

Minutes of the Academic Staff General Assembly
May 12, 2006
1965 Room, University Union

Presiding Officer: Lucy Arendt, Chair, Academic Staff Committee

Parliamentarian: Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Present: 39 members of the Academic Staff, Chancellor Shepard, Provost Hammersmith, University Counsel and Ombudsperson Melissa Jackson.

1. Call to order. Following a brief social around a deliciously calorific cake, Chair of the Academic Staff Committee, Lucy Arendt, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. Lucy joins the ranks of the faculty in the fall and she announced her departure from the Academic Staff Committee and the AS position she has held since 1990.

2. Celebration of Academic Staff and Academic Governance. One of the purposes of the day's assembly was to mark two anniversaries in the history of academic staff governance on campus: the 35th anniversary of the formation of the committee that in 1971 began the work of formulating policies and procedures for academic staff; and the 15th anniversary of the first meeting of the Academic Staff Assembly (which, in 1999 gave way to the Academic Staff Committee and the Academic Staff biennial General Assembly in their current form). Ken Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, Chancellor Bruce Shepard and Provost Sue Hammersmith offered comments for the occasion. Chairperson Arendt recognized 2005-2006 members of the Academic Staff Committee and, had it not been for the forgetfulness of the aging SOFAS would, herself, have been recognized with the traditional presentation of a gold (you bet!) letter opener, guaranteed to open email as well as paper envelopes. That unforgivable lapse was attended to in a smaller meeting when the Academic Staff Committee met in June, but the secretary wants these minutes to reflect the gratitude that should rightly have been expressed before the General Assembly for the excellent job Lucy has done representing academic staff.

2b. State of Academic Staff Governance. ASC Chair Arendt noted that over one third of academic staff have chosen to become involved in governance. Academic staff are committed to the campus mission and our students. They are often the first contacts for students and provide them with services and assistance. Being a student today involves much more than the classroom, and academic staff are involved at every level. There can be no "us/them" attitude differentiating faculty and AS if we are to provide students with a quality campus experience.

We are fortunate to have a strong tradition of governance and can be grateful we stand on the shoulders of those who came before us. Each new generation needs to ask what we can do to build on that commitment, what we can do to make our colleagues want to stay and work here. To do this we need to engage in community building, work to resolve budget issues, engage more AS in active governance, and promote multiple perspectives for problem solving. New and more voices will strengthen our ranks. Bringing "limited" appointments into AS governance, even if only as participants in committee work, will make for stronger governance and promote inclusion. Earlier involvement of AS in budget discussions will have positive consequences. Involvement in governance is not an "extra," it is part of everyone's job. It is important that we continue our commitment to professional development, that we foster activities that bring the community together, that we ask who we are as academic staff and why governance matters.

3. Action Overview

A. Pay Plan Distribution and Budget. Arendt reported that ASC recommendations regarding distribution of the Chancellor's 10% discretionary funds seem to have been accepted and there should be a little extra in many paychecks.

B. Community Building Committee. This was one of the year's most important efforts following the demise of the Campus Climate Committee. Climate is an important campus issue requiring ongoing reflection and care. Climate problems cannot be fixed in a year by an *ad hoc* committee, but will require the ongoing efforts of faculty and academic staff working together. The ASC's hope is that the Community Building Committee will keep the momentum of the Climate Committee going until a new campus-wide committee is operational. Various faculty, student and classified committees continue to share the Academic Staff's belief in the need to address issues of climate and community. Shane Kohl spoke as a member of the CBC. The committee did **not** want:

- to redo the work of the CCC
- identify people of departments to blame
- recommend superficial efforts.

It sought instead to identify positive influences on the AS work environment, identifying several obvious ones:

- increased resources for professional development opportunities
- a clearer understanding of advancement and promotion, a gray area for academic staff more than for faculty or classified.
- Greater involvement of AS in campus decision making.

A very high percentage of AS indicate on surveys that they enjoy working here, yet there is work to be done at both the AS and campus-wide levels.

4. Discussion of Proposed Administrator Evaluation. There was a brief discussion of this topic and a request for further communication with the ASC on this matter. One person suggested that it is important that administrative evaluations be done regularly to avoid any impression of a witch hunt.

5. Committee Reports. Two members of campus-wide committees reported. Dave Kieper, a member of the Strategic Budgeting Committee, noted that the SBC's intent to bring AS into the budget planning process was not as successful as hoped... In some ways the SBC has not accomplished what was intended of it when it was formed four years ago. Its continued value is uncertain. It is still important to give feedback on budget plans, but the process is not where it needs to be. Others added that the faculty also still struggle with this. The group offered its thanks to Dave for his fine service on this committee. Leanne Hansen reported on the Academic Affairs Planning Committee that produced outcomes that were probably as positive as possible under the circumstances.

b. Reports from Academic Staff Committees were received as follow (**See attached reports following minutes**):

1. State of AS governance (Lucy Arendt)
2. CBC Report (Shane Kohl)
3. Personnel Committee (Trudy Jacobson)
4. Legislative Committee (Linda Parins)
5. Orientation Committee (Kelly Kramp)
6. Nominating Committee (Kelly Kramp)
7. Programming Committee (Brenda Amenson-Hill)
8. Allocations Committee (Shane Kohl)
9. Academic Staff Committee - the Annual Report will be forthcoming

4. Adjournment. Academic Staff, Chair Arendt announced that Paula Ganyard is next year's ASC Chair, thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 11.00 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

with attachments

**2005-2006 Academic Staff
Committee Reports
Attached Below**

State of Academic Staff Governance.

Address by Lucy Arendt, ASC Chair (2005-06)

May 12, 2006

Outline

Thanks to Ken Fleurant.

Thanks to ASC members.

Thanks to all who have served on behalf of academic staff this year.

Welcome to those who will be participating next year.

Why I'm **proud** to be a member of UWGB's academic staff.

1. Committed to its mission. We connect learning to life by being engaged, both in our work and home communities.
2. Committed to its students. We want them to succeed. We work with them from beginning to end.
3. Committed to each other. We care. We support each other.
4. Committed to doing our best work. We get things done. We work all week long, over many hours of the day. True for all campus employees.

Why I'm **proud** to be the Academic Staff Committee Chair.

1. Academic staff have a vested interest in this institution's success. 36.09(4m) – codified into state law. Academic staff has governance rights & responsibilities over its constituents and shall “be active participants in the immediate governance of and policy development for the institution.” To that end, we need to participate in decision making that directly affects us. What decisions do not affect us?
2. Academic staff dedicate hundreds of hours to on campus committee service, as evidenced in part by the certificates awarded today.
3. Academic staff are interested in problem solving and opportunity seeking. We take the high road, the productive road, the “it can be addressed” road.
4. Academic staff set goals, and stick to them.

Next, two ways of thinking about academic staff governance. What we accomplished this year, and where we might go in the future.

We are fortunate to have a strong history of positive academic staff involvement in governance. We stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before us. We recognize that our actions affect those who will come after us.

Key **principles** used to guide this year's decision making:

1. What is in the best interest of staff overall? For today and tomorrow.
2. What is in the best interest of the campus overall? For today and tomorrow.
3. What will build our community? Focus on the positive.
4. What can we do proactively to alter the status quo? Set goals, figure out how to accomplish them.

Next, two ways of thinking about academic staff governance. What we accomplished this year, and where we might go in the future.

POSITIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS THIS YEAR

Decision making doesn't happen fast. Besides valuing tradition, we also value the process of gathering and weighing input. We value involvement, engagement. We value "buy in." Input takes time.

Community building

1. Voice of academic staff on cabinet
2. Community Building Committee
3. Limited appointments
4. Proposed administrator evaluation

Budget

1. Staff need to be involved, as early as possible. Staff have to live with the consequences; we need more opportunity to influence resource allocation decisions before they reach a stage where it's almost impossible to make a difference. Such a system ensures decreased feelings of collective efficacy.
2. Pay plan distribution – what we suggested for the 10% that represents the Chancellor's cut.

So much of what gets done is through our committees. We'll hear from them later on in this meeting.

THE FUTURE

1. Need to engage more voices. Newer, veterans, everyone in between. Involvement in decision making = key. What would the campus look like without academic staff (AS) governance? Decisions made without AS perspective are necessarily based on incomplete information.
2. Need to maintain a watchful eye on those things that matter most to us: personnel, strategic direction, resource allocation. Involvement isn't an extra part of our job. it's part of our job. Shared governance isn't about some people getting involved in decision making; it's about all of us getting involved.
3. Growth agenda – As the institution's primary boundary spanners, AS have much to offer this conversation.
4. This represents an opportunity to bring all categories of employees together. The growth agenda = superordinate goal, one that compels the deliberate consideration more than one perspective, one that interests all of us, one that has consequences for all of us.
5. Need to continually find opportunities for all categories of employees to engage in meaningful activities together.
6. In order to be involved in critical decision making, we need professional development, certainly in key areas that affect decision making: communication, teamwork, decision making, leadership. Continuing professional development – what does this mean? Need to role model for students, need to keep ourselves fresh, connected to what it means to be a student.
7. AS creativity has never been in greater demand. Our external environment has become uncertain to the point where we must ask ourselves routinely the hardest of questions: Who are we? What is our purpose? Whom do we serve? Why does it matter? We must act based on the answers to these questions. Accordingly, we must develop a community that flexes together, that tears down walls built up by educational background and ineffectual and outdated organizational structures. To become an employer of choice, one that not only attracts but retains the best and brightest, we must demonstrate our ability to work as a cohesive team, one that values collective productivity and personal development.

To reiterate: I am and will always be **proud** to be a member of UWGB's academic staff.

Because:

1. We are committed to UWGB's mission. We engage in our community.
2. We are committed to UWGB's students. We want them to succeed.
3. We are committed to each other. We care.
4. We are committed to doing our best work. We get things done.

Thank you!

Community Building Committee Progress Report to ASC – May 12, 2006

The Beginning

On February 10th, ASC Chair Lucy Arendt invited nine staff members, including faculty, academic staff, and classified staff members, to commit to being part of the newly formed Community Building Committee (CBC). The CBC is an ad-hoc committee of the ASC and its membership is voluntary. The group first convened on February 21 to receive its charge, elect a chair, and to identify the next steps for the group. The CBC consists of: Sue Bodilly, Rick Warpinski, Lisa Tetzloff, Paula Ganyard, David Dettman, Monika Pynaker (Classified), Jennifer Mokren (Faculty), Bryan Vescio (Faculty) and Shane Kohl as Chair.

The Charge

During the February 21st meeting, the CBC was presented with a charge from the Academic Staff Committee (ASC). The charge is made up of five main points, the most critical of which is point 3 and reads as follows:

“The primary role of the Community Building Committee is to promote a positive relationship environment through a mutually shared vision, where people in the UW-Green Bay campus community can develop both professionally and personally, feel like they have a valued role in the functioning of the University, respect the roles of their colleagues, and feel recognized for their actions. Community building is considered a function of six elements: (a) respect, (b) communication, (c) shared experiences and values, (d) support, (e) trust, and (f) recognition.”

It is primarily this statement that helped guide the CBC in its early stages.

Where Are We?

In order to get a better feel for how we could help promote a positive relationship environment, we felt we needed to have a better understanding of just where some of our challenges were. The CBC, to its credit, took this task very seriously. We concluded very early on that any type of ‘warm fuzzy’ event intended to promote campus climate (i.e. ‘Crazy Hat Day’, Hawaiian Shirt Day’, and/or ‘Bring Your Grandmother to Work Day’) would be met with skepticism and seriously damage the CBC’s credibility. We wanted to drill down and learn more about the specifics of what shapes our work environments and experiences.

Didn’t the Last Committee Do This?

I would like to note that the CBC tried very hard not to duplicate the work of the previous campus climate committee. This was done for two reasons. One, the previous committee did some great work in a number of areas and we did not want to duplicate their efforts. Secondly, after viewing how the work of the previous committee was, or was not, acted

upon, we felt we needed to look at work environment challenges from a different perspective.

The Survey

In our efforts to learn more about what issues effect the campus environment, the CBC chose to use two surveys done in 2004 and 2005 that looked specifically at issues involving work environment. Two versions of the survey were used...one for faculty and one for classified and academic staff. While we realize that using a survey of this type has numerous disadvantages, we felt it was the best tool available. In essence, we asked ourselves: “we have to start somewhere, why not here?”

It’s the What, Not the Who

As a quick side note, I’d like to establish that the CBC is aware that many of the issues that affect our work environment exist at the department level as well as the supervisor and peer level. The CBC did not feel it was in our best interest, or even our right, to try and drill down to identify specific offices, supervisors, and/or individuals who create issues of respect, communication, values, trust, recognition, and so on. Instead, the committee worked to find areas that, if we could have some type of influence on, or make some sort of change to, could help crate a better work environment. Our hope was to find one or two dials that, if adjusted, could have a positive influence on other dials.

Institutional Research

On March 7, the CBC met with Debbie Furlong, Director of Institutional Research to try and learn more about the results of the surveys. In this meeting, and two subsequent meetings, the committee continued to ask questions, identify areas of concern, and drill down into the answers to find variables and trends. Thanks to Debbie’s extensive work on breaking down the information, the CBC was able to focus on three areas that, if we could influence, may help change the aspect of ‘respect’ in the work environment. The areas were professional development, understanding the promotion process, and getting involved in decision making. However, not all faculty and staff felt the same way about these areas.

Professional Development

It does not take a committee, ad-hoc or otherwise, to come to the conclusion that most faculty and staff would like to see more money spent on professional development. Survey results showed, not surprisingly, that 61% of Academic Staff, 49% of Classified Staff, and 58% of Faculty either ‘Somewhat Disagreed’ or ‘Strongly Disagreed’ with the statement “UWGB spends enough on professional development”. Professional development funding on campus always has been, and probably always will be, an issue that affects employees overall job satisfaction. However, since the CBC as a committee had absolutely no power (and even less of a budget) to change this issue, we chose to focus on the other two areas. However, please note that we hope the campus leadership will continue to find ways to

increase funding for professional development and to search for ways to distribute it equitably.

Understanding the Promotion Process - Faculty

For faculty, one of the most significant variables we identified was that by focusing on the understanding of the advancement and promotion processes, we could possibly favorably influence an individual's work environment. Nearly 54% of faculty who have been at UWGB under 5 years, and 41% who have been here 5-15 years, felt that criteria for advancement and promotion were unclear. In discussing this issue openly and honestly with the two faculty members on the committee, it became apparent that issues surrounding tenure, research, teaching, etc., were real. It also became apparent that these issues have been long-term challenges at the University and continue to be discussed within various governance committees and departments. Our hope is the CBC can work with these committees and share these results in an effort to bring a new perspective, along with hard data, to the challenges.

Involvement in Decision-Making – Staff

For academic and classified staff, one of the potential change variables identified was an individual's belief that they were truly involved in decision-making processes on campus. The data seems to indicate that staff members who feel they are involved in decision-making processes on campus (the scope of the survey questions make it difficult to identify if this means within or outside of ones department) feel more engaged, connected, respected and, ultimately, better about their work environment. This assumption breeds a number of other questions. What does 'involved' really mean? Are those that feel involved part of a governance group? Are those that feel uninvolved even interested in joining a governance group? And, as numerous members of the CBC discussed, where is the 'bottom', in some of the new 'bottom-up' decision-making processes that are being introduced on camps. The CBC looks forward to continuing to dig deeper into some of these questions.

The Good News

In closing, there are a number of items that deserve mention within this summary as they are a reminder that many good things are happening at UW-Green Bay...

1. 70% of the staff surveyed agreed that the campus is supportive of their work on campus.
2. 85% of faculty felt that teaching is valued by faculty in their department.
3. 82% of staff, and 93% of faculty, were satisfied with the autonomy and independence they have in their job.
4. 75% of staff, and 86% of faculty feel one of the largest stressors on their work environment is 'self-imposed' high expectations. A campus of high achievers is not a bad thing.

Regardless of budget challenges, climate issues, or environment concerns, an incredibly high percentage of UW-Green Bay employees enjoy working here. There is no better way

of stating this. They are invigorated by the challenge of making UWGB a stronger, more vibrant, more diverse institution. They walk in the door each day ready to connect...ready to engage...ready to move forward.

Yet, there is work to be done. It is the hope of the members of the CBC that this work continues, preferably as a codified, multi-governance committee that will work to identify and alter those variables that can make UW-Green Bay even stronger.

Respectfully submitted,

Shane Kohl
Community Building Committee, Chair

YEARLY REPORT

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

May 12, 2006

The Personnel Committee comprised of Trudy Jacobson, chair, Anne Kasuboski, secretary, Eileen Kolb, Linda Parins, and Mary Thiesen, met diligently and productively throughout the year working on two separate charges:

- Drafting of a brochure intended for laid-off personnel encapsulating what services or assistance would be forthcoming from UW-Green Bay
- Review/Monitor Human Resource list of title progression or Change in classification

Lay off Brochure/Information/Policies and Procedures

The redesign of the first draft of the brochure which had been carried over from the previous year occupied most of the committee's attention during 2005-2006.

Previous to the turnover in the Human Resources department, staff requested and gathered information from UW-Madison, UW-Milwaukee, and UW-LaCrosse as to their handling of layoffs. The committee also met with Melissa Jackson to verify/redirect her initial suggestions/reactions to the draft brochure. She suggested that the brochure be made less "legal" looking. She also directed the committee to focus totally on lay-off and define layoff as opposed to termination for cause or ending of employment due to grant loss/end.

In an interview with Sheryl Van Gruensven, the committee reviewed the step by step procedure used for lay-offs and reviewed the printed material given out. Based upon this review of the materials the committee recommended that a particular line directing the laid off employee to contact the Personnel Committee be added to the letter template:

"The Personnel Committee or its individual members can be contacted if you would wish additional assistance in the lay-off process."

In addition to the added statement in the initial letter supplied by Human Resources to the supervisor of the laid off employee, these additional materials will be included in the packet of materials supplied by Human Resources to the laid off employee:

- Brochure containing the step-by step process for the layoff.
- Letter from Personnel Committee containing Frequently Asked Questions and links for appropriate WEB sources.

Review/Monitoring of Human Resource Listing of Position Conversions

In a meeting with the Acting Director of Human Resources, Cheryl Van Gruensven, on April 10, 2006, the committee expressed its discomfort with monitoring/reviewing position conversions before they were sent to system. Sheryl mentioned that OSER has mandated that positions that are currently academic staff but that can be done by classified staff must be converted back to classified staff when those positions become vacant. The committee will be asking for a start of year report and an end of year report for such conversions.

**Legislative Committee
Mid Year Report 2005-2006
May 12, 2005**

Academic Staff Committee Members:

Linda Parins, Chair . Andy Speth . Kelly Kramp

Faculty Senate Legislative Affairs Committee Members:

Terri Johnson . Mark Kiehn . Rebecca Tout .

Student Representative:

Bob Kranzusch .

Government Relations Representative:

Dan Spielmann .

The Legislative committee's charge is as follows:

- 1.) To monitor legislative and Board of Regents activities which may affect the university at-large and the academic staff in particular.
- 2.) To monitor the progression of legislative and/or Board of Regents policies of specific concern to academic staff and recommend appropriate actions to the ASC.
- 3.) To collaborate as appropriate with the university government affairs officer to assist in the advancement of legislative agendas of benefit to UW-Green Bay and the UW System.

Additional goals as part of the committee's charge from the ASC are as follows:

- 1.) Work with Legislative Committees within Student Senate as well as Faculty Senate to invite legislative candidates to campus for open forums in preparation for the primary and general elections.
- 2.) Meet with campus Legislative Liaison to coordinate possible additional campus activities.
- 3.) Work with Advancement and the Chancellor's office to prepare for the Board of Regent's campus visit in April 2006.
- 4.) Communicate regularly with representatives of professional organizations such as ASPRO and TAUWP to keep the ASC informed on relevant issues under consideration.
- 5.) Develop a list of academic staff non - UW – Green Bay email addresses to be used for communicating legislative information that falls outside of the acceptable state and campus email use policy.

The committee met on an as-needed basis. When our Government Relations Representative, Dan Spielmann, had information to relay, the committee chair would request meetings with the Academic Staff Legislative Committee, Faculty Senate Legislative Affairs Committee and Student Representative.

Dan had reported to the committee that there would be a Legislative Breakfast scheduled in which the committee could participate in February. However, it turned out that the legislators had breakfast privately with representatives of the university.

The committee was in communication with Scott Hildeband of University Communications, and also with Dan Spielmann of University Advancement, to following up with preparations for the Board of Regent's campus visit in April. Scott kept us informed, but felt that it was not necessary for the committee to be directly involved in planning.

The committee did not communicate with ASPRO and TAUWP.

The committee sent out a memo to Academic Staff requesting their private non-UWGB email addresses in order to communicate legislative information that falls outside of the acceptable state and campus email use policy. We received 23 addresses to the Legislative Committee's non-UWGB email account aslegislative@yahoo.com. Through the email account, the committee sent notices of a TABOR forum and information on the new Taxpayers Protection Act.

Academic Staff Orientation Committee

Report for Academic Staff Committee

Committee Members: Amy Van Oss, John Gerow, Kelly Kramp, and Karla Miller

- Conducted an August orientation of all new Academic Staff from the previous year, 5 new staff signed up to receive a mentor.
- Reviewed summarized all evaluation of the mentor program received the previous year and processed the surveys for this year.
- A call for Academic Staff mentor led to all new Academic Staff being paired, along with the planning of a mentor training for Academic Staff—for late May, early June.
- Orientation Chair has been receiving the names of all new hires monthly, to make an early connection with all new Academic Staff.
- Working with the classified staff and faculty to develop some sort-of overlapped training or an opportunity to meet/socialize as a campus group of new employees.
- Assembling aspects of Academic Staff committee to better educate new employees of the opportunities and advantages, while participating on an Academic Staff committee.

Academic Staff Nominating Committee

Report for Academic Staff Committee

Committee Members: Paula Ganyard, Sara Ann Suwalski, Kelly Kramp, and Todd Sanders

- Nominated Academic Staff to five committees and one search and screen in the fall semester.
 - Solicited names of qualified and interested candidates.
- Filled any open Academic Staff committee seats, which were vacant in the fall.
- Completed the spring preference survey and election of new Academic Staff to a variety of Academic Staff committees—all of which took place via an online survey/ballot.
- Filled all vacancies for the 2006-2007 academic year.

Academic Staff Professional Development Programming Committee

Final Report 2005-06

Committee Members: Brenda Amenson-Hill (Chair), Mary Spencer (Treasurer), Nora Kanzenbach (Secretary), Todd Sanders, Juliet Cole and Jane Swan (AS Liaison)

The committee started the year with some assignments from the summer. We were asked to help research and start a Conversational Spanish Class on campus. The Chair, Brenda Amenson-Hill worked with Mary Ann Rose, Classified Staff Advisory Council to complete the research in August. All of the information was turned over to Tom Maki. Tom then gave us cabinet level approval to move forward by working with Barbara McClure-Lukens in Outreach. Outreach coordinated the course registration. This Spanish Class was very successful first semester. This current semester continued with high satisfaction from the staff members that participated. One class spring semester was targeted to level one participant, and the other level two. See attached documents related to the Conversational Spanish Classes.

We also looked at the survey results from 2004-05, and started planning more programs for the year. The committee solicited input on the programs that interested Academic Staff. We included a place for input on our promotion and evaluation documents for programs offered in 2005-06.

The programs presented in 2005-2006:

1. Two sections of level 1, Spanish.

Date: fall semester

Attendance: 50 faculty and staff total

Cost: \$0 from this budget

2. Gender Issues in the Workplace- Dr. Kilmartin.

Date: November 8, 2005

Attendance: 40 total

Cost: \$265 (co-sponsored with the Campus Life task force on healthy relationships—they paid for \$2,500 for contract and promotional expenses) Campus Life held a separate program that evening for students.

3. The Land of Make Belief-Steve Scott

Date: February 2, 3-4 p.m., Phoenix C

Attendance: 32 staff

Cost: \$85.81 for promotion and food at the program

This program was co-sponsored with the Campus Life-Diversity Taskforce

4. Creativity-Tracy Knofla

Date: February 27, 3-4 p.m., 1965 Room

Attendance: 30

Cost: \$67.65

This program was co-sponsored with Student Life. Tracy was hired for the Leadership Series in the evening. We saved thousands of dollars in speaker fees.

5. Ethics in the Workplace-Mike Troyer

Date: March 7, 9 a.m., Phoenix C

Attendance: 54 Academic and Classified Staff

Cost: \$367 (to be divided with Classified Staff)

As per our committee charge, we followed up on the previously scheduled session on Ethics in the Workplace with Mike Troyer, President, Strategic Management Associates and Emeritus Associate Professor of Business Administration (Management). The Classified Staff co-sponsored this program and contributed \$200.

6. Boxes and Walls

Date: April 20, 2006, 11 a.m.-2 p.m. and 5-7 p.m., throughout the Union

Attendance: 125 people

Cost: \$0 (this was collaborative effort with the Campus Life Diversity Taskforce)

This program focused on all types of diversity scenarios. This program was open to students, staff and faculty.

7. Conversational Spanish-Spring Semester

Date: spring semester

Cost: \$0

8. All Academic Staff-Birthday Celebration

Date: May 12, 9 a.m., 1965 Room

Cost: approximately \$130 for catering and supplies

We brainstormed a program on diversity for fall semester, 2006. The program is titled Diversity 201-Expanding Boundaries. This program will explore the Color of Fear. The presenters are Jane Swan and Darrel Renier. They are flexible with scheduling this in September 2006. The suggested date is September 27. The next committee can confirm this date and make the final arrangements.

The committee is also working on a follow up with Mike Troyer on a brown bag discussion, Part 2 on the Ethics in the Workplace Topic. Mike volunteered to come back to campus for no additional charge. Many of the staff participants in his first session would like to continue the discussion on the scenarios he provided in the session. The scenarios are actually real life situations provided by our UWGB Staff.

Budget

We were allocated \$3,879.00 for the year, and we attached our final budget. We notified the Allocations Committee about transferring \$2,500 to them as of March 1, 2006. The co-sponsorships really allowed this committee to do several programs for a minimal fee. We strongly support collaboration and continued work with existing campus committees and departments that program on campus. Some of the key contacts include Campus Life areas-Student Life, Residence Life, Counseling and Health and the AIC Staff. We also worked with the Classified Advisory Council.

Other Recommendations

- 1. Consider holding a half day professional development conference in 2006-07**
- 2. Consider spending more time on a topic of interest to staff, one hour tends to barely scratch the surface on any given topic**
- 3. Offer programs on different days/times to include as many staff as possible**

Submitted by:

Brenda Amenson-Hill,

Chair, Academic Staff Professional Development Programming Committee

Assistant Dean for Campus Life

Attachments: Budget
Meeting minutes

5-3-06

Academic Staff Professional Development Allocations Committee
Final Report for 2005-06
May 12, 2006

Members of the Committee are: Shane Kohl (Chair), Juliet Cole (Proposal Summaries), Anne Seidl (Publicity), Lyn Niemi (Secretary), and Marlys Brunsting (Treasurer).

The committee met in May of 2005 to review the past charge, to get organized, and to elect officers. Subsequent meetings took place in August, October, January and April to review proposals and allocate funds. We have allocated all professional development funds provided to the committee this year.

This year \$11,638 was made available for professional development. One-third (\$3,879.33) was given to the Professional Development Committee, leaving (\$7,758.67) for Allocations. In early April, the Programming Committee returned approximately \$2,500. As of April 25, all funds were allocated. In all, 28 individuals received funds (ranging from the full \$500 to \$39.50) representing approximately 14 different departments. Each recipient and his or her supervisor along Human Resources were notified via e-mail. A summary report detailing our allocations through April is attached.

The Office of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff distributes periodic announcements regarding the availability of funds, procedures and deadlines, via e-mail. The fund request form and related information is also linked to the Human Resources website at http://www.uwgb.edu/hr/UWGB_employ/professional_development.htm an announcement is also available in the LOG on a regular basis.

Since the demand for professional development funds was high this year and we allocated all funds budgeted, the committee would like to ask the ASC to continue to work to better define the role of the committee when making allocation decisions and asks both the Provost & Chancellor to revisit the use of professional development funds in all areas of campus.