On March 24, 2016, Wanda Heading-Grant sent a Memo to campus announcing the FY17 non-represented staff increases. Last year, HRDMA undertook a collaborative process with Staff Council to review the contents of that year’s salary increase Memo, as well as the attached Frequently Asked Questions regarding staff salary increases. This year, there was no collaboration with Staff Council from HR or the Administration, nor was Staff Council notified in advance that the Memo was to be released. Staff Council was surprised when the Memo was released lacking expected parity with unionized faculty and staff as stated and outlined in the attached October 24th, 2014 communication, information about salary increase justifications for the inflation rate used, the reason for the regressively stepped salary levels, the process to award merit, and numerous other details of this process. Given that we have a collaboration agreement in place with HRDMA, we expected to see any announcement regarding salary increases prior to its release to the University community.

Over the past two weeks the Staff Council Office has received outreach from dozens of staff members who are confused, angry and upset in the aftermath of this Memo – not simply the amount and structure of the increases, but the lack of accompanying information or justification. A preliminary analysis of the comments received indicates three primary areas of concern: the amount of the increases, the merit structure and process, and the lack of parity with represented groups at the University. This Memorandum represents the common themes we have gathered from the voices of over 60 non-represented staff members at the University of Vermont. A full report of that feedback, including related feedback from the 2016 Staff Survey, will follow.

Parity with Represented Staff

The maximum increases of 2.0%, 2.25% or 2.5% do not achieve parity with the United Electrical Workers nor the United Academics contracts. Parity was cited as the reason for an additional retroactive increase in FY15 (see attached University communication, page 3), and it was expected that the administration would honor this search for parity through FY17 (again, as that communication suggests). If a lesser rate was to be used, we expected that Staff Council would be given information in a transparent collaborative process on
why that decision was fair and equitable. Why is 1.0% ATB appropriate for non-represented staff when
2.0% ATB is being given to faculty? Why is a total 2.5% pool available for non-represented staff under
$50,000, but 3.0% available for represented staff under $50,000? We are aware that such justifications exist,
as well as market rate analyses and salary benchmarking data, and that this data is utilized in salary decisions –
this is information that should be shared with staff, as “Openness” is one of the primary tenets of Our
Common Ground.

**Merit Increases**

The Memo that was released on March 24th did not contain guidance about how the merit increases are to be
handled. We have heard from supervisors all across the University who are confused about how to
appropriately handle the merit increases, and staff members who do not understand the benchmarks to which
they are to be held. Many staff feel it was improper - or at least premature - to assign the majority component
of the FY17 increase as merit without appropriate guidance. While we appreciate that training is available on
how to conduct effective performance reviews, it is worrisome to many staff that their supervisors do not
have explicit guidance on the nuanced process of assigning merit (which also involves considerations of
compression).

Separate from the issue of supervisory guidance, the merit component as outlined currently by
Administration is not what Staff Council has recommended or intended. Staff Council has advocated for
merit that is above and beyond any cost-of living increase – a reward for exceptional performance. We do
not agree that this goal is served by splitting a minimum cost of living increase into an ATB and merit
component, and many staff perceive that this year’s maximum 1.5% merit raise seems only to replace a
potential larger ATB raise rather than being sufficient to inspire outstanding performance.

To clarify Staff Council’s position, the Compensation, Benefits and Budget Committee will be developing
additional recommendations around merit and performance increases. This communication will be
forthcoming.

**Amount of Across-the-Board Increase**

It is the perspective of many staff members that 1% across-the-board is not sufficient to cover a cost-of-living
increase or inflation in Chittenden County. While 1% may be deemed a sufficient amount by FY17 economic
metrics, it comes as a blow to staff who are still hoping to gradually recover from years of low increases or,
in some cases, no increases at all.

**Staff Council Recommendations**

Assuming that pools as established are unable to be adjusted this late in the budgeting season, our
recommendation for FY17 is that the ATB portion of the salary increase be raised to 2.0% to cover increased
cost of living for staff at all salary levels (in parity with the faculty), that .5% should be awarded across the
board to those staff making under $50,000, and that flexibility (for compression issues) may be used in
awarding the .25% for those salaries between $50,000 and $99,000.
Contract Between UVM and United Electrical Workers Ratified

The agreement between The University of Vermont and the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Local 267 (“UE”) has been ratified by the UE membership. The union represents service and maintenance workers at UVM.

“The new contract between the UE and UVM is a fair and mutually satisfactory one, and we are pleased that the membership has now completed the ratification process,” said Wanda Heading-Grant, Vice President for Human Resources, Diversity and Multicultural Affairs. “As I have said before, our service and maintenance workers are essential to the successful operation of the University. Completing the bargaining process represents yet another positive step in our relationship.”

The contract with UE calls for an overall pay increase of 8 percent over three years, which breaks down as follows: FY15: 2.25% (retroactive to July 1); FY16: 2.75%; FY17: 3.00%. To maintain parity, non-represented staff and non-represented faculty also will receive an upward adjustment of 0.25% for FY 2015 retroactive to July 1. This does not include faculty in the College of Medicine, who are compensated on a separate funding formula.

As announced earlier this year, a two-year contract agreement was reached in August between the University and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, which represents police officers, service officers, and dispatchers. The Teamsters FY15 increase also will be adjusted to 2.25% retroactive to July 1, 2014.

The complex array of compensation changes for multiple groups of employees will appear in paychecks within the calendar year.

Bargaining continues through formal mediation with United Academics regarding a contract for those full-time faculty represented by the union.