

## Minutes of the Academic Staff General Assembly

April 27, 2007

Alumni Rooms, University Union

Presiding Officer: Paula Ganyard, Chair, Academic Staff Committee

Secretary: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Present: 27 academic staff members, Assistant Chancellor Rodeheaver, and  
Provost Hammersmith

**1. Call to order** by the presiding officer at 2:02 p.m.

**2. Academic Staff Committee Report.** Chair Paula Ganyard read the report that focused on the last year's eight goals (layoff manual, performance reviews, leadership skills, awarding prior service in job changes, educating staff on governance, professional development, staff retention, and staff salaries) and progress made on each. She then announced that Dan McIver would be next year's chair and that the ASC would be implementing the shift from two to three year terms.

**3. UW-System Representative Report.** Sherri Arendt explained the position she held this year as UW-Green Bay's Academic Staff Representative to System. She asked for interest in the Academic Staff Leadership Conference to be held this year on June 28-29 in Superior. She then presented two issues the reps had focused on this year. One was the right for collective bargaining, recently deleted from the Governor's budget, but still possible for legislative action. Opinion of this issue elsewhere in the System seemed to be favoring the right in general but not necessarily the specific legislative language currently proposed. The second issue was the improvement of communication with System Administration and more timely consultation with the campuses.

**4. Reports from standing committees.** Reports received from committees are attached:

a. Legislative Committee – given by Jan Malchow

b. Nominating Committee – given by Todd Sanders

c. Orientation Committee – given by Karla Miller (There was a suggestion that this committee may want to reorient its role.)

d. Personnel Committee – given by Jan Malchow

e. Professional Development Allocations Committee – given by Marlys Brunsting

f. Professional Development Programming Committee – given by Gloria Meyer

(Most of these reports will serve as year-end reports, but a few committees are still meeting. Updated annual reports will be available on-line this summer.)

**5. Provost Report.** The Provost beamed her approval of all those who have worked to improve governance over the past year with special recognition to Paula Ganyard, who was presented an engraved letter opener. She was also happy to report that the budget may finally be going in a better direction. She then listed a number of changes that might characterize "the new UW-Green Bay": new facilities (Kress Event Center, Union expansion, Student Services alteration); new academic programs (First Nations Studies, Bachelor of Applied Studies, diversity improvements in languages); an academic calendar change; more attention to the freshman year (including a

shout-out to Dave Dettman); the Growth Agenda possibilities (a teaching/learning center, academic support for freshmen, searches for new faculty and staff, marketing and recruitment expansions); and upcoming renovations (Rose Hall, Wood Hall, and Cofrin Library).

**6. Continuity of Operations Plan.** Jane Rank gave an informational report on this state-mandated initiative to come up with a disaster recovery plan. It will involve most of the university to identify critical functions and recovery options when there is a loss of property and structures, data and communication, and personnel.

**7. Leave Reporting.** Paula Ganyard asked for reactions to changes proposed by System Administration in the policy and practice for reporting leave time. The following issues were raised: can the deadlines always be reasonably met; can supervisors correct leave reports without employee authorization; will there be feedback to employees if there is a problem; is it appropriate that Department Associates sign for supervisors (apparently a common but inconsistent pattern); isn't hourly reporting unfair and unprofessional; and how can we achieve both consistency and clarity on this issue. The Chair will take these reactions back to the ASC.

**8. Criminal Background Checks.** Paula Ganyard presented a brief update on this policy change to do background checks on new hires with a few stated exceptions.

**9. Administrator Evaluation Process.** A faculty and staff committee has a draft proposal for a regularized process to evaluate Cabinet-level administrators on a three year rotation. The proposal favors a 360° formative evaluation with confidentiality protections.

**10. Adjournment.** With no other questions, suggestions, or business before the body, the meeting adjourned around 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

**Academic Staff Committee Reports  
Attached Below**

**Academic Staff Committee Chair Report to Academic Staff Assembly  
April 27, 2007**

It has been a very busy but good year for Academic Staff Governance. The Academic Staff Committee (ASC) worked on a variety of issues, as did our six subcommittees. The subcommittees will each address their accomplishments this year in their own reports, so I will just review what the ASC accomplished this year.

The ASC set eight goals for the year, and I am pleased to report that all eight were either completed or progress was made on them. The first goal was to finish the layoff brochure that has been in production for the past few years. This brochure is now finished, but fortunately, we will not have to use it this year since we had no Academic Staff layoffs.

The second goal was to deal with Performance Evaluations. It was brought to our attention that not every academic staff member was receiving an evaluation each year, so the ASC chose to address this issue in three ways: 1) I asked each of the area leaders at a Chancellor's Cabinet meeting to make sure that their areas completed evaluations and sent them to the SOFAS. 2) The ASC began working with HR to revise the Position Description form and to make sure that everyone has a position description against which he or she may be evaluated. 3) The ASC will be meeting with the Director of HR to discuss improving the evaluation form and process itself, though this most likely will be continued by next year's ASC.

The third goal was Leadership. The ASC wanted to help not only those currently in leadership to improve their current skills, but also to help those who are interested in taking on a leadership role to gain new skills. We assigned this task to the Programming Committee, which successfully accomplished this goal, even to the extent of cancelling a cabinet meeting so that the administration could attend.

Goal number four was to address the issue of awarding years of service to Academic Staff who switch jobs within our University. While this does not happen often, when it does happen, years of service are only inconsistently awarded across the campus. To address this issue, the Director of HR now needs to sign the appropriate form when someone is being awarded years of service. This will ensure that years of service are more evenly awarded. The ASC also feels that it is the academic staff member's responsibility to be aware of this right and to ask for years of service when taking a new position.

The fifth goal was educating staff on what Academic Staff Governance is and why it should care. The Orientation Committee was given this task and they have recommendation for the ASC, which we will discuss this at our meeting on Monday. However, this goal requires everyone's work. We all should be encouraging fellow academic staff members to become involved in governance. This year we had 48 individuals of the 187 academic staff serve on committees, not counting ad-hoc committees such as search and screens. Forty-eight appears to be an impressive number, those 48 individuals served in approximately 53 positions. Several people did more than their share. It would be nice to report someday that 53 individuals are filling 53 positions. It would also be nice to hear the Nominating Committee say that they have more volunteers than they have positions. So, I ask you to encourage newer employees to become involved, and even if you are a seasoned veteran who has "served your time", I encourage to become involved again.

The sixth goal was Professional Development. The ASC felt that it was important to reinvest in the people that we have on staff. Because of all the budget reductions and reallocations that we have had over the last 5-6 years, many departments do not have large budgets, if any, for professional development. We asked that the Professional Development Allocations Committee work this year on gathering data on the increase in conference costs over the last few years and to compare that data with the increase in available professional development funds. This report is included in their end of the year report.

Goal seven was Academic Staff Retention, which is a hard issue to address without also talking about salaries, which was goal number eight. We did try to address both of these issues with our recommendation to the Chancellor on how the Chancellor's 10% should be spent. We once again recommended that this 10%, if taken, should go towards academic staff career progressions, then title changes, and finally market equity adjustments. ASC will be sending that same recommendation to the Chancellor within the next week for next year's pay plan. Recently, in a meeting I had with the Provost, I also reminded her that academic staff salaries need to be addressed alongside faculty salaries.

The 2007-2008 Academic Staff Committee will have a number of issues to keep an eye on, but I am confident that we have an excellent group that will be able to do just that. Next year the ASC will be chaired by Dan McIver, who along with Paul Pinkston agreed to serve an extra year to implement staggered terms. Since the ASC will now be a committee of 6 serving for 3-year terms, it was important to make sure that we were always electing two new members each year. Joining Dan and Paul for their final year are Sherri Arendt and David Dettman and last but not least, the two new members of the ASC will be Eric Craver and Lisa DeLeeuw.

As previously mentioned governance takes about 50 people each year, not just the seven of us on the ASC, so I would like to say thank you to everyone that served on a committee this year. In recognition of your service, the Academic Staff Committee has certificates of appreciation for you. If you served on a committee, please pick up your certificate before you leave.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of this year's Academic Staff Committee: Sherri Arendt (UW System rep), Sue Bodilly, David Dettman (secretary), Dan McIver, Paul Pinkston, and Grant Winslow (Vice-chair), it was an honor to serve with all of you, so thank you.

Does anyone have any questions?

Respectfully submitted,  
Paula Ganyard  
Academic Staff Committee Chair

**Academic Staff Legislative Committee**  
**Academic Staff Assembly Report**  
**4-27-07**

The Academic Staff Legislative Committee for this year includes Dan Spielmann, Andy Speth, Terri Johnson, Mark Kiehn, Kelly Kramp, Pao Lor, Jan Malchow and student representative Sara Beth Duginske.

The committee continues to encourage support for the University Growth Agenda and is monitoring its progress through the state budget process. The growth agenda remains in the Governor's Budget Bill as of this time.

The committee also has been monitoring developments regarding domestic partner benefits, collective bargaining for faculty and academic staff, and the affirmative action policy for admissions. The latter was passed by the Regents and is being implemented. Collective bargaining and domestic partner benefits have recently been separated from the Governor's proposed biannual budget bill by the Joint Finance Committee. Therefore, at this time, each would need to be introduced as a separate bill or be attached to another piece of legislation in order to be considered. The committee hopes to meet with Senator Dave Hansen to discuss collective bargaining.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jan V. Malchow

## **Nominating Committee 2006-2007 Report**

### Members:

Todd Sanders, chair  
Brenda Amenson-Hill, secretary  
Brock Neverman  
Jen Pfundtner

### Summary of Committee Activities:

1. Met six times  
07/20, 08/14 and 09/25 of 2006  
02/09, 03/09 and 04/12 of 2007
2. Selected six Academic Staff members to forward to the Academic Staff Committee to fill positions on the search and screen committee for the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences
3. Selected four Academic Staff members to forward to the ASC for consideration for serving on the Campus Community Building Council
4. Selected two Academic Staff members to forward to ASC for the Capital Campaign Internal Committee
5. Created an online home for the "Governance and Committee Opportunities for Academic Staff" brochure (<http://www.uwgb.edu/saweb/qco/>)
6. "New Employee" brochure never materialized, an online option was discussed with the AS Orientation Committee
7. Forwarded a nominee for the 2007 Academic Staff Regents Award for Excellence
8. Selected two Academic Staff members to forward to the ASC for consideration for serving on the Implementation Committee for adopting a 14-week class schedule
9. Created an online Interest Survey for Academic Staff Governance
10. Conducted the Academic Staff Governance elections
11. Filled all positions for the 2007-08 committees (elective/appointive)
12. Notified Academic Staff members of their elections/appointments

### Recommendations:

1. Investigate the online election system that Student Government utilized for their spring 2007 election.

# **Academic Staff Orientation Committee Year-End Report for 2006-2007**

May 1, 2007

**Committee Members:** John Gerow, Karla Miller, Lynn Niemi, and Pat Theyerl

## **Accomplishments for the Year:**

- Developed a system by which Human Resources notifies the AS Committee Chair when new Academic Staff are hired by the University.
- The Committee sent a survey at the end of January to gather information about mentoring from new and existing staff. Of the 187 Academic Staff members who received the survey, there were 64 respondents, for a return rate of 34.2%
- The survey was not an effective means of identifying potential mentors – only three (3) individuals responded that they would be willing to serve as mentors. Committee members agreed that if there was a need to recruit new mentors, direct e-mails would be a better means to secure them.

## **Suggestions for 2007-2008:**

Based upon changes made to the orientation process and current committee charges, the committee submitted the following recommendations:

- Given that the Academic Staff mentoring program is well-established and very few new staff are hired, the size of the committee could be reduced to 2 members which would be sufficient to handle the workload.
- This year the Academic Staff Orientation Committee was given the charge to promote involvement in Academic Staff governance. Should this role be given to the Nominating committee? Proposed solutions: either a member of the Orientation Committee serves on both committees, or an additional member is added to the Nominating Committee to focus on educating Academic Staff about governance opportunities.

Karla Miller (Orientation Committee) and Todd Sanders (Nominating Committee) met with the Academic Staff Committee on April 30, 2007 to discuss these recommendations. It was proposed that the two committees be combined and consist of 4 members with responsibility for educating staff about governance, encouraging involvement, developing and administering the interest surveys and elections, and facilitating the mentoring program. The Academic Staff Committee will move forward with the process of changing the committee structure/code.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karla Miller  
Academic Staff Orientation Chair

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
YEAR END REPORT 2006-07**

September 13, 2006

- Welcome – Election, Eileen Kolb (Chair), Mary Valitchka (Recorder)
- Grant Winslow Explained Charge
- Received a request from Chancellor to be included in an up coming meeting – The committee replied favorably. (9-11-06)

September 28, 2006

- Meeting with Chancellor and Tom Maki concerning exception to search process

October 11, 2006

- Met to discuss charge for the New Year and what was needed. Including Telecommuting, alternative work schedules, reviewing position movements and other items.

October 30, 2006

- Went over policies from charge from Academic Staff handbook and UW System handbook for the above charge items. The committee decided we would need more information from the Academic Staff Committee. Request will be sent out to HR requesting all pertinent materials concerning position changes.

October 31, 2006

- A request was received by the committee to provide names from the Personnel Committee to participate in a hearing. The names were forwarded to the SOFAS Office on 11-02-06.

November 28, 2006

- First meeting for the Personnel Committee hearing.

December 2006

- Several e-mails concerning Personnel Committee hearing.
- A requested copy of all paperwork pertaining to Academic Staff conversions was sent to HR.

January 2007

- Hearing cancelled, individual withdrew request.
- A requested copy of all paperwork pertaining to Academic Staff conversions was sent to HR. Second request sent.
- Paperwork sent from HR. All items placed in binder for upcoming committees.

## **Academic Staff Professional Development Programming Committee 2006-07 End-of-Year Report**

Committee Members: Juliet Cole, Poppy Grant (Treasurer), Erik Howard, Gloria Meyer (Co-Chair), Mary Anne Spencer (Co-Chair), Sherri Arendt (AS Liaison)

The committee met six times during the 2006-2007 year (September 15, 2006, September 25, 2006, November 20, 2006, January 9, 2007, February 26, 2007, April 23, 2007) to discuss programming activities. This year's committee decided to continue to take advantage of speakers who are already invited to campus through Student Life activities if appropriate topics were available; however, the members wanted to concentrate on programs directly related to the charge they received from the Academic Staff Committee. The committee decided to provide a national speaker in the program this year along with three local presenters to address the specific charge to the committee. By providing a national speaker, the committee expended all but approximately \$75 of the \$3,903.66 allocation for this year programming.

The programs presented included the following:

- 1) The committee sponsored a program on working with diverse student groups on October 11, 2006 **Expanding Boundaries** 2 to 4 p.m. Presented by Jane Swan and Darrel Renier of the Academic Advising Office. The presentation provided insights to working with diverse student groups within the day-to-day operations of the office and provided insights to avoiding situations that are perceived as hostile to minority students because of cultural differences. **25 people attended; Cost: \$86.17 (Refreshments, Advertising)**
- 2) National speaker, Jane Boucher, provided a three-hour program on "How to Build A High Performance Work Team" on February 13, 2007 from 9 a.m.- 12 Noon with continental breakfast beginning approximately 8:30 a.m. This was our largest program expense this year. This workshop helped to address the leadership charge that we received from the ASC. **81 people attended; Cost: \$3362.01 (Includes Speaker Costs of \$3,032.70, Continental Breakfast at Workshop, \$225.00, Copies & Advertising Expenses \$104.31)**
- 3) Jane Birr provided a three-hour program, "Finding Wellness In Mind, Body, & Spirit," on March 29, 2007 from 1-4 p.m. The topic addressed establishing goals related to work, personal life, and finding the motivation to meet those goals to help find satisfaction in work and everyday life. **17 people attended; Cost: \$376.54 (Speaker's Fee, Advertising, Refreshments)**

- 4) The Human Resources Office has been providing information sessions for employees which addressed many of the issues employees had requested in the survey, so this committee did not pursue other topics with Human Resources at this time.
- 5) Available technology for communication continues to be of interest to academic staff according to the survey results; therefore, the committee will pursue a workshop on technology updates for the fall program.
- 6) In addition to conducting interest surveys of attendees at each programming activity, the committee provided an interest survey to the academic staff to aid in planning for the 2007-08 year. Results included:

**Primary areas of interest:**

Understanding Today's Millennial College Student  
Multicultural Diversity on Campus  
Leadership and Management Topics  
Technological Communication Updates

**Types of Programming Preferred:**

1-2 hour sessions

**Time of the Year Preferred:**

October, March, and June

**Academic Staff Professional Allocations Committee**  
**Academic Staff Assembly – April 27, 2007**

The Allocations Committee members are: Kristy Aoki (Publicity), Marlys Brunsting (Chair), Lynn Niemi (Secretary), Anne Seidl (Proposal Summaries), and Zach Voelz (Treasurer)

1. Our initial budget this year was \$11,326 (\$5326 from System, up to \$6000 from the Provost):
  - a. In previous years, the Programming Committee received one-third of our budget. This year they received a completely separate amount of money.
  - b. In April the Programming Committee returned approximately \$78.94 so that our total budget was \$11,404.94.
2. To date, we have awarded \$9155.36 to 23 people. A detailed listing of awards is attached.
3. We presently have \$2295.87 left and will have another meeting on Monday (April 30). If there is still money left after that meeting, we will meet on May 24.
4. At the request of the ASC, we looked into the following issues:
  - a. **Other funding sources** – In February, we notified academic staff via email and the LOG about a grants database that the Institute for Research subscribes to. If people need more than \$500 (our maximum award) or if we run out of money, they can use this database to identify other funding sources. Although most have specific application requirements and are competitive, awards are often considerable. UW-Green Bay staff can search this database by going to:  
<http://www.uwgb.edu/research/COSFUND.HTM>
  - b. **Historical Funding Analysis** – we reviewed data from the committee binders over the last five years to see if travel costs have gone up significantly and whether our funding is meeting the needs of academic staff. The data we had available was limited and results are not generalizable. We found that over the past 5 years the average costs have gone up slightly and our funding levels have been fairly stable, but only one request was denied due to a lack of money. Only 7% of requests were underfunded, but the reasons varied. A summary report is attached.
  - c. **Survey of academic staff** - We sent out a survey to academic staff a few weeks ago to gather information about why people don't apply for funds and whether or not departments have matching funds. Results will be available soon and will be sent to the Academic Staff Committee.

**d. Suggestions for the Academic Staff Committee**

- i. We suggest that the committee return to a monthly meeting schedule. We found this year that we could not always review applications before the staff member travelled to the event. Since one of the requirements of making awards is that the funding approval must occur before the travel occurs, some people were unable to apply because their travel occurred before our next meeting date. If there are no requests for that month the meeting can be cancelled.
- ii. We also suggest that the data collected every year be standardized in order to make it easier to analyze historical data.
- iii. We suggest that the guidelines be clarified so that departmental PLUS individual commitments count toward the 50% match. We feel that some individuals were underfunded in the past because their individual contribution was not counted as part of the “institutional, departmental or individual” match.

*Submitted by Marlys Brunsting, Chair  
April 27, 2007*

**Historical Funding Analysis April 2007 – AS Allocations Committee**

The Academic Staff Committee charged the Allocations Committee to determine if travel expenses have been increasing in the last few years and if our funding levels are meeting the needs of staff. We examined the applications and committee meeting minutes from the last five years as well as WISDM data, which was available for the last 3 years. Data collection was uneven during this period, so it is difficult to generalize in some areas. The key findings were:

- The amount of money allocated to the Professional Development Allocations and Programming committees was fairly stable over the last 5 years (within \$609).
- Average cost of travel (as estimated by travelers) was relatively unchanged in the last 5 years (within \$188).
- Total cost of travel over the five year period (as estimated by travelers) ranged from \$79 to \$2649.
- Average amount actually spent from committee funds ranged between \$238.80 and \$353.58.
- A maximum award of \$500 covered more than half the average total costs estimated.
- Every year, less than half of the applicants asked for the maximum award (\$500). Usually the percentage was closer to 33%.

- The number of eligible requests varied slightly in the last 5 years (25-35) and did not increase each year.
- There were 148 total eligible applications in the last five years. Ninety-two of those applications were from different individuals. Sixteen of those people applied at least 3 times during that time period.
- More applicants travelled out-of-state (range was 52% to 72% over 5 years) than in-state (28% to 48%).
- At least 12 people paid a portion of the costs on their own, although this data was not always recorded.
- Allowable mileage rates increased in the last 5 years, but hotel and meal rates did not.
- Only one individual was denied funding because there was no money left. Only one other person was denied funding, but for a different reason.
- Each year there were requests funded for less than the asking amount. Sometimes this was because several people from the same department were going to the same conference. Sometimes it was because the department was not matching the amount requested. Sometimes it was because there weren't enough funds available. The reasons were not always clear.
- For two of the three years for which there was data, there was money left over at the end of the year. This was probably due to any one or a combination of factors: travelers spent less than they were awarded; the Programming Committee returned more money than originally anticipated; or there weren't as many applications.

Please see attached spreadsheets for complete data. These results should not be generalized. The applications reviewed do not represent a random sample of academic staff on our campus and there is very little data to analyze at this point. We can say that of the applications received by the committee during the last 5 years, only 0.7% were denied due to a lack of money. Only 7% of all applications were underfunded but the reasons varied. Costs of travel, as indicated by these applications, have increased, but the number of applications and the amounts requested have not forced the committee to deny or underfund a significant number of requests. A longer time period analysis is advisable. We recommend that data collection be standardized in the future in order to repeat this study.

*Prepared by Marlys Brunsting and Lynn Niemi, Academic Staff Professional Development Allocations Committee*

**Historical Funding for ASPD**

**Allocation Committee 2006-07**

	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>
How much money did UW System and the Provost provide for both Allocations and Programming?	\$12,012.00	\$11,412.00	\$11,403.00	\$11,711.00	\$11,638.00
How much money did the Allocations Committee have to allocate (less the 1/3 for Programming)?	8,008.00	7,608.00	7,602.38	7,807.00	7,758.67
How much money did the committee have to spend after Programming returned remaining funds in the spring?	na	7,608.00	9,802.38	9,398.32	9,758.67
How many eligible requests were received?	30	25	35	30	28
How many requests were funded (in whole or in part)?	29	25	35	28	28
How many requests were denied because there was no additional money?	0	0	0	1	0
How many requests were underfunded?*	1	1	4	4	1
How many people paid for part of their travel out-of-pocket?***	4	0	0	3	5
What was the range of total costs? (as estimated by travelers)	\$186 to \$2340	\$160.04 to \$2340	\$85.65 to \$2155	\$133.80 to \$1695	\$79 to \$2649
What was the average of total costs? (as estimated by travelers)	912.79	790.78	853.70	905.10	978.13
What was the range of amounts awarded by the committee?	\$93 to \$500	\$80.02 to \$500	\$42.93 to \$500	\$60 to \$500	\$39.50 to \$500
What was the average amount awarded by the committee?	313.82	322.89	295.16	368.87	350.31
What was the total amount actually spent (from WISDM)	na	na	8,357.87	10,607.39	9,601.53
What was the average amount actually spent (from WISDM)	na	na	238.80	353.58	342.91
What was the allowable mileage rate this year (state car/personal car)?	\$.22/32.5	\$.22/32.5	\$.22/32.5	.28/.38	.28/42.5
What was the allowable meals rate this year (per day maximum)?	\$34 / \$40	\$34 / \$40	\$34 / \$40	\$34 / \$40	\$34 / \$40
What was the allowable hotel rate this year (instate/Milwaukee or Madison)?	\$62 / \$72 or specific high cost rate	\$62 / \$72 or specific high cost rate	\$62 / \$72 or specific high cost rate	\$62 / \$72 or specific high cost rate	\$62 / \$72 or specific high cost rate

\*Underfunding occurred either because there wasn't enough money or the committee decided on a reduced amount for other reasons--the documentation didn't always provide a reason

\*\*There may have been more people who paid some of their expenses--this data wasn't always recorded