UF UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

Office of the Vice President
and Chief Financial Officer
Purchasing Services
http://purchasing.ufl.edu/

971 Elmore Drive
PO Box 115250
Gainesville, FL 32611-5250
(352) 392-1331 Fax 352-392-8837

March 2nd, 2017

ADDENDUM #1 to the University of Florida Invitation to Negotiate ITN 17RL-126 Compensation Consulting and Human Resource Services Consulting scheduled to be opened on **March 9th, 2017 at 3:00 PM** at the University of Florida, Elmore Hall Conference Room, Radio Road, Gainesville, Florida.

This addendum consists of:

- Responses to written questions submitted by the "Schedule of Events" deadline of February 23rd, 2017 by 5:00 PM

This addendum shall be considered part of the Contract Documents for the above mentioned **ITN 17RL-126** as though it had been issued at the same time and incorporated integrally therewith. Where provisions of the following supplementary data differ from those of the original document, this addendum shall govern and take precedence. All other terms, conditions, and regulations will apply.

Sincerely,

Rob Luetjen
Rob Luetjen
Procurement Agent III
Procurement Services

Please acknowledge receipt of Addendum #1 by signing below, and returning this addendum with your proposal. Failure to include addendum with your proposal may result in rejection.

_____
Signature

_____
Company Name

_____
Company Address

_____
City/State/Zip

Goals and Desired Outcomes

1.   Question: Please provide additional context on the challenges faced by UF and the need for the projects (Lot 1 and Lot 2).

Answer: At present, the university lacks a compensation philosophy or strategy and its pay guidelines are very limited. As a result, compensation is handled in an ad hoc way, except in certain colleges where faculty compensation plans have been developed independently.

Because resources are limited, it is critically important that our compensation budget be spent effectively. As a result, HR is leading this effort to design and implement a fair and competitive compensation strategy that will allow us to adopt a long-term view (which will, in turn, allow for prioritization of the available compensation spend).   This effort will help attract, retain and reward high-performing faculty and staff at all levels as we work to support UF's aspirations to be among the top ten public universities in the country.

2.   Question: Please expand on the needs and expectations for the Lot 2 proposal. Is this an expressed need for a long-term consulting arrangement for all human capital issues the university may face?

Answer: We have a need from time to time to engage outside consultants on various HR institutional needs. This is more about having ready access to subject matter experts on a case-by-case basis.

3.   Question: What are the desired outcomes of the projects (Lot 1 and Lot 2)?

Answer: For Lot 1:

The University of Florida is seeking competitive proposals from qualified companies to help design a market-based compensation plan for faculty and staff. This multi-phased effort will include the development of a compensation philosophy as well as a strategy that supports an appropriate intersection of market/external competitiveness, internal equity, and performance/incentives to better maximize the effectiveness of UF's compensation budget. The following describes the desired outcomes in key areas.

Philosophy and Strategy	• Define compensation philosophy and strategy to create alignment with institution's needs and to help prioritize UF's compensation spend on what matters most.
Faculty	• Conduct competitive market analysis of faculty salaries by discipline and rank, using UF-provided data or supplementing as needed, using peer and aspirant comparison groups.
	• Analyze internal equity of current faculty salaries, relative to time in rank, gender, and race. Develop recommendations for tracking performance to incorporate in future equity analyses.
	• Develop pay guidelines for faculty pay, including recommendations and timelines for achieving external competitiveness as well as incentives to reward or reinforce needed performance or results.

Staff	• Define a set of comparison and aspirant institutions and markets (local, regional, or national, as appropriate) and obtain market data to review overall competitiveness and internal equity of staff positions. • Recommend pay ranges, guidelines, and incentives that enhance career progression clarity as well as reward or reinforce needed performance or results.
Executive	• Define peer and aspirant comparison groups and conduct compensation benchmarking analysis for executive team members to determine positioning within this comparison group. • Provide recommendations on national trends in the area of executive compensation and incentives and potential changes based on the benchmarking analysis.
Total Rewards	• Review competitiveness of indirect financial and non-financial compensation compared to peer and aspirant group. Provide recommendations on national trends and potential changes that could enhance "total rewards" at UF.

Answer: For Lot 2:

Access to expertise as needed.

4.   Question: Could you clarify the needs for an internal equity analysis for staff and faculty?

Answer: We wish to ensure that any systemic pay discrepancies across staff and faculty positions are understood and a plan is put in place to address them to the extent this is possible.

LOT 2 – Pool of vendors

5.   Question: Have you determined the number of firms you will select for the pool?

Answer: No

6.   If our firm is selected in Lot 1, are we automatically selected for Lot 2 as well?

Answer: Yes

7.   Question: Can you give examples of the types of projects you've sought help with in the past?

Answer: With the change in HR leadership, this is the first time UF has contracted as an institution with HR consulting firms. Firms have provided work to Colleges regarding compensation and incentives and some small project work to HR regarding benefits and executive compensation.

Priorities/Timeframe

8.   Question: Please confirm the target timeframe for the overall project. Are you anticipating a phase approach or is the university's expectation to have all of the requested scope be conducted concurrently?

   Answer: We expect this to be a multi-phased effort that may take several months/years to complete. We are interested in the consultants' recommendations for pacing/time frame and if/whether some of the elements can be done concurrently. We would expect to see a timeline and phases defined in the proposals submitted.

9.   Question: Is there a desired priority in the series of projects (i.e. covering faculty, executive compensation, or staff first or are concurrent timelines intended)?

   Answer: The table provided in response to question 3 is in priority order unless it is the recommendation of the consultant to complete some of these concurrently—for example, we could envision total rewards being completed concurrently with the faculty piece.

10.   Question: Has UF established a timeline for the compensation component of this ITN?

   Answer: Not explicitly, but we do understand that this could be a multi-year effort

11.   Question: What is the anticipated timeframe for the effective date of the new compensation program, and does the University expect a single go-live date for all of the three focus populations?

   Answer: We expect this to be a multi-phased effort that may take several months/years to complete. We are interested in the consultants' recommendations for pacing/time frame and if/whether some of the elements can be done concurrently. We would expect to see a timeline and phases defined in the proposals submitted. We do not want to have a single go-live date.

12.   Question: What is the timeframe for completion of the Compensation Study (does this have to be done within a specific timeframe for end of FY adjustments or impact on budgeting, etc.)?

   Answer: We expect this to be a multi-phased effort that may take several months/years to complete. We are interested in the consultants' recommendations for pacing/time frame and if/whether some of the elements can be done concurrently. We would expect to see a timeline and phases defined in the proposals submitted.

Executive Sponsorship/Institutional Approvals

13.   Question: Does UF intend to have a steering committee in place for the engagement?

Answer: Yes

14.   Question: What different approval committees would we be expected to work with for each focus population (e.g., Board of Directors for Executive Compensation, etc.)?

Answer:

Philosophy and Strategy	UF Cabinet (or a subset)
Faculty	UF Cabinet (or a subset)
	Faculty Senate involvement, including its Faculty Welfare Council and Compensation Committee, with consultation with the United Faculty of Florida
Staff	UF Cabinet (or a subset)
Executive	VP for HR, possibly Board of Trustees (or a subset)
Total Rewards	UF Cabinet (or a subset)

15.   Question: Will the consultant be working with the UF board or a board committee in the executive compensation process? If not, how will executive compensation information be shared with the board or board committee?

Answer: No – this will be handled by the VP for Human Resources

16.   Question: Who will be the consultant's day-to-day contact for the consulting engagement?

Answer: Associate Director responsible for Classification and Compensation as well as other members of the HR leadership team

17.   Question: Who is the executive sponsor(s) for the compensation project?

Answer: UF HR Vice President Jodi Gentry

18.   Question: Will the UF Project Team include representatives from each group (i.e.: faculty, staff and executive?)

Answer: Yes

19.   Question: Who will approve any recommendations for the compensation program(s) for faculty, staff and executives?

Answer: UF Cabinet for faculty and staff. President and/or UF Board for executive

20.   Question: Which group will have the responsibility to approve the compensation philosophy and comparison markets for each group (faculty, staff, and executives)?

Answer: UF Cabinet

ITN Response process/Content

21.   Question: Please expand on the expectations related to the requests outlined for Tab 4 described for Lot 1

Answer: If your company has creative ideas about the engagement because UF is an AAU aspiring to pre-eminence (as opposed to another kind of organization) please share them. If not, state "nothing to add".

Numbers of classes of employees

22.   Question: Please confirm how many executives will be covered in the Executive Compensation assessment.

Answer: There are fifteen members of the cabinet (excluding the athletic director) – plus we are interested in looking at our academic deans (16 of them) as part of this effort.

Existing UF Programs

23.   Question: Is there a pay for performance program currently in place for executive team members that will be covered in this engagement?

Answer: Not consistently – that is why we are asking for this effort to include some focus on best practices in executive comp—that is:

- Define peer and aspirant comparison groups and conduct compensation benchmarking analysis for executive team members to determine positioning within this comparison group.
- Provide recommendations on national trends in the area of executive compensation and incentives and potential changes based on the benchmarking analysis.

24.   Question: What is the minimum required hours per week and/or month must the vendor be onsite?

Answer: Just as needed

25.   Question: Will VPN access be granted to work offsite?

Answer: If appropriate

26.　　　Question: What onboarding requirements with HR must the vendor meet before the vendor may start work?

Answer: After contract award, if not already on file the awarded supplier must provide a W9 and complete a UF Vendor Application. A purchase order will be generated after award. Work may begin once the vendor has received a purchase order.

27.　　　Question: How many PC compatible media copies are required?

Answer: One (1) See section 4.1.1 on page 12

28.　　　Question: Small business certifications are currently pending. Should that information be included somewhere in the bid?

Answer: Yes, please insert information behind tab 4

29.　　　Question: The RFP describes compensation being done ad hoc – has there ever been an overall compensation review/update undertaken for either a certain college or group of jobs (other than faculty)?

Answer: Not to our knowledge—the College of Medicine is probably the most advanced in this area

30.　　　Question: The RFP describes certain colleges having come up with independent faculty compensation plans. Have those plans been evaluated and is the intent to preserve the design of those plans?

Answer: The plans have not been evaluated, but yes, we would expect those plans to be preserved although, as appropriate, recommendations to improve them or bring them into alignment with other university recommendations would be part of this effort. No changes to these plans would be mandated.

31.　　　Question: The RFP mentions the "OnTarget" project covering staff classifications and updated job descriptions. Please describe the state of job descriptions for any job titles not covered by "OnTarget" such as leadership positions (e.g., are they up-to-date?)

Answer: Faculty do not have position descriptions at UF, and leadership positions are not particularly up to date.

32.　　　Question: What market data sources does the University currently use/subscribe to for each of the three focus populations (Faculty, Staff, Executives)?

Answer: UF currently participates in and subscribes to the CUPA-HR Administrators, Professionals, Four Year Faculty, and Non-exempt Staff Salary Surveys. The Office of Institutional Research participates in the Oklahoma State Faculty Salary Survey as well as the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE).

33. Question: How many unique job titles are covered under this project for each of the three focus populations?

Answer: Staff: 1193 active job codes. Faculty: UF currently has 28 faculty titles (excluding our development k-12 school) that are used in conjunction with modifiers. For example: Faculty ranks include Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. A research modifier may be added resulting in a Research Assistant Professor.

34. Question: How many distinct job titles are currently used?

Answer: Staff: 1002 Faculty: 235 (including modifiers)

35. Question: We understand that the job classification project has been recently completed and job descriptions and titles have been updated. Approximately how many staff job titles exist which will be covered in the study?

Answer: All staff job classifications, excluding temporary OPS, are included in this project.

36. Question: Do any executives currently have employment contracts that spell out any specific compensation terms or benefits? If so, how many?

Answer: Yes, all 15 members of the cabinet do

37. Question: Does UF currently have a list of peers that have been used in the past and perhaps have been approved by the Board?

Answer: Yes

38. Question: How many different disciplines among faculty are currently used?

Answer: Based on 4 digit CIP Code, 93.

Scope of Analyses required during the project

39. Question: Will the faculty analysis include both tenure track and non- tenure track faculty? Will it include research and teaching assignments?

Answer: Yes

40. Question: How many ranks of faculty will be analyzed? Does this include adjuncts, instructors, etc.?

Answer: Adjuncts are not included in the scope of this project nor will our PK Yonge faculty (K-12 teachers). UF currently has 32 faculty titles that are used in conjunction with modifiers. For example: Faculty ranks include Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. A research modifier may

be added resulting in a Research Assistant Professor. Some work would be needed to clarify how to align some of other ranks, such as county extension faculty and the scientist/engineering faculty titles.

41.   Question: Is part-time and/or adjunct faculty included in the evaluation?

Answer: Part-Time faculty are included but adjuncts are not.

42.   Question: Does UF now track performance among faculty?

Answer: Annual evaluations, but this information is not available electronically at the university level (it may be at the college level in certain circumstances)—we also have access to academic analytics but that's currently used as information only.

43.   Question: Does UF expect that the peer groups will be the same for faculty, staff and executive?

Answer: When national markets are to be considered, yes, but for staff, some local and regional markets are probably more appropriate in which case a different peer group would likely make more sense.

UF surveys used

44.   Question: Does UF use the CUPA-HR CIP code to designate faculty discipline?

Answer: Yes

45.   Question: Does UF participate in the CUPA-HR surveys?

Answer: Yes

46.   Question: What market surveys does University of Florida purchase today? What is the percentage of jobs that are aligned to market data?

Answer: UF currently participates in and subscribes to the CUPA-HR Administrators, Professionals, Four Year Faculty, and Non-exempt Staff Salary Surveys. The Office of Institutional Research participates in the Oklahoma State Faculty Salary Survey as well as the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE). The Office of Institutional Research has done some benchmarking for faculty appointments. Human Resource Services has not engaged in benchmarking for staff positions.

47.   Question: Please indicate surveys that the University participates in including proprietary surveys. Are the results available to the vendor electronically?

Does UF participate in any faculty salary surveys?

Does UF participate in any staff salary surveys?

Does UF subscribe to any survey sources?

Does UF participate in any executive surveys?

Answer: UF does not currently conduct any proprietary surveys.

UF currently participates in and subscribes to the CUPA-HR Administrators, Professionals, Four Year Faculty, and Non-exempt Staff Salary Surveys. The Office of Institutional Research participates in the Oklahoma State Faculty Salary Survey as well as the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE).

Total Rewards

48.   Question: In terms of Total Rewards Analysis, please confirm the following:

a) The Total Reward Analysis will be conducted for all three groups of employees: faculty, staff, and executive?

   Answer: Faculty and staff benefits are currently virtually the same; executive has minor difference**s**

b) Are you expecting a customized survey peer group for the Total Reward Analysis? For the analysis, we will leverage our existing database of participating companies. However, the database might not have your targeted peer group. Please indicate your preferred approach.

   Answer: We prefer peer group information but can be flexible if good ideas exist elsewhere

49.   Question: Is private sector comp data important for those staff jobs that may be found in private organizations?

      Answer: Yes

50.   Question: What benefits and retirement programs does UF have design and management control of?

Answer: We currently have control and influence over voluntary retirement options as well as our UF select plans.

The plans are (found on the UF HR Benefits website):
UFSelect Direct Reimbursement Dental Plan (Eagles)
UFSelect Humana Vision
UFSelect Legal
UFSelect Term Life
UFSelect Standard Long-term Disability Insurance

51.   Question: Incentive Plans – there seems to be a desire to implement pay for performance in all three groups (Faculty, Staff and Executive). Wanted to get a sense if you currently have any programs in place? What is the desired outcome for implementing or revising a performance-based reward program that you are not getting today?

Answer: The College of Medicine currently has a performance based incentive plan for clinical faculty. Recommendations to improve them or other university recommendations would be part of this effort.

52.   Question: Are there certain issues that UF encountered during the classification study that could be shared with potential bidders?

Answer: No, but the Classification and Compensation team can provide additional information regarding the project as needed.

53.   Question: We wanted to confirm that the consultants would have access to Faculty, Staff and Executives throughout the process for interviews/focus groups and discussion around strategy.

Answer: Yes, we are prepared to arrange those as needed

54.   Question: Can you share insight on the University's governance structure, particularly as it relates to oversight of pay for the top executive group?

Answer: Compensation decisions are coordinated through the VP for HR, but must be approved in advance by key members of the board of trustees.

55.   Question: Briefly can you describe your thoughts on the current competitiveness of pay across the three groups (Faculty, Staff and Executive)?   And symptoms around retention, ability to recruit, etc.

Answer: There is a general feeling that UF lags in compensation relative to peers but a comprehensive review has not been conducted. We believe clinical faculty and executives are positioned closer to market.

56.   Question: Does the University currently have a Compensation Philosophy?

Answer: At present, the university lacks a compensation philosophy or strategy and its pay guidelines are limited. As a result, compensation is handled in an ad hoc way, except in certain colleges where faculty compensation plans have been developed independently.

57.   Question: Why is UF undertaking the engagement at this time?

Answer: The new vice president of Human Resources, in concert with UF's senior leadership, has identified that an overall compensation strategy/plan is needed to support UF's preeminence aspirations.

58. Question: Can you provide a breakdown of the 5,000 faculty by full-time vs. part-time and/or adjunct?

Answer: This number excludes adjunct appointments. Approximately 2,300 are non-tenure accruing, 1,800 have tenure, and 540 are tenure accruing. Approximately 400 have an FTE assignment less than 1.0.

59. Question: Does each of the 40 executives have unique jobs?

Answer: Yes

60. Question: What is the current pay structure(s) for staff?

Answer: UF has not maintained the staff pay structure over time. As part of the project we expect that a new staff pay structure will be developed based on the recommendations provided by the consultants.

UF Peer Groups

Question: Can you share any lists of comparison groups that UF uses to evaluate faculty salaries?

Answer: The Office of Institutional Research provides a list of peer institutions at http://ir.aa.ufl.edu/.

61. Question: How does UF currently define its competitive market for staff?

Answer: UF has not defined the competitive market for staff. Based on job title we compete locally, regionally, or nationally. As part of this project, we intended to define the relative pay markets for staff classifications.

62. Question: For market competitive analysis, please confirm whether the below peer group is applicable to all three group of employees or only to faculty and executives:

    a) University of California, Berkeley; University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign; Indiana University-Bloomington; University of Michigan – Ann Arbor; UNC at Chapel Hill; Ohio State University – Main Campus; Penn State University – Main Campus; Texas A&M University; UT at Austin; University of Wisconsin-Madison

Answer: In many cases the above referenced peer group is applicable. However, a local or regional market may be more appropriate for some staff positions.

    b) If the peer group for staff is different, please provide us with the confirmation of the comparators, for example, against general industry?

Answer: General industry at a local or regional level.

63.   Question: Against which institutions does UF currently benchmark for executives?

    Answer: CUPA-HR Administrators Salary Survey

64.   Question: Does UF have a specific practice with regards to working with the faculty or faculty leadership?

    Answer: We engage the Faculty Senate and the appropriate councils and committees associated with it. We also would expect to consult with the faculty union as part of this effort.

65.   Question: Are there existing groups or mechanisms by which the consultant will interact with UF departments to disseminate information? If so, please describe.

    Answer: Yes. UF HR Communications

66.   Question: How do you anticipate gaining input from the SME's/others at the other campuses?

    Answer: UF HR is centralized and represents all of UF. There are no other campuses. External UF locations utilize UF HR located in Gainesville.

67.   Question: Has the faculty, staff or executives received incentives in the past? How has the program(s) been administered?

    Answer: Yes. However, incentive plans have been implemented on an ad hoc basis.

68.   Question: Please describe the University's approach to communicating compensation, performance, career and other workforce topics (in person, electronic, print)?

    Answer: We have a professional HR communications staff that handles most internal communication efforts.

69.   Question: Will training be required to educate HR and managers on the new structure? If so, how do you typically provide training to these stakeholders (in person, electronic, webinar, etc.)? At what point in the project would you envision the trainings to begin?

    Answer: We would be interested in having this type of recommendation be provided by the consultant if it's seen as necessary and/or a best practice.

70.   Question: Does UF currently utilize a market pricing system? If not, does the University have an interest in securing such a system for ongoing maintenance of the compensation evaluation?

    Answer: We do not currently utilize a market pricing system but would be interested in recommendations.

71.   Question: In what form, level of detail and time period does the University currently house performance data for faculty, staff and executives? What HRIS system does the University use to house employee-related data?

Answer: UF uses Oracle's PeopleSoft. Performance data for staff is stored in PeopleSoft. Faculty evaluation data are not housed electronically at the university level (they may be at the college level).

72.   Question: Who are the key stakeholders that are critical to the project? Do you expect regular briefings from the consultant to the key stakeholders throughout the project?

Answer: The HR VP will communicate with UF's senior leadership

73.   Question: Please provide us with an overview of University of Florida's project core team members—who will be on the team and their general role?

Answer: At present:
- Jodi Gentry – committee chair and Vice President for UFHR
- Melissa Curry, Director, Recruitment and Staffing, UFHR
- Greg Dubois, Assistant Vice President for Finance and Planning, Office of the Chief Financial Officer
- Brent Goodman, Associate Director, Classification and Compensation, UFHR
- Laura Huntley, Associate Vice President, Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs
- Angel Kwolek-Folland, Associate Provost, Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Jeanna Mastrodicasa, Associate Vice President for Operations, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
- Mike McKee, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
- David Quillen, incoming Faculty Senate Chair, Associate Professor, Department of Community Health and Family Medicine
- John Yelton, Chair, Compensation Committee, Faculty Senate, Professor, Department of Physics

74.   Question: How long ago was the "On Target" Classification Project implemented?

Answer: April 22, 2016

75.   Question: Was the pay structure updated for faculty, staff, and executives as part of the project "On Target"?

Answer: No

76.   Question: Besides annual base salary, please confirm other elements of the compensation programs such as incentive programs, guaranteed cash allowance that the university is providing to faculty, staff, and executives:

a) The current website indicated that incentive payments are provided to recognize and reward employees. However, we would like to understand general framework of the incentive programs across all relevant employee groups.

Answer: Most employee groups do not participate in a formal incentive plan. The College of Medicine clinical faculty participate in a performance based incentive program.

77.   Question: Please provide a ballpark figure of the number of benchmark jobs for faculty (out of 5,000); staff (out of 8,700), and executives (out of 40). For the staff population, our initial review showed that there are around 600 benchmark jobs across 18 job family. Please confirm the figures for all of the relevant groups.

Answer: We are counting on the expertise of the consultants to clarify the role and number of benchmark jobs. We also see this as an opportunity for knowledge transfer between the consultant and our classification and compensation team.

78.   Question: Please confirm whether job descriptions are available and up to date for faculty, staff, and executives. Again, we were able to identify the relevant job descriptions for the staff population (as a result of "On Target" Classification Project) from your website, but we would also like to confirm whether similar job descriptions are available and up to date for faculty and executives.

Answer: Staff positions descriptions, with some exceptions, are available in PeopleSoft and staff classifications were recently updated as part of the On Target Project. Faculty classifications can be found in the University's Academic Personnel Employment Plan regulation. The regulation is found online at http://regulations.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/7003.2016final4-8-16.pdf. We do not have individual position descriptions on file. Executive level positions were not included in the On Target project. As a result, they may not be up to date.

79.   Question: If job descriptions are not available and/or current, does the scope of work include writing/updating job descriptions for all of the relevant roles?

Answer: No

80.   Question: Currently, is there an updated and formal pay structure for faculty, staff, and executives?

   a) We were able to locate 2012 pay structure for exempt/non-exempt, IT, Health Care, Law Enforcement, and Radio positions.

Answer: UF has not maintained the staff pay structure over time. As part of the project we expect that a new staff pay structure will be developed based on the recommendations provided by the consultants.

81.   Question: How do you classify employee in the pay ranges? Is there a formal job evaluation system to evaluate and classify employees in the appropriate job level and pay band?

Answer: UF currently does not use a formal job evaluation system.

82.   Question: In addition to conducting market pay analysis for faculty, staff, and executives and providing pay guideline recommendations, are you looking for additional supports in designing job leveling structure?

Answer: Yes. As part of the project we would be interested in recommendations regarding best practices for leveraging the compensation module within PeopleSoft.

83.   Question: The following collective bargaining groups are listed on your website: AFSCME; Graduate Assistants United (GAU); United Faculty of Florida contract (UFF); Florida Police Benevolent Association. Please confirm:

    a) Category of employees that belong to the above bargaining groups

Answer: UFF represents faculty of in-unit colleges including Engineering, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Journalism, Design Construction and Planning, as well as College of the Arts. AFSCME represents employees classified in University Support Personnel System (USPS) job titles. USPS titles are being phased out since de-evolution from the Board of Regents. Approximately 600 positions remain in the USPS classifications. PBA represents law enforcement officers in University Police Department

    b) Estimated % of faculty, staff, and executives belong to each of the above group

Answer: UFF (1600 positions) approximately 30%. Staff 7.5% of positions.

    c) Level of union's involvement in the project and your expectations of the consultant's involvement with the unions

Answer: We expect to consult with the unions as needed, but this would be handled by UFHR not the consultants

84.   Question: In terms of implementation, are you also looking for supports in drafting pay guidelines as well as communication process?

Answer: We are interested in support drafting pay guidelines but are prepared to leverage our internal communications resources.