

ACADEMIC STAFF SENATE MEETING *MINUTES*

November 15, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Tu, Sue Holm, Tom Fennessey (Chair), Christina Kline, Ryan Kreuser, Tammy Fanning, Jen Bird (Secretary), Ray Reinertsen, Trisha Skajewski

MEMBERS ABSENT: N/A

GUESTS: Donna Dahlvang, Peggy Fecker, Chris Markwood, Faith Hensrud, Susie Isaksen

Meeting called to order at by Chair at 12:03pm.

I. Chancellor's Report

- a. New Governor elect did come to Board of Regents meeting. Made it clear that the state is in at least a 3 billion dollar deficit. He has started to take some aggressive actions. One hopeful thing is that we are burdened with a lot of regulations by the state, but he has asked for us to be lenient in our flexibilities. We've started discussing with him how we can be flexible and what that will mean, what can give, what cannot. So, we might be able to start making a case for individual flexibility as opposed to a one size fits all approach.
- b. This will be a tough budget year again, we can expect furloughs and budget cuts again, but will hopefully have some leniency in how we work with our part of the budget cuts.

II. Provost's Report

- a. No report

III. Faculty Senate Chair Report

- a. No report

IV. Old Business

- a. Discussion and Approval of October 18th meeting minutes (action item)

- i. Holm motion to approve. Fanning second. Approved.

- b. Reports:

- i. Legislative committee report

1. Skajewski reported. We've met. There is a possibility of a change in the Legislative Liaison role. For now, Tom Bergh is the Chair of this committee.

- ii. Personnel/compensation committee report

1. Tabled.

- iii. Mentoring sub-committee report

1. Report emailed by Fanning to senators. Questions regarding the report can be directed to Fanning or Bird.

- a. Our subcommittee is made up of 3 senators (Jen, Trisha, and Tammy) and 3 at large academic staff members (Mary Schoeler, Jenice Kienzle, and Kathy Pykkonen).

- b. Yesterday we discusses mentoring and the larger picture of orientation and staff development for academic staff. The group decided that we would automatically have new academic staff members assigned to a mentor (or a "welcome wagon" staff member – name to be determined.) New staff members would receive an email welcome from the welcome wagon, a phone call, and be invited to have coffee when they arrived to campus. If the new staff member does not want to participate in the formal mentoring program, they can opt out of it.

- c. In order to get the new staff members names early, Tammy and Jen are currently on a list to receive an email from Nina Kangas of any new hires as they are hired. So we will be able to contact the staff members prior to them arriving on campus!

- iv. AS rep report

1. Report emailed by Dahlvang to senators. Questions regarding the report can be directed to Dahlvang.
 - a. Reps met in Madison on October 29th.
 - b. HR update from Al Crist included info on compensation/payplan. Philosophy is that salaries should equal our peer medians by the 15-17 biennium and peer salaries should be the principal determinant. System requested in the budget: 1. That the 2% rescinded be reinstated. 2. That the base \$'s that were taken by furloughs in 09-11 be restored. 3. Flexibility to address \$ disparities (performance based pay, add to recruitment and retention fund, etc.) Keep in mind this request was created before the elections.
 - c. Collective Bargaining – consultant is being selected to assist UW with bargaining. Request for bargaining of faculty at Eau Claire and Superior is expected in spring semester.
 - d. Probationary to Indefinite appointments - there has been word on some campuses that System is telling campuses it is no longer allowed. Al Crist confirmed that is NOT true. It is permitted in UPG's and is governed by institutional policy (like our ASPP). Al will email out the next campuses that will undergo job security audit for spring term – I'll share this when I get it.
 - e. Extramural Fringe – Debbie Durcan from System updated that a working group will get together again in the next 2 weeks. They are calling for accountability and transparency. Discussion of de-pooling (using actual expenditures/person, not a blanket rate).
2. Dahlvang also noted in the email two important issues that have occurred since the reps meeting:
 - a. The resolution regarding the Implementation of Possible Future Furlough Days that UW-Sheboygan passed (handout attached to email) has gone forward. Baraboo, Marshfield, Fox Valley, and Rock County have also passed similar language. In addition, UW-Stout created a resolution and UW-Milwaukee has said they are planning to do so also.
 - b. Ruling regarding unit clarification last week – there is an attached email that went to all academic staff at Madison last Thursday about the ruling, and I would urge our campus to do something similar. I think time is of the essence in this issue. Earlier today I sent a link to an article about this topic, and we have the powerpoint that discusses unit clarification that we did on campus in the summer of 2009 as guides as well. In addition, the reps group has decided to create a resolution – the final draft is attached – and we will be forwarding that along this week. It is attached for your reference - perhaps this group should discuss to determine if a campus based resolution is also in order? Not sure how everyone feels on that. At a minimum, I believe it's important to at least make an announcement campus wide about the ruling. UW-System has indicated in the past that if the ruling occurred like it has, they will take legal action against WERC – so far I have not heard that they have done so.
- v. Campus Climate Survey
 1. Tabled.
- vi. Senate Chair report
 1. Tabled.
- vii. CIPT committee updates

1. Fennessey reported on committee make-up updates. The Chair of Academic Staff Senate will serve on the committee as well as an additional academic staff (preferably Instructional Academic Staff) and a classified staff member.
- c. Review of upcoming events
 - i. SGA is having a meet your student government tonight from 8-10pm in the YU
 - ii. Chancellor's Ball – December 4th
- d. Other Old Business
 - i. Committee appointments
 1. Fennessey reported. Still working in a couple of vacant seats. One big one, is the seats on Faculty Senate. We need to fill those with 2 non-voting members from academic staff. Meetings are Tuesdays from 2-4pm. Is there any interest? Fanning is interested but would like to know a little bit more. Holm is interested maybe next semester, as the time set for now does not work for me currently. Reinertsen will serve.

V. New Business

- a. Campus Climate Survey update
 - i. Fanning reported. Committee is asking campus and Academic Staff Senate to take information (from handout provided) back to our departments and share the information and generate some discussions about the survey and help motivate people to take it.
 - ii. Fennessey asked if there are university specific questions that we get to have on there and if so, is the committee putting those together. Fanning said that this is the case.
- b. Development Grants – Round II
 - i. Call went out. Senate will set a meeting to review grants.
- c. Senate Subcommittee discussion
- d. Review of 2010-2011 Topics for Discussion list
 - i. Fennessey asked how we as a senate want to go about setting our goals and priorities. Do we need a special meeting? During our regular meeting? Also, what do we want to do in terms of our actions regardless of if we are collectively bargaining or not. Kreuser was in favor of a special meeting. Senators agreed. Fennessey will send out a meeting request.
- e. Other new business
 - i. Report by campus administration
 1. Administration and Human Resources had been asked to attend the November Senate meeting. They were presented with a list of questions prior to the meeting that the Senate wished to discuss with them.
 - a. Fennessey reported that at times Academic Staff Senate feels like it has too many things going on. So the question posed was, “What role do you see Academic Staff Senate playing and how does that fit in the strategic plan?” The main points of the discussion follow:
 1. Markwood commented that Academic Staff Senate has some specific duties that we need to be doing, but we also have some broad responsibilities. If administrators are sending down things that are taking away from the essential tasks of Senate then we need to have a conversation about this.
 2. Fanning mentioned that at times we seem to be taking on implementing things that maybe we should just be recommending instead of actually implementing.
 3. Markwood discussed how this is an important distinction. Faculty Senate has taken the role of more recommending rather than being the body that implements. The role is very clear and administrators understand that role. Academic Senate needs to decide their priority. Markwood

also questioned if it is that things are recommended and not being listened to, or if things are just not being recommended.

4. Reinertsen discussed that in the case of Academic Senate it is more about us not making recommendations.
 5. Hensrud commented that it will be important to clarify the role of governance amongst academic staff. Particularly with Instructional Academic staff it seems to be unclear and this needs to be understood all around. Hensrud suggested looking at other institutions and seeing how Academic Staff Senate functions there and how they portray themselves.
- b. Next question was what is the role of Human Resources? What are the goals and priorities?
- i. Fecker reported that HR is comprised of recruitment/selection, compensation, employee/labor relations, training and development, laws/regulations/administration policy, benefit and safety issues – within those topics are a lot of different areas. Fecker handed out mission statement and well as the current goals/priorities. Right now HRS implementation is a top priority taking up a lot of time (it will go live in April). Fecker provided a handout for HRS. Other priorities include: employee orientation (face to face and on-line versions). Fecker stated that HR was included in on the original work done for the Academic Staff Mentoring program with Jen Bird. Fecker also mentioned that HR has encouraged System to come out with some training that could be adopted on campuses. Another priority is to look at our performance review system.
 - ii. Fennessey mentioned the need for orientation for supervisors as well so that they know how to help guide their staff through the various processes including the promotion process. Fecker stated that this could be included in the broad orientation they are starting to plan.
- c. The last question discussed was why we are not using Rolling Horizon and Multi-Year contracts at this point?
- i. Fecker reported that they have opened up multi-year appointments – everyone who has requested and is eligible under those UPGs has these as of right now, with the exception of Instructional Academic Staff. IA staff were removed from the eligible list when David Prior was here as Provost. Dahlvang asked why this happened. Markwood explained that there are long term positions without a termination date – we’ve decided they should be faculty positions– but we’ve filled them with IA staff - without the promotion, pay, etc. – we are trying to work on this and reverse it. Reinertsen suggested that instead of people who are eligible applying for these positions that they just be given them. Fecker commented that it is never automatic. Reinertsen suggested that we make it more automatic as it would help with morale issues. Fecker will look in to it.
 - ii. Dahlvang brought up that our policy says that the employing department should review staff’s eligibility, it should not be done through application – if we are missing the orientation that helps

people with the process – then we should follow what our policy says. Fecker reported that information does go out to staff and their supervisors about this process. Dahlvang mentioned that there is a disconnect between people getting the information and understanding what to do with it. Fecker stated that this will be worked on.

- iii. Dahlvang mentioned that IA staff were hired in faculty spots and we know that is something we've been trying to change. The fact is that we have people in these roles sometimes for many years – so we have these people in roles, then we should be still following the policy and give them the appointments they should be eligible for at least in the time they are here. We need to follow our campus policy. Markwood commented that he would question departments who are doing that – is it because of power structures and keeping people in non-promotable positions? This is a wrong approach. It is a tough conversation - but we need to have it – find a balance.
- iv. Fanning asked if there is a place on the evaluations that a supervisor could recommend an employee for one of these types of positions? Fecker mentioned that it really needs to be a separate form. Dahlvang reiterated the need to follow our campus policy. Fecker mentioned we need to follow UPGs as well.
- v. Several Senators voiced appreciation for having an open conversation with us about our concerns. Bird encouraged Human Resources to really look at and consider the suggestions and comments made. It would make the role of HR more clear to people and help them see that HR is supportive. Sometimes it is unclear as to whether HR is an advocate or not. Working on even some of the small things will make a huge difference.
- vi. The group discussed moving forward from here. Hensrud encouraged members of Academic Staff to be engaged in conversations – seeing areas such as committee participation where – for instance on Faculty Senate – 2 Academic Staff can be on the senate, but nobody is. Therefore, they aren't getting your report at their meeting you need to make sure academic staff are engaged. Group discussed that we are working on getting a representative there at the Faculty Senate meetings.
- vii. Fanning asked Markwood about his mention of the possibility of a CETL like body for academic staff and where are we at with this? Markwood reported that one project charter is to have a plan in place for moving forward with a leadership/development program for academic staff by the end of the year. Bird reported that a group is getting together to talk about wants/needs for orientation and development center/program for academic staff and would be willing to share the suggestions we come up with.

ii. Collective Bargaining

1. Reinertsen and Isaksen reported. Academic Staff can bargain collectively with faculty or separately. Bird asked how priorities are laid out if everyone bargains together. Isaksen explained that everyone works together, but there is a possibility to have separate bargaining units for instructional and non-instructional staff or faculty if we feel there is a need. Holm asked about supervisors and how they fit in. There has not been a clear message as some say

it is not open to you if you supervise anyone. Reinertsen and Isaksen mentioned that it might be dependent on the number of people you supervise. Fanning asked when we will know. Isaksen will try to get a clear answer on who is eligible, from the union side.

2. Isaksen gave an overview of what TAUWP is and how it fits in with collective bargaining. Shared the mission of TAUWP and wanted to see how they can work together with Academic Staff Senate to improve things for Academic Staff on campus. The union will do what its members want it to do. Union involvement will help balance the power between Academic Staff and Administration. There is some overlap with what the union does and what Academic Staff Senate. We can work together on those things. There are also some things that Academic Staff Senate can do that unions cannot do. Hope we can collaborate and build things positively for this campus.
3. Fanning suggested that if things move forward with the union that it would be important to have someone (who is not currently on Senate) from TAUWP come to Academic Staff Senate meetings.

Kreuser motioned to adjourn meeting. Reinertsen second. Meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jen Bird, Secretary