different needs. To tell a unit, "You will no longer require so-and-so to do such-and-such," will not go over well.

- o The "distributed model" page of the CC report, with the "future state opportunity" really does not make sense to me, based on the survey I filled out last year. Just because I answer phones doesn't mean that therefore I need to be pigeonholed into a General Administration position, because my position entails much more than answering phones.

- o I agree that workload varies from one position to the next. For instance in College of Health Sciences, an office associate in one office makes very little money but has an exceptionally large amount of tasks to complete on any one day or week (some with very high responsibility), but a project coordinator in another dept in the college has less to do, because they are not given enough responsibility, but that does not therefore mean that roles and responsibilities should be standardized. Rather, it means that the College of Health Sciences should do an audit of each staff person's role in order to understand that lopsidedness and then make decisions in conjunction with all units to ensure that staff members are remunerated properly and have enough work to do or have some tasks shifted, if necessary (Health Sciences office associate position should probably be a Project Coordinator). Often, the staff feel the power imbalance and don't feel free to state this situation, so it would be up to those with power to get to the realities of things.

o How people will be placed on new career ladders – mostly by title, as opposed to knowledge, skills, and experience I agree with the staff senator who said that they should, therefore, be more willing than usual to complete job audits during this transition.

o FYI that job titles such as “Finance I, Finance II, Advisor III, Advisor IV” will mean absolutely nothing (or nearly nothing) to future employers as they skim a resume.

• I do really hope that those in charge of rolling this out will really take such things into consideration. We need to be treated as full partners here.