

ACADEMIC STAFF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 28, 2005, 12:30 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.
Vista Conference Room, MAC 301
Minutes approved October 12, 2005

Present: Lucy Arendt, Sue Bodilly, Dave Dettman, Paula Ganyard, Samantha Surowiec, Jane Swan, Grant Winslow

Guests: Eileen Kolb, Mike Stearney

ACADEMIC STAFF COMMITTEE AGENDA

1. Call to Order by Chair at 12:31
2. Minutes of September 14, 2005, meeting -- Approved
3. New Business

A. Provide feedback on proposed reorganization of pre-college programs to Assistant Dean Mike Stearney

The Committee met with Assistant Dean Mike Stearney, who explained the process used to develop the proposed reorganization and the expected outcomes. The Committee was especially pleased to see that the proposal rewards the efforts of existing staff by offering them promotions. Likewise, the group was pleased to see that one of the proposal's intended outcomes is to create a new position at a level and with a salary likely to attract a diverse applicant pool. The Committee supported the proposal.

B. Provide feedback on the Board of Regents resolution I.2.c (attached) to Chancellor Bruce Shepard

As requested by the Chancellor, the group reviewed the Regents' personnel policy recommendations. All were seen as readily supportable. The Committee recognized the need to be responsive to concerns expressed by the legislature and the taxpayers they represent. Of the eight recommendations, the first generated the most discussion. The Committee agreed that our current policy and practice of giving individuals with pre-existing appointments at UWGB are provided with concurrent appointments when assuming administrative positions such as Directors, no such concurrent appointments are provided to new hires. One issue of concern to the Committee is that new hires into these director-level positions do not have representation in academic staff governance. The Committee agreed that it would welcome further discussion of the impact of concurrent appointments and other options (e.g., fixed-term contracts) on staff members' opportunities to participate in academic staff governance.

C. Provide feedback on the draft Faculty Diversity Initiative (attached) to Provost Sue Hammersmith

The Committee applauded the administration's continuing attention to the need to diversify the campus' faculty, staff, and students. To that end, this initiative was seen as a step in the right direction. Still, the Committee did not agree with the rationale for not including staff in this initiative, as described in the proposal's penultimate paragraph. The assertion that "there is simply no counterpart for, say, a search for a director of a given program ..." and so on suggests that (1) all faculty positions may be broadly defined - an arguable assertion, and (2) that no staff positions may be broadly defined - an equally arguable assertion. Not all campuses are structured as we are, and it is quite possible to attract staff members to a posted position who are qualified in more than one area (e.g., career services, academic advising). In fact, such "cross-competence" would seem desirable as we discuss

moving toward integrated services in the Student Affairs area. Of course, not all staff positions may be broadly defined. Nor can all faculty positions. We would be more content if the rationale simply stated, "we have to start somewhere, and so we have decided to start with faculty positions, at least some of which may be broadly defined." The ASC would welcome the opportunity to be involved in developing a similar program for academic staff.

D. Provide feedback on the proposed Center for Food in Community and Culture (attached) to Provost Sue Hammersmith

The Committee agreed that this was a wonderfully interdisciplinary idea! Still, the group wondered about the Center's fiscal support, since institutional activities generally require some measure of resources beyond the efforts of the involved individuals, and since all activities represent trade-offs in terms of time and so on. The committee also questioned if there should be representation by academic staff, students, or a community member.

E. Discuss allocation of web space for academic staff committees

Tabled until next meeting.

F. Other

4. Old Business

Eileen Kolb (Program Manager-Records, Registrar's Office, and member of the Academic Staff Personnel Committee) met to discuss the brochure dealing with the layoff procedure. Opinions were shared concerning who is responsible for the creation of this document. The Personnel Committee feels that this is the job of Human Resources, but the ASC believes that it is the obligation of the Committee, and not Human Resources, to make the code accessible and understandable. The ASC has asked that the Personnel Committee continue to gather information and further develop the brochure.

A. Discuss community building as a strategic priority for 05-06

Due to time constraints, the Committee was unable to address the above priority. The ASC will schedule an additional future meeting outside of our bi-weekly meetings to address this issue.

5. Information Items

A. ASC Chair update

No update

B. Provost update

The preliminary analysis of the results of the campus climate survey has been completed and will be posted on the SOFAS web site along with the raw data. The Provost stated that the key findings thus far reveal a desire for increased professional development opportunities. The data also reveals dissatisfaction with current promotion procedures. The Provost suggested that the Committee might want to invite Debbie Furlong to a future meeting to examine the results in detail.

The Academic Staff Forum hosted by Provost & Vice Chancellors is scheduled to take place on Friday, November 4, from 2-3:30 p.m. The Forum will address suggested topics and include an open forum.

The Provost discussed the NEW ERA consortium and the shared a preliminary draft of the NEW ERA Bachelor of Applied Studies Degree which would provide guidance for students at two year institutions who make the transition to four-year institutions. Before the degree can be offered it must undergo the process of approving a new degree.

C. Academic staff Committee updates, including System Academic Staff Reps report

No Reports

D. General

1. Information of interest to academic staff is posted on the SOFAS website: <http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/>
<<http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/>>

2. Fall semester ASC meetings are scheduled for every other week, beginning Wednesday, September 14, from 12:30-1:45 p.m. in the Vista Conference Room, MAC 301.

All meetings are open unless otherwise stated.

Respectfully Submitted by Dave Dettman

Review of Employment Policies and Practices

BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Resolution I.2.c.

The Board of Regents recognizes the need to review and reform the employment policies and procedures within the University of Wisconsin System. Given that recognition, no new concurrent or “back-up” appointments will be granted until the Regents are satisfied that processes are in place to ensure two principles are being followed: 1) No one will be paid for not working; and 2) People will be paid at a rate commensurate with their current job, not any prior one.

Therefore, upon the recommendation of the President of the UW System and the Business and Finance Committee,

- (1) The Board of Regents supports the President’s suspension of the practice of granting administrative back-up appointments for new employees and the granting of further indefinite academic staff back-up appointments unless approved by the UW System President. This suspension will remain in effect until lifted by the Board of Regents. With input from appropriate governance groups, position titles designated as limited appointments shall be reviewed, and the practice of negotiating fixed-term contracts for administrators in lieu of limited term appointments shall be considered. A report on that assessment will be presented to the Board of Regents no later than its November, 2005 meeting;
- (2) Because the Board of Regents shares the deep concerns of citizens of the state and legislators over the criminal activity of any of our employees, the Board of Regents directs and requires that the UW System Administration determine and establish policies and procedures to assure to the public and the Legislature that any employee charged with a felony will be immediately investigated and disciplinary action, if any, will be determined in a timely manner. In the event such policies and procedures are precluded by applicable law, the Board of Regents and the UW System President will work with the Legislature to enact appropriate changes to the law to effectuate the intent of this resolution. Nothing herein shall preclude institutions from otherwise following normal disciplinary procedures;
- (3) All UW institutions shall be required to seek approval from the UW System President for any settlement involving the termination of a limited appointee. Such settlements shall be reported to the Board of Regents;
- (4) UW System Administration shall revise its policy such that when administrators return to their faculty position, they will be compensated at a salary rate consistent with other faculty members of the same rank in the department (when considering years of service, previous salary as a faculty member, length of time served as an administrator and other factors normally considered when setting faculty salaries). The UW System

Office of Human Resources shall approve all such salaries along with appropriate justification prior to implementation;

(5) All UW institutions shall require that employees who are returning to the faculty from an administrative position, and are being offered transition time to prepare to teach, shall provide the equivalent of a sabbatical proposal and subsequent report of work accomplished during the transition. The transition period should be no longer than one academic semester unless the person has served in a limited position for five or more years, whereby two academic semesters may be allowed;

(6) UW System Administration, in consultation with UW institutions, shall develop a revised sick leave policy by October 1, 2005 that specifies the time period after which a health professional's certification for use of sick leave will be required;

(7) The Board of Regents shall review and approve as appropriate the total compensation package for the President and each Chancellor; and

(8) In light of Sarbanes-Oxley regulations, the President shall review and prepare for the Board a recommendation on whether the internal audit function is sufficient and whether the System Auditor shall report directly to the President and the Board.

Background

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay, in its Plan 2008 and other irrevocable commitments, must and will further diversify our student body. We do so for several important reasons: to more fully serve the diverse region from which most of our students come; to help build brighter futures for the region and the state we exist and are funded to serve; and, primarily, to enhance the quality of the educational experience for *all* our students as they are prepared to contribute effectively to communities and to enterprises that, if these are successful undertakings, are drawing upon the diversity that is, fundamentally, this nation's most important source of future strength.

Faculty diversity is closely intertwined with the achievement of a diverse student body. The research seems clear: students bringing the strengths of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds seek to attend and are more likely to be retained by institutions with faculty and staff who more closely represent, racially and ethnically, the academy of the future rather than the academy of the past.

Faculty diversity is also closely related to our ability to become the rich educational resource and community needed in today's world. Faculty bringing the strengths of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds bring into the academy the multiple perspectives and bodies of scholarship that will enrich our enterprise and better prepare us and our students – *all* our students -- for success in today's racially and ethnically diverse communities, workplaces, and world.

Achieving a diverse faculty and staff is easier to preach than to practice. We all know the challenges. We cannot let the challenges thwart our intention to move ahead, though. We must use our shared imaginations and creativity to analyze, to innovate, and to evaluate trusting in our commitments to experimentation and research as the bases for sorting out the approaches that fail – and failures there will be if we are really being creative – from the successful approaches that should be expanded.

We do not start in a vacuum. Google “faculty diversity initiative” and you will find programs on campuses everywhere: the Harvard's, Duke's, Ohio State's, UCLA's, and Grinnell's to be sure with budgets that make our heads swim but, also, at campuses closer to ours in states ranging from Wyoming to Oregon to New Jersey to Florida to Minnesota. Here is prima facie evidence that, by establishing a faculty diversity initiative at UWGB, we are hardly doing anything our colleagues in the academy would find out-of-place. Indeed, many states universities and systems began faculty diversity initiatives 25 years ago or more. If anything, we are way behind our peers.

That last comment is unfair for we have been working hard, position by position, to diversify our faculty and staff. We have had a faculty and staff diversity initiative although we have not used that particular name. The fact is, though, that the results have been slow in coming. Over the last five years<data from Debbie/Mary>

The Faculty Diversity Initiative: Step 1

Step 1 (more on other steps later) is predicated on the hypothesis that unnecessary rigidity in defining our academic positions limits our ability to attract as large a number of applicants as possible. And, in a highly competitive environment for the very best faculty who might, also, advance our affirmative action commitments, larger pools are much more likely to yield success. Additionally, step 1 follows from the hypothesis that, even when we do define positions so as to assure large pools, financial limitations thwart opportunities to simultaneously serve academic and affirmative action goals.

Step 1 has these simple components:

1. For all tenure and tenure-track openings, usual reviews will take place prior to deciding if the search will be authorized. The proposing unit, in addition to the usual required justifications and considerations, will offer explanation on one additional topic:
 - How is the position(s) defined to maximize opportunities to hire diverse faculty?
 - Here, units may note choices made in defining the breadth of the position, the nature of the fields chosen for primary emphasis, the decision to pool the fields to be covered among several openings (current or anticipated) with each position to cover some subset of fields but not associating specific subsets with specific positions,
2. Where approve searches are undertaken and, in the course of the search, there are situations where candidates advancing our affirmative action objectives are identified but do not fit the exact position for which the search is being conducted. However, the program may well anticipate openings in the future for which, through some reconfiguration of the current and the future opening, two hires could be made, at least one of which would increase faculty diversity. In such situations and assuming the recommended candidates have the support of the program faculty, dean, and provost, both hires will be allowed even if one of the anticipated openings is not available for a year, two years, or three years.
3. The "bridge funding" for the appointment (salary and fringe) for which an opening is not yet available will be reimbursed by the University as follows:
 - a. One year bridge: 100%
 - b. Two year bridge: 67% both years
 - c. Three year bridge: 50% each of the three years

For two and three year situations, the provost, dean, and program would need to work out funding for the portion not covered centrally

4. For purposes of this initiative, candidates may be either national or international but must, for purposes of the reporting categories we use for DOE and UW System, report themselves to be a member of one of the underrepresented ethnic or racial groups.

Further Discussion

This is only Step 1. It is a step we can take even in severe budgetary times for the fiscal impacts are manageable (bridge funding involves continually reinvesting the same small, fixed pot of funds; the base budget impact is zero). But, it is only a first step.

A full faculty diversity initiative, at least to judge from programs at peers around the country, must also involve initiatives aimed at assuring retention and success that will lead to tenure. And, complete programs include efforts antecedent to our focus, in step 1, on recruitment; they involve various means of building pipelines – e.g., investing in the further education of current employees, going after ABD's with special programs for completion of terminal degrees, and the like.

We don't, then, yet have a full faculty diversity initiative. But, we must start, and Step 1 is a start.

Why faculty and not faculty and staff? Earlier, we noted that diverse faculty *and staff* are known to be important in attracting and retaining students of color. That is certain. The answer has to do with the nature of typical faculty and staff searches. In faculty searches, the concept of broadly defining fields and reconfiguring those fields when presented with what candidates offer for openings current is feasible. There is simply no counterpart for, say, a search for a director of a given program or function where specific skills are defined and which cannot, usually, be redefined because of the pool of candidates found to be available and knowledge of another director's position open somewhere else in the university. That Step 1 is *faculty* diversity initiative follows from the different nature of the position definition process; it does not in any way reduce our essential need to diversify staff as well.

Finally, remember that this is an experiment. We will periodically reassess, adjust, expand, end as our shared evaluations indicate. Most importantly, we will continue to share our ideas for better, indeed, more radical, experiments.