

Joint Faculty Senate & Academic Staff Council Meeting  
14 January 2009  
Pyle Center  
Madison WI

PRESENT:

University Committee: Barb Barker, Greg Blonde, Michael Childers, Tom Evans, Katy Forsythe, Matt Hanson, Dave Hart, Kathy Hetzel, Pete Kling, Chris Kniep, Art Lersch, Kathy Miller, David Nack, Mahlon Peterson, and Rene Mehlberg,

Academic Staff Council: Allisanne Apple, Jerry Clark, Ja'Tawn Campbell-Pinson, Lisa Nielsen Agnew, and Bev Phillips.

GUESTS: Christine Quinn, Rick Klemme, Ann Keim, Willie Larkin Ray Schultz, and UW Legal staff – Tom Stafford

EXCUSED: ASC: Lynn Blinkenberg, Tom Culviner, Michael Maguire,  
UC: Mike Ballweg, Kathleen Haas, Chuck Prissel, and Jensen.

- I. PROVOST REPORT: Christine – great morning, thank you and glad to be here. Community engagement goals were written by us. Very exciting for Christine. Program innovation fund – will continue – announcement coming out soon w/May 1<sup>st</sup> the close. \$125,000 will be available. Will do some videos and other take aways to showcase the projects and tell the story. 3 areas emphasized: Increased diversity and global awareness, economic development, engagement and community. Think about efforts that might have potential for external money. Could be some seed money for you to think about engaging such projects. Look for new innovative ideas that have not been used before.
- II. PAY PLAN DISCUSSION: Board of Regents met in November to discuss a pay plan. A resolution was provided to the BOR by both the University Committee and the Academic Staff. Neither group was able to present to the BOR. Our data illustrates that we are low in retention and compensation compared to other states. That was weighed in the pay plan decision. David maintains that if you don't ask for what you need – you will never receive what you need. Allisanne – the Chancellor decided not to ask for more of a pay increase of the BOR – because of the economic climate. Question – how do we advocate for ourselves to get more money in this climate of demise in every direction. Rene – comments on the Senate representative feedback as she is a senate representative for University Committee. Person who spoke on behalf of UW System faculty. Systemwide it is being discussed and brought to the BOR's attention. Last faculty rep meeting much discussion about why they did not have input or why they are not a part of the process. UW-Oshkosh – faculty senate committee – is putting forth an audit report.

Information presented by System to the BOR showed that we are behind. ACTION\*\*\* Get the UW System PowerPoint shown to the BOR to all in the room. Mahlon – within the WI retirement system we have seen the best. Hopes that whatever we do – that it be positive and not negative. In Eau Claire County the unions signed 2-3 year contracts with a pretty good percentage increase. Christine – we want to continue to support excellence – the BOR struggles with this same issue. Part of the rationale of the Nov. BOR meeting was maybe a different way to tell the story – the graying of the faculty. It is complex and we need to take care in how we frame the story. Apple – the state does not understand the impact of the loss that we experience. Greg Blonde – Legislative Audit Bureau makes sense and is curious why UW Stout may not support it. Faculty pay is just a subset of the discussion. At the local level – the way things get done when there is a controversial issue – you need a legislator to champion the cause. Tom Evans – why are we having trouble with this one? Christine – could it be the receptivity to the story. Ray – on the BOR website you can read the pay plan resolution as they passed it. In the where as portion, it is identified that we don't get enough but in spite of economic times they had to ask for less. Vote by Faculty Senate only – no quorum for Academic Staff. Motion: from Rene Mehlberg – I move to support the UW Oshkosh Faculty Senate recommendation for the LAB to commission a white paper on faculty salary and this white paper should include faculty and academic staff seconded ;by Katy Forsythe. Amendment: add staff – so LAB audits the faculty and staff review/study/audit. Catherine – what are the cons of supporting this resolution? None apparent. Art – what is the timing on this. Can we wait until the next meeting? Greg Blonde – agrees it is important to understand both sides of the coin – can we bring Al Crist to our meeting to get his input before we make a decision? Rene – next Faculty rep meeting is 2/20 – and the Faculty reps hope to have a response before then. Mahlon agrees to take a vote and not wait. David – all in favor ayes opposed – 4 the ayes have it.

- III. STATE BUDGET – implications for Extension – David Nack – in a better place than other institutions. Open to the floor for discussion. Rationale from the Chancellor was the first he heard – David does not feel we are in the loop and we are a spectator to it all. Michael Childers agrees – and for us to continue the maximum access mission – we provide much. Risser – Co-Chair of JOCER – will be deciding on our pay plan and we should be engaged in a relationship with him and leveraging anything and everything we can.
- IV. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING – General discussion of the issues – there was a bill that would enable UW System – employees – faculty and staff – that would give them the opportunity to decide whether or not they wanted bargaining and negotiating – in the last legislative session. It did not pass. We are the only group of any size that does not enjoy that right – all others are unionized. Now some bill will be introduced in this session – will very likely be passed and the Governor has agreed to sign it. Because of this – at the last

joint academic staff council & university committee mtg we had Frank Empsak come in and present. Would the whole Senate like to repeat this? It was very informative for the ASC and the UC? Would like your feedback. Tom Evans – motion that the bargaining issue before us be put on the March meeting, have a joint meeting and ask our executive committee put together a program that fairly represents the issues before us. Seconded my Michael Childers. Greg – discussion of the motion – as a member of the UC – would feel more comfortable if the motion charged to “explore” the program. The motion, as it is, demands a program be created. Would like to find out what it might be, and if the timing is right for such an approach given the economic difficulties we are experiencing. Apple – doesn’t see anything wrong with an informational meeting – point is to explore the pros and cons. David Nack – Risser did endorse the last collective bargaining bill. Chris Kniep – suggests we need the conversation Tom is talking about – further exploration and then get more information. Dave Hart – feels we are being pro-active to get informed – and not advocating one side or the other. Vote ayes many opposed – the motion carried. UC will look to setting up a program for the March senate.

- V. UWS7 AND AMENDMENT UWS 11 – discussion and Extension actions. History – Extension asked to provide input on a resolution. We did not agree to what they were putting forth. We did not agree and they put it forth anyway. Now there are System regulations and the question is does Extension want to put forth regulations like Systems when we do not agree. We do not HAVE to adopt such regulations. Ray – Greg Blonde worked on coming up with resolutions. Ray – history – when a new rule comes through from the BOR – extension puts it in extension language – extension numbers etc. The two UWS 7 & 11 are the same – only one says faculty and one says academic staff. The UWAS 7 and amendments to UWS 11 are now a part of state law. We can not ignore System Regulations and laws, but the question is what do we do with this? Greg – By Law, we need to respond to the legal obligation that has been brought by the BOR – we are not in compliance and we need to bring our bylaws in compliance w/UW System law.
- OPTION # 1 – accept we have a new law and we need to rewrite ours. Tow the line and rewrite those two chapters.
- OPTION #2 – approach that we will not rewrite those chapters, but put a reference in those chapters that employees need to study UW Systems rules and regulations to study their rules regarding dismissal. It is barely in compliance, provides our employees with the knowledge of them and indirectly maintains our objector status. Cons of this move – our objections are clearly lost. Requires proactive effort by UWX employees to access governance rules.
- OPTION # 3 – Provides Extension employees’ access to appropriate information. This offer says “here’s the link’ plus a statement that extension objects to them. Difference is the “objector statement” goes along w/Option #3. Open for discussion: - David Nack: anyone can make a motion and we

can stop to discuss that motion. Michael Childers – historically – we gave a lot to BOR and they took it under advisement. By the end of that process and seeing the rules that were confirmed gave Michael a sense of confer and ignore. Question – historically at that point the Senate had enough. So – why do we have to take this up? David Nack – System has advised us that we need to bring our regulations into compliance. 1 – Adopt all of it. 2 – Tell people here are the regulations so they can be informed. 3 – Continue to make our statement.

Tom Stafford – Pay issue – at the time of accusation there is a hearing and if found to be suspended – Chancellor’s call – you are then suspended with pay. You will have rules on the book that they don’t know exist.

Mahlon – not in favor of lying on the ground and do not fighting this a little bit. Options – certainly not #1. Does not feel there is anything wrong with letting people know that we do not agree. Motion: Move to adopt Option #3 from Mahlon and seconded by Michael Childers. Discussion: Childers question – Can we put a hot link on the website? Yes, from Ray – we do not give our paper copies anymore, just the electronic source of rules. This motion just adopts Option # 3 only in reference to UWS 7? Yes – Academic Staff will have to take it up on their own.

Tom Stafford – works for UWS 7 – but you both have an 11 – and they are different.

Tom Evans – Not sure yet what we are voting on. Art – where are we getting the statement from? Whose is going to write it? The only thing that will be in the UWS 7 rules – is the EX statement of objection with the hotlink to the System rules. All discussion or history of drafting of this statement is in the minutes only. Vote: in favor 8 Opposed 6 – Motion carries. Faculty Senate vote only.

- VI. Proactive discussion of institutional issues and opportunities appropriate for governance. NONE

#### UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ONLY

- I Article IV report: The report was sent to Rob Burke and Chris Kneip is on that committee. Art – What are the parameters – what qualifies a person to become the chair? It was not in the report. Ray – you have to be a member of the faculty in the particular governance unit. David – did everyone receive the Article IV report? Chris Kneip – was passed one year ago w/changes and sent to System for review. The question that has come up is what is the difference between the county department head role and the faculty governance unit? Rank promotion and salaries are part of the faculty governance piece. The grid was determined after much discussion is the most effective model to make it work is if there are 2 or more faculty in the county – and then there would be state or regional part – representing Coop – where there would be others like Labor Education and Something Sciences. Greg – was it discussed to have a county department head and if they chose, to have a county faculty

chair – or do they have to be one and the same? Chris – they are 2 distinct things according to the revisions of Article 4. There is annual election to see who will be in charge of the faculty governance unit. The appointment of a county department head – is less an election process but more an administrative selection process. It is different in each county. Greg was asked if Article 4 was going to be done by March in time for the elections. Process – approved by the senate, on to the chancellor and then on the BOR – when they vote the changes become law. Mahlon – we have to let faculty members understand that there is going to be an election. People in the offices are going to say why we are doing this and we as senators owe it to our constituents to explain it to them and inform them. Revisions to Article 4 are done. Greg suggests that because the membership is thin today and because this will not be complete before the March election, that we bring this back at a later date when there are more here for the discussion. Nack – if there are any objections or modifications let’s discuss them today. – if not let it ride. Greg – exactly my point – this is significant to county offices – should we discuss it later? Maybe we can set up a WisLine and ask some things of the Ad Hoc committee. David Nack – needs to hear if there objections or problems with this. Not hearing any problems or objections, David will assume that this is acceptable.

II PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR FACULTY TENURE ORIENTATION WORKSHOP COMMITTEE REPORT: Chris Committee is Chris – Catherine and Rene – to make the orientation workshops. Handout – Last year there was one workshop in August. Goals – outlined 3 goals. Defined the target audience. For ’09 – 3 workshops – May, July and September – full day – central location – minimum attendees 20 and maximum 45. Christine – congratulations – this is important work and you have done a good job. Needs to be a motion to accept the report and direct the who will be on the organizational committee. Report be accepted and departments identify anyone who will serve on the committee seconded by Rene motion passed.

III PLANNING COMMITTEE for tenure scholarship and reflection forum report: Art Lersch: Oral report – Kathleen Haas is on the committee also. Basically they sent out an initial email to the FTAC SRP chairs Dept chairs, program directors and associate program directors and reminders again in early January. History – this forum took place in August and follow up discussion in Sept which brought about this committee. Questions asked – when to have the forum, do you want to join the committee and would you share topics to be discussed at this forum. Consensus was May. Most did not want to volunteer. One person from last year’s committee would consider doing it again and one other person was recommended to be asked to be on the committee. Hopes to get folks from FTAC and SRP on the committee. Responses also suggested small groups be utilized and specific topics – gray areas to people – need far more discussion. How different departments define scholarship – portfolios etc. Art recommends that we set a date in May as

soon as possible – would like to find more folks to serve on this committee and would like to define goals. Catherine – have talked about goals in past minutes – and even though you are two – go ahead and forward your thoughts – revisit old minutes. Location – probably Stevens Point.

- IV SELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBER TO REPRESENT EXTENSION ON UWS PRESIDENT'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION: A large body – 40 – 50 people, Reilly chairs it. And it is totally advisory. David attended one session and the discussion was about the Star fund at that meeting. Does anybody want to sit on it? We Must have someone on the Commission. They meet once or twice a year and they are in Madison. It does not need to be a senator – it needs to be a faculty member. Michael Childers is willing to serve. Motion: Art moved to appoint Michael and Rene seconded the motion. Ayes have it.
- V SELECTION OF A FACULTY MEMBER TO PARTICIPATE ON A REVIEW COMMITTEE TO SELECT EXTENSION NOMINEE FOR THE 2009 REGENTS TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD: Does not have to be anyone on the senate – can be any faculty member. Barb Barker moved Rene Mehlberg for this position and Matt Hanson seconded the motion. Ayes have it.
- VI Chair's Report: non to give – Minutes – Rene moves to approve the September 9<sup>th</sup> minutes and Michael Childers seconded the motion. Minutes approved.
- VII Adjourn – Mahlon moved to adjourn and Barb seconded. Meeting adjourned at 4:12pm.

Minutes Compiled by Molly Delaney