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UW COLLEGES
Senate
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County
1:10 p.m.

MINUTES

2014-2015 Senators Present: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Marcy Dickson and Luke Dock, UW Colleges Online; Lisa Schreibersdorf and Mike Winkler, UW-Fond du Lac; Kathy Immel and Evan Kreider, UW-Fox Valley; Julie DeZeeuw and Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Rose Brust, Joanne Giordano, Holly Hassel, and Katie Kalish, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp and Roseann Stenstrup, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, and Jeff Verona, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Faye Peng, UW-Richland; Michael Gorman, UW-Rock County; Matt Raunio and Kay Sbabaro, UW-Sheboygan; Christi Larson and Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankenson, UW-Waukesha; Christiana Kmecheck, Wayne Mortenson, and Graham Pearce, Student Senators

2014-2015 Senators Absent: Juli McGuire, UW-Fox Valley; Steve Kaiser, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Stephen Schmid, UW-Rock County

2014-2015 Alternate Senators Present: Rachelle Barr, UW-Rock County (Schmid)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Clif Cavanaugh, UW-Richland; Joe Foy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Marly Harmeling, SGC Executive Director/Student, UW-Sheboygan; Tammy Ladwig, UW-Fox Valley; Justeen Mallo, UW-Marathon County; Ruth Machsmeier, UW-Washington County; Paul Price, Alternate Deans’ Representative; Bethany Reilly, UW-Fox Valley; Stephen Schmid, Associate Dean, UW-Rock County; Mark Schmitz, UW-Sheboygan; Melissa Smiley, UW Colleges Online; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Kelly Wilz, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

Others Absent: Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Colleen Godfriaux, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor; Tamara Lavender, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; April Peissig, UW-Manitowoc; Josue Peralta, SGA Treasurer, UW-Waukesha; Cathy Sandeen, Chancellor, UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Troy Schoultz, UW-Fox Valley; John Short, Deans’ Representative; Patti Wise, BAAS Program Manager

1) The January 22, 2015 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was called to order at 1:10 p.m. by UWC Senate Steering Committee (SSC) Chair Mark Peterson.
2) UW-Washington County Dean Paul Price thanked the group for coming to the campus, stating he was pleased he could be with the Senate for the day as he had been in times previous. He was glad early meetings and lunch had gone well; he asked that if anyone needed help to please let him or any of his staff, several of which were also attending the meeting, know. He again thanked the group and asked them to enjoy the day. Dean Paul Price was thanked with a round of applause.

3) Roll Call of 2014-2015 Senate, Introductions of Alternates and Guests. Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate Linda Baum circulated the attendance sheet. SSC Chair Peterson introduced new classified staff senators Kay Sbarbaro, UW-Sheboygan, and Roseann Stenstrup, UW-Marinette. New student senators Christiana Kmecheck, Wayne Mortenson, and Graham Pearce were introduced. Alternate senator Rachelle Barr from UW-Rock County (for Stephen Schmid), and Paul Price, Dean of UW-Washington County, attending for Deans’ Rep John Short were also introduced. As it was the annual Bring a Guest to the Senate meeting, there were several in attendance: Clif Cavanaugh, CSEPA, UW-Richland; Marly Harmeling, SGC Executive Director from UW-Sheboygan; Tammy Ladwig, Psychology, UW-Fox Valley; Justeen Mallo, Library Services from UW-Marathon County; Ruth Maschmeier, also Library Services, UW-Washington County; Bethany Reilly, Physics & Astronomy, UW-Fox Valley; Stephen Schmid, the new Associate Dean at UW-Rock County; Mark Schmitz, Assistant Professor of Biological Sciences, UW-Sheboygan; Melissa Smiley, Academic Support Specialist, UW Colleges Online; and Kelly Wilz, CTA, from UW-Marshfield/Wood County. Chair Peterson noted that Colleen Godfriaux and Steve Wildeck had both been in attendance earlier, and Vice Chancellor Wildeck would be addressing the Faculty Council later.

4) The agenda (Attachment 1) for the January 22, 2015 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was unanimously approved [Raunio/Gorman].

5) The minutes of the October 24, 2014 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate held at UW-Richland (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were approved by unanimous vote [Kozma/Kmecheck].

6) Reports
   a) SSC Chair Peterson announced that Chancellor Cathy Sandeen was in Washington, D.C. attending the AAC&U Conference.
   
   b) Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Greg Lampe was also attending the AAC&U Conference. His written report (Attachment 2) was pointed out in the Senate materials.
   
   c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy noted the location of his report (Attachment 3) in the materials. There were no questions.
   
   d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse had sent notice that his plans had changed, causing him to remain in Madison.
Attention was called to his written report (*Attachment 4*).

e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Mark Peterson detailed the location of his report (*Attachment 5*) in the materials. He said that the state legislature is entering the budget process and the governor is bringing the budget a little earlier than usual. The faculty reps had been advised to remember that when politicians were talking, they were speaking politician. He also noted that reading press reports might be tempting, but it is better to go to the source for information, mentioning the Board of Regents web site. Senator Kalish asked about a segment of his report that spoke about faculty being uncomfortable speaking truth to power, noting that the Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) had written the email to Steering about faculty and tenure track faculty being uncomfortable in those situations. She said that academic and classified staff are also uncomfortable doing that. Peterson shared that he had a visceral reaction to the email with regard to faculty, but agreed completely regarding academic and classified staff. He noted that the need to continue pressing forward to find ways to make it safe for academic staff and classified staff to speak truth to power. He pointed out that an agenda item stemming from the email will come up later.

f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Jeff Verona located his report (*Attachment 6*) in the materials. Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster asked that if AS Lead Senator Verona wanted help with the work related to merit reviews for IAS, to please come to the chairs through him. The department chairs would like for merit reviews for IAS to be examined as noted in Verona’s report.

g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Danielle (Marcy) Dickson called attention to her written report (*Attachment 7*) and three report appendices, thanking Linda Baum for getting the appendices included. She asked that questions regarding the nine over twelve pay issue go to Faculty Rep Mark Peterson.

h) University Staff Lead Senator Rose Brust noted her written report (*Attachment 8*) in the provided Senate materials. There were no questions.

i) Student Governance Council President Graham Pearce pointed out his report (*Attachment 9*) in the binder. SSC Chair Peterson asked him about meeting Chancellor Sandeen. SGC President Pearce replied the meeting went well, and that Chancellor Sandeen seemed to be very supportive of student governance.

j) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush located his report (*Attachment 10*) in the materials. There were no questions, so he reminded the Senate that the SAPC would be pleased with anyone who volunteered to help write policy.

k) Former Senate Budget Committee Chair Stephen Schmid noted the report (*Attachment 11*) in the Senate materials, and announced that Michael Gorman had been elected as the new chair of SBC at the committee meeting earlier in the day. Senator Bush, in relation to point A.3 of the report where it stated that paying out 9 month salaries over 12 months “from a business standpoint, it makes no sense….” asked about making sense from a
human point of view. Faculty Rep to System/SSC Chair Peterson responded that the issue has reached a fever pitch on many other campuses, but not at Colleges. There are a lot of expenses connected with doing the nine over twelve, approximately $3 million. Further, there could be a paycheck with multiple funding streams which makes it all more difficult. AS Rep to System Dickson pointed out Appendix 3 of her report, noting it would take about 35,000 programming hours to add that function to PeopleSoft. Peterson noted that the best option might just be to have a separate percentage put into a different bank account, which UW System can and will do. Senator Kalish wondered what happens to people who have payments deducted from their checks every month when they do not have checks for three months. Senator Bush wondered why it was such a difficult issue to overcome for UW System when other state institutions are doing it already. Alternate Deans’ Rep Price offered that Colleges do not have the money to make the changes and the state is not going to supply it, so the change is not going to happen.

Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services for UW Colleges and UW-Extension joined the meeting to explain further. He noted that nine over twelve is an option that has been requested for many years that did not go anywhere. When HRS came along it was thought that it would be included; there were huge problems with PeopleSoft and for some reason 9 over 12 did not make the list. It cost $82 million to implement HRS. When the 9 over 12 issue came up again, heatedly, people thought it should be easy to handle. However, it is not part of PeopleSoft so it would require additional modifications to an already highly modified system. Vice Chancellor Wildeck also informed the Senate that spreading nine paychecks over twelve months is not done in all other state institutions as people frequently hear. An analysis looking at the complexity of distributing pay on a cycle different than that from when earned showed it was hugely complex (taxes, benefits, and so on) and would drive the implementation cost of 9-9 or 9-12 in self-service mode (person choosing which they preferred) to $3 million to implement and $3 million to maintain each year thereafter. It currently costs $19 million a year to run HRS. The 9-12 option is no longer being pursued. The vice chancellor suggested following other options such as automatic payroll deduction to an account of your choice with a certain amount placed in a different account. Senator Kalish wondered what happened to people who have court ordered payments garnished from their paychecks in months 10, 11, and 12. Vice Chancellor Wildeck explained that the System is ordered by the court to handle those, and they are dealt with manually; the court orders an amount to be sent to a third party. Alternate Deans’ Rep Price noted that pay can only be garnished when it is received—no paycheck, no garnishment. The vice chancellor asked Kalish if she had heard of a case where there is a problem; she replied in the affirmative, so he replied he will look into it. Senator Bush said that he understands the fiscal issues and that the matter is not going to be resolved. However, he stated, that needs to be clearly communicated to the institution so people know as they make job decisions based on the twelve month paycheck issue. Vice Chancellor Wildeck replied that a statement on the formality of the decision has been requested of administration. Faculty Rep Peterson noted that the response to that is generally along the lines of “you just talked about it at your meeting, so you’re doing it now.” Senator Hankenson offered that the priority of the issue certainly depends on
where one is sitting. Senator Kalish agreed; not all have the same financial situation, and something can push people into a catastrophic financial situation. Senator Hassel said that it is a serious problem and asked if something had been done to assess the level of support faculty and IAS have for the change. Vice Chancellor Wildeck stated that the UW Colleges share to support the modifications would be $120,000 annually.

l) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta pointed out to his written report *(Attachment 12).* Senator Hassel asked if the committee’s work on merit would lead to a substantive revision of FPP #501 this year. FPSC Chair Gulotta replied a revision would not be ready this year, saying that much of the feedback the committee has received has been conflicting. A survey to faculty will be sent out next month for further input.

m) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Kristin Plessel was not in attendance but had submitted a report *(Attachment 13)* to which SSC Chair Peterson drew attention. He asked that any questions be sent to SAC Chair Plessel.

7) Old Institutional Business

a) Adoption: Proposed New Institutional Policy #407 (“Approval of Departmental Bylaws”) [SAPC] policy to delineate process of departmental bylaw approval *(Attachment 14).* Senator Klemp related that UW-Marinette did not like the proposed policy, saying that the chancellor has the authority to negate anything in the policy, so they would prefer sending the original version of the policy to the chancellor again. SAPC Chair Bush explained that the original proposal had been approved by the Senate but not by Interim Chancellor Brower. This version addressed the issues Brower had pointed out as problematic. Senator Van Slooten said that UW-Manitowoc had approved of the timeline portion of the policy, but not the rest. Senator Kozma asked if it was thought the chancellor shouldn’t have approval over budgetary and personnel issues. Van Slooten replied that it was thought to be departmental erosion. She furthered that it created a line item veto for the chancellor around departmental bylaws. SAPC Chair Bush said that this proposal forces a timeline to be adhered to. Senator Kozma continued that only problematic elements of bylaws can be sent back for revision rather than the complete set of bylaws being effectively held hostage. The changes allow the departments to gain some control over the bylaws. The motion passed [Raunio/Kalish].

b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #301.01 (“Administering the Student Survey of Instruction”) [FPSC] altering language so SSI is not known as “public document” *(Attachment 15).* SSC Chair Peterson noted the purpose of the proposed changes. The adoption was unanimously accepted [Kozma/Raunio].

c) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #103 (“UW Colleges Certificate Program”) [SAPC] increasing access to non-credit certificates in Continuing Education courses *(Attachment 16).* The motion passed by unanimous voice vote [DeZeeuw/Dickson].

d) Other. There was no other Old Institutional Business.
8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 2.02 (“Senate Membership”) [SSC] amend to remove chancellor as presiding officer (Attachment 17). SSC Chair Mark Peterson explained that the proposed amendment was to reassign the presiding officer duties according to long-standing practice. The Senate Steering Committee chair has been the presiding officer of the Senate rather than the chancellor for a long time. Presiding officers generally do not have a vote, Peterson said, but the presiding officer is also a senator and needs to keep their vote in order to represent their campus. Senator Hassel related that Steering had had some discussions around parliamentary procedures and what presiding officers generally can and cannot do. Peterson then continued, explaining that the chair only votes in the case of a tie, in general, and things along that line, which as he had noted would not work for our institutional situation. Senators were reminded that votes by campus collegiums will be necessary.

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of the UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 5.0 (“Annual Elections”) [SSC] correct number of student senators participating in elections (Attachment 18). SSC Chair Peterson explained the introduction by summarizing the written rationale. He noted that just as for the other senators (faculty, academic and classified staff), it should be the incoming student senators who vote in the April annual elections.

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of the UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 9.0 (“Senate Faculty Senator Reapportionment Procedures”) [SSC] include classified staff senators (Attachment 19). Chair Peterson noted that this change was to include classified staff members in a review of senators and their distribution across committees.

d) Other. There was no further New Institutional Business for the Senate to discuss.

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Discussion Item: Assessing UW Colleges Governance: Discussion Questions for Collegium [SSC] (Attachment 20). Senator Hassel said that the SAPC had sent the Steering Committee some questions around the climate and culture of governance and the roles people play in governance. Steering discussed the issue and thought of doing a survey, but then decided to have the questions asked in campus collegiums. There was some debate about where any perceived issue might arise from. Senator Kozma suggested that administrators answer the survey, too. He then asked what it was that Steering was looking for: a change in structure, comfort levels, or something else. Chair of Chairs Ahrenhoerster replied that Steering was not fishing for anything. The committee wants to know if people feel comfortable talking, and have sincere questions to try to find out responses around that. Senator Kalish said that SAPC contacted SSC in response to people feeling pressured or having disappointment expressed to them around Senate voting. The questions are a way to find out if this is something felt by three
people or thirty. Senator Bush said it could also find differences between campuses. He has heard of people being told not to be involved until they are tenured. Senator DeZeeuw stated that people might not feel comfortable answering these questions in collegia. Senator Hankenson explained that people should be offered the opportunity to contact their local AS liaison, campus CS representative, or faculty senator one on one or in small group discussions. They could also send an email with the assurance that all emails will have identifying information removed. If senators want to set up a Qualtrix or other sort of survey, that is fine, too. All responses should be sent to Senator Margaret Hankenson or Holly Hassel no later than February 28 so it can be compiled for the Senate Steering Committee and the Senate. Senator Hankenson will send an email with the questions for discussion and details on sending feedback.

b) Other. SSC Chair Peterson shared a conversation from the earlier Senate Steering Committee meeting surrounding an update from UW Colleges Online and Distance Education Dean Glena Temple regarding the UW Colleges Online seeking a campus designation. He noted that UW System has been generally supportive of the idea, and that in order for UW System to allow further discussion, an endorsement from the UWC Senate supporting the discussion of the idea of the virtual campus is necessary. Dean Temple sent a summary of the last meeting she and Provost Lampe had with representatives from UW System that Peterson said he would circulate along with proposed endorsement language for Steering, and then it would go out to the Senate for all to share with their constituents. Eventually if the Board of Regents approves discussions will come back to UW Colleges and the Senate so they can determine what if anything to do with the idea of a virtual campus. Senator Kozma suggested that the Senate Online Program Committee (SOPC) be included in the discussion of the idea, of an endorsement, and all else. Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster said a statement endorsing the discussion of possibly creating the virtual campus is what UW System and the Board of Regents need in order to give permission to allow the conversations; further, he reminded everyone that if the Regents approved the discussions and the Colleges decided to create the virtual campus designation any eventual work and details would all come through the Senate. There was discussion about planning something without knowing what exactly is being planned. Senator Hassel wanted to make clear what was being endorsed. Senator Kalish offered that Bylaws and policies would be reviewed in order to assure students received the best practices. Senator Giordano wondered about the practicality of calling Online a campus. Lead Student Senator Pearce asked if Online students are currently represented in shared governance. SSC Chair Peterson replied that they are not. The question of whether revenue sharing would continue was raised. The answer was that it would. It was felt that there need to be safeguards in place to ensure that it continues. Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster said that if Online is not made a campus, policies will have to be rewritten to make Online fit and to ensure Online follows policies and procedures, too. SSC Chair Peterson noted that there are Online people who are not being served properly, and shared governance mechanisms should be extended into Online to serve everyone. Chair Peterson will share an endorsement with Steering and from there with the Senate so they can discuss it with their constituents prior to the March Senate meeting.
10) Adjournment. The UW Colleges Senate reached the end of the agenda at 3:07 p.m. and SSC Chair Peterson announced they were adjourned.
UW COLLEGES
Faculty Council of Senators
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County

MINUTES

2014-2015 Faculty Senators Present: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Lisa Schreibersdorf, UW-Fond du Lac; Kathy Immel and Evan Kreider, UW-Fox Valley; Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Holly Hassel and Katie Kalish, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Faye Peng, UW-Richland; Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankenson, UW-Waukesha

2014-2015 Faculty Senators Absent: Stephen Schmid, UW-Rock County

2014-2015 Faculty Alternates Present: Rachel Barr, UW-Rock County

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Clif Cavanaugh, UW-Richland; Tammy Ladwig, UW-Fox Valley; Stephen Schmid, Associate Dean, UW-Rock County; Mark Schmitz, UW-Sheboygan; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Kelly Wilz, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

1. Call to Order 2014-2015 Faculty Council of Senators. The UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators (FCS) was called to order at 3:29 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative to UW System Mark Peterson.

2. The roll call for the 2014-2015 faculty senators, alternates, and guests was circulated by Linda Baum, Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate.

3. The agenda for the January 22, 2015 meeting was amended to include an update on the faculty compensation plan. It was unanimously approved as amended [Klemp/Raunio].

4. The minutes of the October 24, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Council held at UW-Richland (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were approved by unanimous voice vote [Alitto/Klemp].

5. Reports

   a) Chair Mark Peterson noted that his report was in the Senate materials.

   b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta said he had nothing to add to his earlier report. Chair Peterson asked where the committee was on merit and when something might be expected by the Faculty Council. FPSC Chair Gulotta replied that
the comments the committee has heard contain “lots of negativity,” and they feel the need to gather more feedback. A survey is being prepped for faculty that should be out in early February, allowing a report at the next Senate meeting. The FPSC hopes that the survey helps give a direction for necessary changes. Gulotta noted that the committee is also staying in contact with the Faculty Compensation Committee regarding the role of merit.

6. Old Business

   a) Other. There was no Old Business on the Faculty Council agenda.

7. New Business

   a) Other. No New Business was included on the Faculty Council agenda.

8. Other Business

   a) Other. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services Steve Wildeck updated the Council regarding the process of the faculty salary compensation work. He noted that on December 12, 2014 Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower had received the final recommendations of the Faculty Compensation Committee, accepted them, and moved them for implementation. It had further been announced that those receiving adjustments would be informed no later than January 15, 2015. One hundred and sixty-five letters had been sent on January 8, so they would have been received in advance of the January 15 date; if a letter was not received, it would mean the faculty member is not currently receiving an adjustment. The letters indicated in which year the individual’s adjustment would be made: effective the end of December 2014/payment January 2015, or effective end of December 2015/payment February 2016. Letters also noted the faculty member’s current salary rate, the adjustment amount, and what the adjusted rate would be. The salary adjustment amounts are binding; they do not depend on budget issues or possible pay plan adjustments. $300,000 is distributed the first year, and $300,000 the second year, for a total of $600,000 annually. The theme for the Faculty Compensation Committee was retention, as had been reported before. Time at rank, merit, and comparison with market peers were factors considered. Internally, it was known that retention problems are greatest with assistant professors, so all of the assistant professors on the list had adjustments made in the first year, for a total of $55,000 going to 37% of eligible assistant professors (most first and second year assistant professors are not eligible, the Faculty Council was reminded). Then those with the biggest rate adjustments were determined (seen as needing the largest adjustment to come into line with peers), and were assigned in declining amounts until the $300,000 was reached. Those remaining were assigned to year two. Deans and chairs will discuss how to assign the $60,000 (second year) discretionary funding at their March meeting. Twenty-four assistants, 90 associates, and 52 full professors received adjustments (although one person in one category resigned). Vice Chancellor Wildeck believed 92 adjustments were given in the first year and 74 in the second, and reminded the Council that the $60,000 was still not accounted for. Senator Hankenson noted that some on her campus
think they should have gotten an adjustment based on the formula, and so wondered how much the formula changed following the Faculty Compensation Committee’s meeting with the Faculty Council of Senators. Vice Chancellor Wildeck related that he had been asked by a faculty member to see the elements of their increase, and he had shown everything to them. While the information for all will not be distributed as it could be worked backwards to determine a person’s merit, people can ask to see their own. Wildeck acknowledged that if they were not hurrying to finish the process in time for the February payroll, it could have been put in individual letters.

Senator Kozma suggested that letters go out to all now with their information and calculations; faculty members can see how close or far away they were without contacting the intimidating Vice Chancellor Steve Wildeck. The vice chancellor replied that Quin Knudsen in HR could be contacted for that information, as could deans and business officers. He said discussions had been held about sharing the computations with all faculty, but it had been decided not to as the information had gone out regarding a January 15 notification if receiving an adjustment. Anything further might have been seen as an unnecessary hit to morale. Kozma argued that a letter with the calculations, saying it was in the interest of transparency, so a faculty member could check for errors, would be appreciated. Senator Klemp disagreed, saying that discovering one missed by “a hair” would be something people would not want to see. Senator Kalish stated that all due diligence had been done: the announcement of the date of when one would be received if it was due had been read and processed; if an adjustment did not arrive, move on. Morale is bad, so do not make it worse. Senator Kuhlmann thought maybe the process was not as clear to those outside of the Senate. Senator Hankenson also felt that nothing additional needs to be done, adding that it was good to know that there are sources for faculty members to go to if they are worried about an error. Vice Chancellor Wildeck expressed that Paul Whitaker was heroic with his efforts to thoroughly vet the faculty compensation topic. The funds have been put where UW Colleges priorities are, said the vice chancellor, but the work is not over yet. Nobody, he said, thinks of the task as a one and done exercise. The deans and chairs may want to address issues such as people who missed the cut off by a few dollars. Other issues, such as promotion steps, are also being examined. Senator Klemp asked if decompression would be the next issue undertaken. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services Steve Wildeck noted that a modest amount of decompression in each rank had been addressed. Elements were included in the factors examined and addressed such as gender equity corrections that dealt with some decompression without any unintended consequences. Vice Chancellor Wildeck was thanked for his time and the information.

9. Adjournment. The January 22, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Council of Senators was adjourned at 4:04 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative Mark Peterson.
UW COLLEGES
Academic Staff Council of Senators
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County

MINUTES

In Attendance: Jeff Verona, Luke Dock, Joanne Giordano, Michael Gorman, Mike Winkler, Julie DeZeeuw, Danielle (Marcy) Dickson, Melissa Smiley (guest)

Absent: Steve Kaiser

Agenda

1. Approve of Minutes from ASCS meeting of October 24, 2014
   1st – Mike Winkler
   2nd - Danielle (Marcy) Dickson
   Vote – All in Favor

2. Approve Agenda
   1st - Michael Gorman
   2nd - Danielle (Marcy) Dickson
   Vote – All in Favor

3. Discuss revisions of ASPP #708 (Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff) (p.53)

   One small change from full responsibility to just responsibility. Last paragraph of policy.
   - Jeff passed on HLC guidelines to show what guidelines need to followed for anyone teaching in our institution - Determining Qualified Faculty pg1 paragraph 2, & page 3 bullet 2
   - Jeff looked at the comprehensive institutions to see what their policies are for IAS
     - Joanne pointed out the difference between professional development and scholarship
   - We would like to set up a WisLine with Greg Lampe - Jeff will send the list of what other schools are doing for Greg.
   - Questions for Greg
     - What are your expectations for IAS
     - Engagement in the activities that demonstrate profession growth

4. Information from Dave Carlson regarding summer pay plans for IAS and Faculty (5.57)
Jeff had a conversation with Joe Foy. Dave's concerns seem to be that somewhere there is a formula that was created. Joe said the formula does exist and comes from central finance and then the formula is sent to each campus and each campus plugs in their own numbers and the person who does this on each campus is different.

Joe has a complied list and is going to share it with Dave and Jeff V.

Mike G asked if the summer rates are reflective of state minimums, Jeff was not sure and we do not believe there are any policies

5. **Discussion of revisions to ASCB Bylaws**
   
   Jeff will need to send bylaws out to all academic staff and look for feedback in a few weeks

6. **Reminder of upcoming senate elections**
   
   Counsel membership ends - Jeff, Julie, Joann and Mike M end. Julie will not be seeking reelection. There are openings on other committees. Will be touch with Dave Carlson to send out elections.

7. **Other Business**
   
   Survey is going to be put into qualtrex then send to all academic staff and IAS with who they can contact if they want to talk in person. Marcy and Joanne will send it to the counsel for review before it goes out

8. **Adjourn 4:45pm**

Submitted by Lucas Dock
UW COLLEGES
Classified Staff Council Senators
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County

MINUTES

Present: Rose Brust (MTH), Christi Larson (WSH), Kay Sbarbaro (SHB), Roseann Stenstrup (MNT)

Not Present: Juli McGuire (FOX)

Guests Present: Justeen Mallo (MTH), Ruth Maschmeier (WSH)

1. Called to order – Chair, R. Brust

2. Approval of agenda Motion by Christi Larson, Second by Roseann Stenstrup, Approved.

3. Policies: The final draft of the local grievance policy was sent to the Chancellor for approval. Kay S. suggested that for future, when acknowledgement of thanks are given a copy of the actual work be included. The staff were confused as to what was transpiring. After much discussion the group thought a procedure should be established while we are in the process of revising the UPS local policies. When the agenda is sent to the University Staff Council, the group would like to have any item being asked to be reviewed/voted on attached to the agenda so all have an opportunity to review the information prior to the meeting.

Rose will ask Linda Baum to add Nena Beier to the Layoff Policy Committee. The Layoff Committee is in the process of reviewing the document. They will be meeting again on January 28, 2015. The group would like the procedure for seeking approval of the final document. What are the steps for reviewing and drafting a policy?

Rose B. will work with Linda Baum regarding terms of Committee members /Council members. Looking at the present council, it appears we may need to alter some terms so everyone is not changing over at the same time.

Regarding the “TO DO” list, the group has decided that we are still in the learning process of our roles as Council members and reviewing the local UPS policies. This is enough at this time so no further work should be assigned unless required.

Adjourned: Larson/Stenstrup

Submitted by Roseann Stenstrup
Attachment 1

Schedule
UW COLLEGES
Meetings of Senate, Committees, and
Academic Staff, Classified Staff, and Faculty Councils of Senators
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County

Coffee and Collegiality
9:30 a.m. - 9:55 a.m.
Commons

Committee Meetings
10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

- Senate Academic Policy Committee
  Room 323
- Senate Budget Committee
  Room 311
- Faculty Professional Standards Committee
  Room 303
- Senate Steering Committee
  Room 301/302

Lunch
12:05 p.m. - 1:05 p.m.
Commons

UW Colleges Senate
1:10 p.m.
Room 301/302

Council Meetings
following Senate

- Academic Staff Council of Senators
  Room 311
- Classified Staff Council/Guests
  Room 323
- Faculty Council of Senators
  Room 301/302
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Senate
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County
1:10 p.m.

1) Call to Order of 2014-2015 Senate

2) Welcome by UW-Washington County Dean Paul Price

3) Roll Call of 2014-2015 Senate, Introductions of Alternates and Guests

4) Approval of Agenda

5) Approval of Minutes: October 24, 2014, UW-Richland (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings)

6) Reports

   a) Chancellor Cathy Sandeen
   b) Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Greg Lampe
   c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy
   d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse
   e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Mark Peterson
   f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Jeff Verona
   g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Danielle (Marcy) Dickson
   h) University Staff Lead Senator Rose Brust
   i) Student Governance Council President Graham Pearce
   j) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush
   k) Former Senate Budget Committee Chair Stephen Schmid
   l) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta
   m) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Kristin Plessel

7) Old Institutional Business

   a) Adoption: Proposed New Institutional Policy #407 (“Approval of Departmental Bylaws”) [SAPC] policy to delineate process of departmental bylaw approval

   b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #301.01 (“Administering the Student Survey of Instruction”) [FPSC] altering language so SSI is not known as “public document”

   c) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #103 (“UW Colleges Certificate Program”) [SAPC] increasing access to non-credit certificates in Continuing Education courses

   d) Other
8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 2.02 (“Senate Membership”) [SSC] *amend to remove chancellor as presiding officer*

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of the UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 5.0 (“Annual Elections”) [SSC] *correct number of student senators participating in elections*

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of the UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 9.0 (“Senate Faculty Senator Reapportionment Procedures”) [SSC] *include classified staff senators*

d) Other

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Discussion Item: Assessing UW Colleges Governance: Discussion Questions for Collegium [SSC]

b) Other

10) Adjournment
Call to Order 2014-2015 Faculty Council of Senators

Roll Call of faculty senators and alternates

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes: October 24, 2014, UW-Richland (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings)

Reports
   a) Chair Mark Peterson
   b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta

Old Business
   a) Other

New Business
   a) Other

Other Business
   a) Other

Adjournment
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Academic Staff Council of Senators
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County

Roll Call

Select Recorder

Approval of Minutes from ASCS meeting of October 24, 2014.

Approve Agenda

I. Discuss revisions to ASPP #708 (Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff)
II. Information from Dave Carlson regarding summer pay plans for IAS and faculty
III. Discussion of revisions to ASCS Bylaws
IV. Reminder of upcoming senate elections
V. Other business
VI. Adjourn
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Classified Staff Council Senators
Thursday, January 22, 2015
UW-Washington County

Current Members:
- Brust, Rose – UW-Marathon County (Chair)*
- Larson, Christi – UW-Washington County
- Roseann Stenstrup – UW-Marinette
- McGuire, Juli – UW-Fox
- Kay Sbarbaro – UW-Sheboygan

Call to order

Approval of Agenda

- Grievance Policy
- Layoff Policy
- Performance Management
- Threshold Constitution Amendment (Clarification)
- Discuss items on “TO DO” list

Other

Adjourn
Update on the UW Colleges Flexible Option: Now in its second year of implementation, the UW Colleges Flexible Option continues to evolve. The program continues to be limited to ten student enrollments per subscription period (a subscription period begins on the first day of each month and extends three months) as back office processes, student support systems, and other matters are addressed and improved to serve students well. Presented below are the major developments regarding the UW Colleges Flexible Option (I want to thank UW Colleges Flexible Option Coordinator Kim Kostka for her assistance with providing these updates):

- **Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Site Visit:** The UW Colleges Office of Academic and Student Affairs is preparing for an HLC site visit which is scheduled for Monday and Tuesday, March 16 and 17. The purpose of the site visit is to evaluate the continued development and implementation of the UW Flexible Option program in the UW Colleges. Over the two-day visit, two peer evaluators will be meeting with the Provost, Chancellor, members of the Flexible Associate of Arts and Science (AAS) Degree Committee, the UW Colleges Registrar and Director of Admissions, Bursar, Controller, Director of Student Financial Aid, UW Flexible Option Academic Success Coaches, Student Services staff, marketing staff, faculty members engaged in the UW Colleges Flexible Option program, UW Colleges Flexible Option students, Academic Success Coaches, Instructional Technology staff, and UW-Extension Continuing Education, Outreach and E-Learning staff.

  Additionally, the HLC peer evaluators will be reviewing documents and data including a summary of changes in the design/implementation of the program to date, the latest data related to the program (enrollments, retention rates, competency clusters completed by students, etc.), reviewing the online orientation (Flex Fit) and student readiness assessments, a sampling of competency sets (including assessments and curated content), a sampling of Individual Learning Plans, and the Program Evaluation Rubric (which is currently under development).

  UW Colleges Flexible Option Coordinator Kim Kostka will be working with me and Executive Assistant to the Provost Sharon Brickl to prepare the necessary documentation for the visit and coordinate on-site meetings and activities.

- **Enrollments:** According to the December 2014 enrollment report, since January 2014, 275 first-time, new students have enrolled in the UW Flexible Option; this figure represents the total individual students served by the program since January 2014. Slightly over 100 students enrolled in the Information Science and Technology program, 75 enrolled in the Nursing program and 55 enrolled in the UW Colleges Associate of Arts and Science degree. It is important to note that these three programs account for 84 percent of students served within the program. Additionally, UW-Milwaukee degree-seeking students in need of fulfilling general education requirements for their respective bachelor degree completion
programs continue to enroll in UW Colleges competency sets. Two to three UW Colleges Flexible Option students pursuing an Associate of Arts and Science degree should graduate in early spring.

- **Competency-set Development:** In addition to the competency sets developed to date, four new competency sets are under development in Mathematics, Spanish, Chemistry, and Economics. With the exception of the Economics course which is still in the discussion stage, I am anticipating work to be completed in the other three areas in early spring.

- **Operations:** I am pleased to report that all UW Colleges Flexible Option registration and bursar/student billing functions are running smoothly. Our operations staff are under the supervision of Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse. Rich’s team has been very responsive and solution-focused as challenges surface.

- **Student Financial Aid:** Administering student financial aid in the UW Flexible Option program has been a difficult challenge to overcome. After over six months of negotiating with the Department of Education, the UW Colleges was approved for offering financial aid to students admitted to the UW Flexible Option program. Currently the UW Colleges is working with UW-Extension to create the program and awarding financial aid to UW Flexible Option students.

- **Assessment Planning:** Coordinator Kim Kostka is currently leading discussions about discipline-specific competency set and UW Colleges Flexible Option program level assessment. Because enrollment numbers are small in competency sets, the decision has been made to focus on program level assessment this year. As enrollments steadily increase across competency sets, discipline-specific competency set assessment will be planned and implemented.

UW Colleges UW Flexible Option Coordinator Kim Kostka and I will continue to keep you updated on the UW Colleges Flexible Option program.

**Update on the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) Degree Completion Program:** Our institution’s bachelor degree completion program continues to evolve and serve our BAAS degree-seeking students. Listed below are the major developments regarding the BAAS degree completion program (my thanks to BAAS Degree Program Manager Patti Wise for assisting me with these updates):

- **UW System Substantive Redirect for the BAAS Degree:** As reported in my October Provost Report to the Senate, in early September 2014 the UW Colleges received UW System approval to make three changes to the BAAS degree completion program.

  1. Flex the 30 plus 30 credit restriction and allow BAAS degree-seeking students to take more UW Colleges courses
  2. Allow students to take any of the 100 UW Colleges BAAS degree-approved UW partner courses with Cognitive Skills (CS) and Global Skills (GS) designations
3. Expand access to the BAAS degree completion program by admitting students with a Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) applied associate degree

The UW System-approved program changes will be effective the date a revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is signed between the UW partner institution and the UW Colleges campus. To date, UW-La Crosse, UW-Parkside UW-Stout, and UW-Stevens Point have signed the revised MOU, allowing UW-Baraboo/Sauk County, UW-Barron County, UW-Waukesha, and UW-Marshfield to implement the changes immediately. In December, the UW-Platteville Faculty Senate approved the changes to the MOU. Final administrative details are now being negotiated. The UW-Superior Faculty Senate is scheduled in late January to vote on the changes to the MOU. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs expect to receive signed MOUs from UW-Platteville and UW-Superior early in the spring semester.

- **Articulation Agreements:** When UW System approved the UW Colleges Substantive Redirect proposal, one of the requirements for implementing expanding access to the BAAS degree completion program by admitting students with a WTCS applied associate degree was to develop specific articulation agreements with each of the WTCS institutions with which we plan to work. BAAS degree Program Coordinator Patti Wise has been working in consultation with the BAAS degree-granting campuses and the WTCS campuses on developing articulation agreements. I am pleased to report that good progress is being made towards gaining approval from the four technical colleges with which we plan to work: Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College (UW-Barron County), Madison Area Technical College (UW-Baraboo/Sauk County), Mid-State Technical College (UW-Marshfield/Wood County), and Waukesha County Technical College (UW-Waukesha).

- **Assessment:** This year the Senate BAAS Assessment Committee, in consultation with the BAAS Assessment Coordinator Stephen Schmid are planning an assessment strategy for the BAAS core curriculum using a Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)-based rubric being developed through a grant partnership between UW-Waukesha and UW-Parkside. Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy has been working closely with Stephen on planning and implementing this program-level assessment.

Program Manager Patti Wise and I will continue to keep you informed as to how the BAAS degree completion program is progressing.

**Associate of Arts and Science (AAS) Degree Revision and Curricular Reform Updates:** As reported in my October Provost Report to the Senate, during this academic year I plan to launch a comprehensive review and revision of the AAS degree and a curricular reform effort. During the first week of January, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy and I met to plan the first steps in launching the AAS review and curriculum reform process and a timeline for completing these processes. To that end, in the very near future, I will be asking the Senate Steering Committee to assist me with putting out a call to all faculty members inviting nominations and self-nominations for the faculty coordinator position. The faculty coordinator will lead both the AAS degree revision and curricular reform processes. Once the faculty coordinator is appointed, he or she will work with the Office of Academic and Student Affairs
with naming a committee to work on organizing the structure, process, vision, and timeline for the AAS review and revision process as well as curricular reform. I believe that these reform efforts should be completed by fall 2016. At that time, the process will be handed over to the Senate so that the AAS degree- and curricular reform-related policy pieces can be developed and acted upon. As promised, I will consult with the Senate Steering Committee, the UW Colleges Deans, the UW Colleges academic department chairs, and central office administrators as we move the process forward.

I will continue to keep you informed of any developments in our planning efforts to review and revise the AAS degree and launch curricular reform in the UW Colleges.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

1.12.2015
Undergraduate Research: Each of the campuses and the Online and Distance Education Program received undergraduate research (UGR) grants of $10,000 each from the UW System. The hope is that these grants will serve as seed money to either grow new UGR opportunities for our students, or advance existing opportunities. My thanks to everyone involved in getting their applications together. Continuing on the theme, I continue to serve on the Wisconsin System Council for Undergraduate Research (WiSCUR) executive committee, and will update as needed on possible System-wide UGR collaborative opportunities. Currently a scan is being done in order to get a sense of existing collaborations that may serve as models for the System.

Summer Research Grants: Eight recipients of 2015 Summer Research Grants (SRG) have been notified. There was a large, strong pool of applications, and I want to thank the Senate Professional Development Committee for their work reviewing applications and making recommendations to the Provost and Vice Chancellor.

Catalog Revisions: This is a catalog review year for the UW Colleges. We are in the process of working with academic departments to update the course descriptions for all AAS and BAAS courses. The revised catalog will go live in August.

ESL Working Group: The University of Wisconsin Colleges is experiencing a growing international student population. These students are adding vibrancy, diversity, and cultural enrichment to our institution and the campus communities in which they are being welcomed. The international program is also strengthening the ability of the UW Colleges to weather declining enrollments among traditional student populations across the state. Further, “focusing on the recruitment of international students to campuses with student housing” is one of our 2014-2015 Institutional Priorities. The UW Colleges is fully committed to the success of our international students and making higher education available to prospective students from around the globe.

To ensure that the UW Colleges are adequately serving the needs of our international student populations, and positioning the UW Colleges within a locus of strength when recruiting international students and working with foreign governments, it is mission critical that the institution develop a strong English as a Second Language (ESL) program to best support student populations on campuses with international student programs. As a result, the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs has authorized the formation of a task force and will ask task force members to develop an ESL program for the UW Colleges that will be implemented on those campuses that house international student programs.
**Committee Charge:**
The charge of this task force is to develop recommendations in the following areas for consideration by the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs:

- Identify existing curriculum that needs to be included in an ESL program
- Find curricular gaps that would require the development of new curriculum for an ESL program
- Ascertain how credentialing of instructors will be handled and provide recommendations as to the types of credentials instructors will need
- Determine professional development opportunities that will help current instructors and employees of the UW Colleges get the training they need to either begin ESL instruction or maintain currency within the field
- Explore whether the UW Colleges should seek certification for its ESL programs
- Recommend campus locations for ESL programs
- Develop recommendations for programmatic assessment of the ESL programs on an ongoing basis

**Committee Composition:**

- Joanne Giordano, Coordinator, UW Colleges Developmental Reading and Writing Program (UW-Marathon)
- Rachel Knighten, Chair, World Languages Department (UW-Fox Valley)
- Jennifer Flatt, Professor, World Languages and English Departments (UW-Marinette)
- Emery Wontor, Student Services Coordinator, International Office (UW-Richland)
- Tim Urbonya, Director, International Education (Academic Affairs)
- Patrick Hagen, Dean/Campus Executive Officer (UW-Richland)
- Mary Hankins, Associate Lecturer, English Department and Co-Director of International Program (UW-Barron County/Rice Lake)
- Lee Friedrich, Sr. Lecturer, English Department and Co-Director of International Program (UW-Barron County/Rice Lake)
- Cynthia Bailey, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs (UW-Marinette)

I want to personally thank all those who have agreed to serve on this taskforce and engage in this critical conversation.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph J. Foy
December 2014
Chapter 17 Revision

Pursuant to my last report (10/24/14) UW System President, Ray Cross appointed a committee to address the conflicting language that exists between UWS Chapter 17 (State of Wisconsin Statute) and changes to the Title IX, Save Act, and the Violence Against Women Act (Federal laws). I was asked and accepted the responsibility to represent the Senior Student Affairs Officers from across the UW System on the Chapter 17 Committee.

To date, the committee has convened twice (12/8 and 12/17). During our initial meeting we spent a large amount of time discussing the scope of the committee’s work and the importance of conducting our work only within the scope as defined by the office of General Counsel, and as approved by the Board of Regents. The scope of the committee’s work is limited to modifying only the sections of UWS Chapter 17 that conflict or are inconsistent with the U.S. Department of Education’s expectations, specifically, ensuring that equality for both the accused student and the aggrieved student exists in the statute, and as it is related to the following federal items:

- Title IX
- Department of Education’s “Dear Colleague Letter”
- Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)
- Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act)

Any proposed changes to UWS Chapter 17 must fit within the narrow scope. This limits the committee’s work and role. Therefore, the focus is on the administrative code procedures under UWS Chapter 17 that relate to student nonacademic misconduct. Further, this is only in regard to offenses of sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence and stalking (what we are commonly referring to as the “VAWA 5”).

During the committee’s second meeting, the majority of the time was spent identifying the portions of UWS Chapter 17 that presented conflicts or inconsistencies with the VAWA 5. Two attorneys from the office of General Counsel captured the suggestions and will be developing a draft of the proposed modifications. At the next meeting (not yet scheduled) the committee will review the proposed modifications and provide feedback.

Members of the UW System Chapter 17 Committee include:

Committee Chair

Vicki Washington, Associate Vice President for Inclusivity, Diversity, Equity and Student Success
UW System Administration

Staffing
Artanya Wesley, Senior Academic Planner for Student Affairs
UW System Administration

Paige Reed, Senior System Legal Counsel, Office of General Counsel
UW System Administration

Erin Kastberg, System Legal Counsel, Office of General Counsel
UW System Administration

Committee Members

Thomas Pedersen, Director of Student Conduct & Community Standards
UW-River Falls

Tonya Schmidt, Assistant Dean of Students/Director of Student Title IX and Clery Compliance
UW-Madison

Richard Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
UW Colleges

Chelsea Malicki (Student), Residential Behavior Coordinator
UW-Milwaukee

Anthony Sumnicht (Student), Student Body President & Chair of UW Student Representatives
UW-River Falls

Mary Beth Mackin, Dean of Students
UW-Whitewater

Joanne Bares, Student Services Coordinator of Residence Life
UW-Oshkosh

As more information becomes available or as drafts of the document become available for review beyond the committee, this information will be shared with the institution.

UW Colleges Student Conduct and Title IX Task Force

Annually the UW System hosts student conduct training. Following a training session last Spring, several of the Assistant Deans for Student Affairs and I met to discuss the training and to determine how the UW Colleges could continue to develop and improve our institutional and campus student conduct programs.
The outcome of the meeting was to recommend that the UW Colleges create a Student Conduct and Title IX Task Force. Greg Lampe agreed that a task force with this specific focus would have a positive impact on our institution. The task force was formed and has met several times since May 2014. Members of the Student Conduct and Title IX Task Force include:

- Joyce Atkins, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Fond du Lac
- Cindy Bailey, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Marinette
- Debbie Butschlick, Athletic Director, President WCC Athletic Directors Assn., UW-Washington County
- Christine Curley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, UW Colleges/UW-Extension (Task Force Co-Chair)
- Kristin Fillhouer, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Rock County
- Katie Kalish, Associate Professor of English, UW-Marathon County
- Brittany Lueth, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Marshfield/Wood County
- Kristine McCaslin, Director, Auxiliary Services, UW-Marathon (Task Force Co-Chair)
- Dundee McNair, Assistant Campus Dean for Administration and Finance, UW-Richland
- Carla Rabe, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Fox Valley
- Wendy Seegers, AODE Director, UW Colleges

The task force reports to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and will continue the work that began with the review of campus compliance with UWS Chapters 14 and 17 during the Fall of 2012.

The task force will initially focus on four areas:

- Compliance
- Training
- Resources and best practices
- Policy and practice

In addition, the direction resulting from the UW System Chapter 17 Committee’s work will be facilitated within the UW Colleges by the task force.

Fall Student Affairs Conference

The 2014 Fall Student Affairs Conference was held on November 3rd and 4th at the Stoney Creek Inn and Conference Center in Wausau. Although the conference was not held on campus, it was hosted by UW-Marathon County. The conference was attended by over 100 student affairs and marketing staff members from across the UW Colleges. The conference format continues to provide the opportunity for multiple concurrent presentations by our UW Colleges colleagues. Topics selected for presentations this year included:

- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
- The Legalization of Marijuana: Why it Should be of Concern for Universities
- Advising our Student Veterans
• UW-Fox Valley Retention Plan 2014/15
• Student Conduct and the UW Colleges
• Determining Residency for Tuition Purposes
• UW Colleges Regional Recruiters
• Drug Abuse Trends Impacting our Students, Campuses and Communities
• New Freshmen at Risk: How to be Proactive and Create a Culture of Success
• Audio Note Taker Software
• An Expanded and Continuous Alert Program at a Two-Year Campus
• Highlights from the National Conference on Student Recruitment, Marketing and Retention
• UW Colleges Online and Distance Education: Rebooting for the 21st Century, Building Relationships and Collaborations
• Electronic Tutor Reports as a Tool for Retention and Advising
• “High” in Plain Sight
• School Certifying Officials Veterans Roundtable
• International Roundtable
• Best Practices in Recruitment Roundtable
• Best Practices in Retention Roundtable
• Best Practices in Student Activities Roundtable
• Best Practices in Advising Roundtable

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Barnhouse
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
01.07.15
Irons in the fire:

Some of the current and inbound projects include: a major overhaul of our merit processes (currently in the hands of FPSC); a revamping of the AAS degree (in process with the Provost); a move to establish a half time position for a faculty member to oversee the Colleges ongoing investigation of questions surrounding gender equity; continued exploration of what a "virtual" UW Colleges Online campus would look like (one that meets the conditions established by Regents’ policy and state statute); our participation in UW System's collection of faculty and academic staff workload anecdotes (about 20 faculty members shared anecdotes with me – those were properly anonymized, if that’s a word, and forwarded to interim System Senior Vice President David Ward's office); compensation adjustments are beginning – for faculty – and we need to keep an eye on how those will proceed and to what extent other aspects of the Repositioning Task Force proposals will be, or won’t be, implemented; and, finally, some ongoing questions about reported discomfort among some faculty regarding the overall relationship to the central office staff. This last one struck a particular chord with me since I was astonished, frankly, to discover that any faculty member – tenured or untenured – felt any discomfort with the idea of speaking truth to power: especially, in this case, to anyone in our administration. Professors Hassel and Hankenson have put together a set of questions that Steering hopes will help campus collegia explore this issue more thoroughly. It's a critically important one. We all know the reality of our situation: we are underpaid, there is very little academic prestige attached to working where we do, and many of us feel increasingly demonized and alienated by the ongoing, ambient, political turmoil in the state. Still, for all of that, we do have something in the Colleges that no one can take away from us: our collegiality. Even after working here for 25 years, our collegiality remains one of the best parts of my day and – and here’s the important part – this collegiality extends throughout governance, from staff to faculty to administration. This kind of collegiality is rare in academia – it’s unusual even in Wisconsin. We need to do whatever it takes to preserve it. Without it, we might as well be substitute teachers working in a box store.

Fortunately, collegiality is something we’re pretty good at. The conversations we’ll be having about our institutional culture should prove satisfying. Based on what I’m hearing from everyone, we need to do something about this creeping alienation. This might be a place to start.

In the wars-and-rumors-of-war category, a reminder and some links. Please always be sure to check the Regent’s website [https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/meetingmaterials/] first, following their meetings, rather than relying on press reports about what happened, or about whatever President Cross may have said. My experience over the last couple of years, sitting in the meetings and then hearing or reading about them, has been that the press gets the details wrong – consistently and dependably wrong.
Finally, a few examples of what they’re saying, and hearing, in Madison. The last link here is a particularly interesting insight into where the state’s head is. Professor Kramer did some fascinating and useful work looking into this question.

- “President Cross presents plans to transform how the UW System does business.”

- Faculty turnover report from System to the Regents can be found here:
  [https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/download/meeting_materials/2014/october_9-10/Agenda%20for%20the%20Business%20and%20Finance%20Committee%20Meeting.pdf](https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/download/meeting_materials/2014/october_9-10/Agenda%20for%20the%20Business%20and%20Finance%20Committee%20Meeting.pdf)
  The Colleges have had about 40 resignations since 2011, a few for real retirements but most from Assistant Professors and a few Associate Professors.

- Here’s a fascinating article for those who may not have seen it.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Peterson
Attachment 6

UW Colleges Academic Staff Lead Senator
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
January 22, 2015

Adjustments to ASPP #708 (Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff)

Based on feedback from IAS, associate deans, department chairs, and the central administration, the Academic Staff Council of Senators has made some minor changes to the language of this policy. After an appropriate further discussion and consultation, we will forward the policy to the chancellor.

Review of Bylaws

In concert with the current overhaul of the Senate constitution due to the inclusion of classified staff in shared governance, the Academic Staff Council continues to review its bylaws.

Merit Review for IAS

As the Senate continues to examine merit review policies for IAS and faculty (IP #320 and FPP #503), IAS are reporting conflicting messages regarding the role of their annual Activity Report. Some campuses use the IAS AR as a basis for merit consideration, even though the AR form (which is a faculty form) specifically instructs IAS that those parts of the form which might figure into a merit review (sections III, IV, and V) are “optional” for IAS. Additionally, different campuses have different practices regarding the awarding of merit for IAS. Finally, some associate deans have expressed concerns that IAS who teach only in the Spring semester often do not submit an AR at the end of the year. The Council wishes that any revision of IP #320 contain a specific framework for the campuses on how IAS merit is to be awarded and that an IAS-specific version of the AR be developed. IAS need to understand the necessity and importance of the AR, and better tracking needs to be developed to make sure that IAS complete their activity reports.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jeff Verona
January 22, 2015
**Academic Staff Post-Progression Series Review Guidelines**

The Academic Staff Post-Progression Series Review is one of tools identified on the Pay Tools Portfolio 2014-15. This program will help divisions identify those long-term academic staff in the highest rank of the title series. It is important to note that while an academic staff employee may be eligible to an adjustment under this review, he/she is not entitled to a pay increase. Divisions also have the flexibility and are encouraged to consider equity, market, or change-in-duties adjustments outside of this review cycle.

Appendix 1: **Academic Staff Post-Progression Series Review Guidelines**

**Hostile and Intimidating Behavior Legislation (UW Madison)**

PART I: Language Describing Hostile and/or Intimidating Behavior

Unwelcome behavior that a reasonable person would find hostile and/or intimidating, and that makes the climate for work less hospitable and does not further the University’s academic or operational interests is unacceptable as it impairs another’s ability to perform his/her responsibilities to the university. A person or a group can perpetrate this behavior. The person need not be more senior than or a supervisor to the target.

Inside Higher Ed Article:


Appendix 2: **Hostile and Intimidating Behavior Legislation (UW Madison)**

**David Miller**
- Status of 9/12

Appendix 3: **Distributing Earnings 9/12 for 9 month employees**

**Jerry Addie**
- Wants to ensure that Classified Staff, soon to be known as University staff, will have a place during Reps Meetings in Madison – positive response that this will happen very soon

Respectfully submitted by,

Danielle “Marcy” Dickson
January 5, 2015
Appendix 1

Academic Staff Post-Progression Series Review Guidelines

The Academic Staff Post-Progression Series Review is one of tools identified on the Pay Tools Portfolio 2014-15. This program will help divisions identify those long-term academic staff in the highest rank of the title series. It is important to note that while an academic staff employee may be eligible to an adjustment under this review, he/she is not entitled to a pay increase. Divisions also have the flexibility and are encouraged to consider equity, market, or change-in-duties adjustments outside of this review cycle.

1. Eligibility for consideration

Central campus (OHR) will assist divisions by sending a list of eligible academic staff in early November every year. Adjustments for eligible staff can be effective through the start of the following fiscal (A-basis) or academic year (C-Basis).

(a) Academic staff five years after promotion or appointment to the highest rank of a title series in the same position are eligible for consideration. For Category A positions, this includes the senior and distinguished titles, and those Program Manager series that are not currently promotional series. For Category B, this includes the no-prefix titles (i.e. Researcher) when that is the highest level of the position.

1. In the first year of implementation, all academic staff meeting the criteria above will be eligible for consideration for an adjustment.

2. Going forward, the timing of review for academic staff will be based on a cohort approach tied to the year of promotion or appointment. Academic staff will be eligible for review when they reach five, ten, fifteen, etc., years of service in the same position and title. If a person has moved to a new position with the same title, he/she must work in the new position for five years to be eligible for review under this program.

3. To be considered in the first year of this program, the academic staff member must have held the same position for five years as of November 1, 2014 or earlier. Note: Category A academic staff may not exceed their pay range maximums under this program unless a formal ESR is requested and approved.

(b) Academic staff whose performance is at least satisfactory. Supervisor must complete the annual performance review for the academic staff member for consideration for a base adjustment under this program.

2. Criteria for award

Adjustments made as part of the Academic Staff Post-Progression Series Review can only be made on the basis of internal equity, market concerns, or a substantive change in duties as outlined in UPPP 10:  http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/polproced/UPPP/1001.pdf

Base adjustments cannot be awarded on an across-the-board basis, nor is an eligible employee entitled to receive an adjustment. After determining that an academic staff member is eligible
for consideration, the supervisor must consider equity, market factors, or change-in-duties impacting the individual.

- For equity, compression or other internal equity situations should be considered.
- For market, such information may include, for example, efforts by competing universities or other employers outside UW-Madison to lure the academic staff employee, or exceptional market pressure for a high-demand niche within a larger field or discipline, or an individual star reputation so powerful that the academic staff member has become a “market-of-one.” If such additional market considerations modify the assessment of market concern and its urgency, indicate how.
- For change-in-duties, information on a substantive change to the person’s job duties must be evident. The change has to be a qualitative rather than a quantitative change (as stated in UPPP 10.01).

In addition, departments must evaluate whether the academic staff employee’s performance is at least satisfactory. Although performance cannot be used as a basis for an adjustment, satisfactory performance is a prerequisite.

3. Review/Approval Process
Tracking of the adjustments will be done by utilizing the Rate/Title change JEMS system. Divisions must choose equity, market, or change-in-duties as the reason for the salary adjustment. Deans/directors must enter a brief justification for the adjustment in the rate/title change system. Departments and divisions must consider the possible impact of the recommended salary rate on gender/race equity or other equity concerns within the unit.

**Amount:** Adjustments will be for at least 5%. If the adjustment is being requested solely based on change-in-duties, a maximum of 10% is allowed. For Category A positions, the salary cannot exceed the maximum of the pay range unless a formal ESR is requested and approved.

**Effective Date:** Adjustments cannot be effective earlier than the first of the month following the receipt of the request to the Dean/Director’s office as indicated by the DEPARTMENT APPROVED status in the Rate/Title change system. Adjustments will typically be effective no later than the start of the next fiscal or academic year after the person became eligible. Requests for a later effective date due to the timing of grant renewals can be considered by the division. Requests for equity, market, and change-in-duties adjustments may also occur outside this review window, so divisions should be encouraging departments to put forward requests as situations call for a review.

**Pay Plan Implications:** An employee receiving an equity base adjustment must receive at least average merit compensation during the budget cycle following the base adjustment.
Addition to Academic Staff Legislation

PART I: Language Describing Hostile and/ or Intimidating Behavior

Unwelcome behavior that a reasonable person would find hostile and/or intimidating, and that makes the climate for work less hospitable and does not further the University’s academic or operational interests is unacceptable as it impairs another’s ability to perform his/her responsibilities to the university. A person or a group can perpetrate this behavior. The person need not be more senior than or a supervisor to the target. Unacceptable behavior may include, but is not limited to:

- Abusive expression (including spoken, written, recorded, visual, digital, or nonverbal, etc.) directed at another person in the workplace, such as derogatory remarks or epithets that are outside the range of commonly accepted expressions of disagreement, disapproval, or critique in an academic culture and professional setting that respects free expression;
- Unwarranted physical contact or intimidating gestures;
- Exclusion or isolation having the effect of harming another person’s reputation in the workplace or hindering another person’s work;
- Sabotage of another person’s work or impeding another person’s capacity for academic expression, be it oral, written, or other; or
- Abuse of authority, such as the use of threats or retaliation in the exercise of authority, supervision, or guidance, or impeding another person from exercising shared governance rights, etc.

Repeated acts or pattern of hostile and/ or intimidating behaviors are of particular concern. A single act typically will not be sufficient to warrant discipline or dismissal, but an especially severe or egregious act may warrant either.

This definition of hostile and/ or intimidating behavior is not intended to impede academic freedom or violate rights to free expression. The definition will not in any way constrain commonly accepted workplace management practices, e.g., performance reviews, discipline that complies with University policy, reassignment of duties, etc. This legislation is intended to address patterns of hostility or intimidation that impede persons from carrying out their duties to the University, ensuring that all, regardless of rank or status, may pursue their work and speak as they see fit.

PART II: Procedures for Implementation of Part I

A person who has been the target of hostile and/ or intimidating behavior may use the informal process for redress or proceed directly to the formal process.

1. The Informal Process

A person who believes he/she has been subjected to unacceptable hostile and/ or intimidating behavior may wish to discuss the matter with the academic staff member involved either directly or through the intervention of an intermediary at the department, school/college, division, or campus level such as Ombuds or Employee Assistance Office.
Academic staff may use the informal resolution process outlined in Section 7.01 of Academic Staff Policies and Procedures (ASPP).

When an individual believes that these rules have been violated and seeks to deal with the problem informally, he/she should be prepared to identify precisely the pattern or acts of conduct believed to constitute the violation. Precision is often aided by expressing the complaint in writing. If the matter is not promptly resolved, and if the person complained against so requests, the complainant shall provide such a written statement.

Oral and written communications occurring during the informal process may not be used as evidence in any subsequent formal proceeding.

If a complaint about unwelcome behavior is being handled informally, and there is a dispute about whether the alleged behavior constitutes a violation of these rules, the person or body handling the matter shall seek advice on this question from the Office of Human Resources (OHR) and inform those concerned of the advice received.

A complainant who believes that informal approaches are inappropriate or that an informal process that has been invoked is not functioning or has not resolved the matter satisfactorily is entitled to invoke the formal process.

2. The Formal Process

A. Filing a Written Complaint

An individual may file a written complaint with the department chair or unit head. If there is a conflict with the department chair/unit head, the complainant may file with the dean/director. ASPP (Academic Staff Policies & Procedures) Chapter 8 identifies rights for the individual against whom the complaint is filed. If upon investigation of the complaint, discipline or dismissal is appropriate, the department chair/unit head (or Dean/director), may initiate the disciplinary or dismissal process.

Discipline or dismissal can be imposed on academic staff members for violation of ASPP 6.01 in compliance with the requirements of the formal processes delineated in Chapter 6 of ASPP.

B. Filing a Grievance

If filing a written complaint pursuant to Section 2.A above does not lead to a resolution, an employee may file a workplace grievance pursuant to applicable policies and procedures for the complainant's employee category.

Academic staff members may file a grievance with the Academic Staff Appeals Committee pursuant to ASPP 7.02 and consistent with this Section. If disciplinary procedures (ASPP Chapter 6) are not begun within 30 working days of the filing of the original written complaint pursuant to Section 2.A above, an academic staff member may file a grievance under ASPP 7.02. If disciplinary procedures are begun, an academic staff member may file a grievance within 20
Senators and Council Reps (revised 12/10/2014)
New members elected for Manitowoc and Baraboo.
The following are the names of the UW Colleges University Staff Council members:
Bell, Joyce (WAK), Brust, Rose (MTH), Carter, John (RLN), Dodge, Dawn (BRN), Larson, Christi (WSH), McGuire, Juli (FOX), Messerschmidt, Dawn (MSF), April Peissig (MAN), Sbarbaro, Kay (SHB), Schwinn, Tracy (FDL), Sisulak, Lisa (RCK), Stenstrup, Roseann (MNT), Weber, Lynn (UWC), Brad Wilson (BRB), Witte, Curtis (ONL)

The following are the names of the UW Colleges University Staff Council of Senators:
Rose Brust, Christi Larson, Juli McGuire, Kay Sbarbaro, Roseann Stenstrup

Council welcomes David Prucha
The University Staff Council welcomed David Prucha as the new liaison to the chancellor at their November 14, 2014 meeting.

UPS Policy Work
The Council has nearly completed the work on the Grievance Policy. Discussions are ongoing among the University Staff Council, the Council Grievance Policy Committee members (Joyce Bell, Justeen Mallo, and Char Schmidt) and David Prucha, Director of Human Resources for UW Colleges and UW-Extension. The Council is having difficulty with the section regarding the Impartial Hearing Officer. The Council has requested the three options per the Board of Regents Grievance Policy and are being told that the recommendation is to set up a Grievance Committee comprised of University Staff colleagues. What that structure might look like has not yet been determined. While the Council has expressed knowledge that two of the 4-year Universities already have an approved Grievance Policy that includes all three options, they are concerned as to why the UW Colleges University Staff are being asked to provide only the one option.

Statewide Meetings
Members of the University Staff continue to meet with representatives from the 4-year institutions discussing policy work and other classified staff issues. Recent meeting 1/9/2015, was held to discuss the status of Grievance Policies and to look at other policies moving forward. System has said “yes” to the split of insurance premiums on paychecks but that will not begin until July 2015.

Respectfully submitted,
Rose Brust, Chair
UW Colleges University Staff Council
I'm very happy with the progress that SGC has made in the first semester toward several goals for the current academic year. The new SGC Executive Board has built student participation, has been gaining momentum and is ready to go for the spring semester.

Since elections were not completed in May as per the SGC constitution and bylaws, an election was held on October 24, 2014 for the full five-member SGC Executive Board. To facilitate this, I worked closely with Kim Valenza, SGC Advisor, to organize the meeting and communicate with student leaders and their advisors at each campus — despite my lack of a recognized role with SGC at the time. This election was a success, and I'm happy to report that SGC now (finally!) has a full slate of officers, as follows:

President: Graham Pearce, Marshfield/Wood County  
VP: Wayne Mortenson, Barron County  
Financial Director: Christiana Kmecheck, Marinette  
Executive Director: Marly Harmeling, Sheboygan  
First Year Officer: Jonathan Watson, Sheboygan

One of our accomplishments in working with you, the Senate, was filling the eight open Senate committee student positions. This was achieved through strong & persistent communication. Our initial meeting as an executive board in late November was dedicated primarily to this task. All of these positions were filled and appointees notified at the beginning of December.

I met with Chancellor Cathy Sandeen on January 5th to establish communication between the Chancellor and SGC, and to share my goals for the remainder of this year: to revitalize student interest in SGC, and to work on initiatives for student engagement. Both the Chancellor and myself see this as an issue of importance to the Colleges as it plays a role in student retention, and to SGAs for its role in student participation and effective representation.

My efforts have focused on reopening and establishing channels of communication between students, faculty senate members, student leaders, and their advisors. This has been a labor-intensive process but I believe it's the only way to get SGC back to being an effective organization, with buy-in from all constituencies involved in student government and its role in shared governance. I do take note of and appreciate the efforts of past SGC presidents to create institutional memory for the Council, but regardless, SGC can only be what each year’s board makes of it and it is my goal to continue to be inclusive and to foster good communication and responsiveness as it pertains to the needs of students, SGAs and all the individuals that SGC serves.

SGC would like to thank Chancellor Cathy Sandeen for her support in these goals; Kimberly Valenza for her valuable advice and mentoring; Richard Barnhouse, Linda Baum, Mark Peterson,
and the SGA advisors on each campus who have encouraged participation in SGC.

Respectfully,
Graham Pearce
Student Governance Council President
Recent months have been relatively quiet for the Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC), especially given the whirlwind of work completed over the past year. This said, it is never truly quiet, and the committee has been continuing work on previous charges as well as beginning work on new charges. This report provides details of recent committee work.

SAPC met the morning of October 25, 2014. During this meeting, we discussed and/or acted on the following items:

1) In the spring semester, 2014, Senate Steering charged SAPC with a review of IP#107 concerning mediated instruction in the Colleges. In August, Joanne Giordano agreed to revise and redraft this policy. Giordano’s thoughtfully revised policy was discussed at September and October committee meetings. Since the October meeting, Giordano distributed revised policy to Provost Greg Lampe, UWC Online Dean Glena Temple, the Senate Online Program Committee, and department chairs for review. The committee has received some formal feedback, and we anticipate further discussion at the January, 2015 meeting.

2) The committee also discussed the current backload of work posted to Sharepoint. Some materials in the ‘task’ folder date back more than two years. Caleb Bush indicated a lack of clarity regarding what work remained to be completed and what had been accomplished. The committee agreed a review of this backlog was warranted. Bush indicated he would consult parties with deeper knowledge of past committee work to begin this clearing-out process.

In the interim between October 25, 2014 and January 22, 2015 meetings, SAPC has been working on the following tasks:

1) During the 2013-2014 academic year, SAPC was tasked with a review of a new policy concerning academic forgiveness. This policy was developed with new degree pathways like the flex option in mind, where students with poor academic records might return to school after considerable time away. The Colleges would need policy in place to “forgive” these poor grades if returning students demonstrate a record of improved performance.

Prior SAPC Chair, Lou Pech, returned a marked-up draft of this policy to Senate Steering in March, 2014, reflecting the numerous concerns the committee held. In late November, Senate Steering Chair, Mark Peterson, contacted SAPC and tasked the committee to revisit this policy, given heightened needs for the flex program, online, and the Colleges generally. Bush contacted Associate Vice Chancellor Joe Foy asking for his input. Foy sent comments to the committee while also discussing the policy.
with Associate Vice Chancellor Rich Barnhouse and Registrar Larry Graves. Graves raised concerns regarding the policy’s potential impact on the Colleges’ course transfer mission. Foy then asked the committee to hold discussion until further review of transfer issues. SAPC will continue to work with Foy, Graves, and other parties on this policy, anticipating further discussion and/or revision at our January meeting.

2) One of SAPC’s significant accomplishments in 2013-2014 concerned Constitutional and policy changes creating a formal place for academic programs in the Colleges as well as allowing the formation of departments (perhaps from pre-existing programs). In early January, 2015, Steering Chair Peterson tasked SAPC with further review of Senate Policy #408. Peterson has asked the committee to development policy guidelines for dissolving, combining, splitting, and/or relocating departments or programs (not only creating departments this time around). The committee will begin discussion of this important task at our January meeting.

So much for our period of ‘relative’ quiet; it was fun while it lasted. As Chair, I anticipate lively, thoughtful discussion and productive output on these tasks in the coming months.

Respectfully submitted,
Caleb M. Bush
Chair of Senate Academic Policy Committee
January 22, 2015
The Senate Budget Committee’s (SBC) last regular meeting was on 24 October 2014 at the Senate meeting.

A. At SBC’s October meeting, the following topics were discussed:
   1. VCAF Wildeck reported that the Colleges & Extension are largely the institutions that have met the requirements to address the structural deficit and lost general revenue.
   2. Wildeck also walked the committee through the Colleges’ financials as of mid-June. The Colleges have about 9.5% of funds on reserve. The Repositioning exercise brought about $2.3 million in the second year. However, about $2.9 million is needed to cover the new faculty compensation plan. The Colleges started the year without a structural deficit, but will likely have one in the future. The Colleges will need to find base budget funds to continue funding the faculty compensation plan.
   3. Addressing an item raised last academic year, Wildeck explained the Instructional Staff payment options and the barriers to making that happen. While in his interim position at System, Wildeck learned about the limitations of the HRS payment system. HRS was not designed to pay out 9-month salaries over 12 months. From a business standpoint, it makes no sense to build this functionality into the payment system. Self-withdrawal into a Summer-savings account is an option.

B. In late December, Steering asked SBC to examine the question of professional development funding and the award distribution processes at campuses and departments. In particular, professional development award distributions vary from campus to campus and from department to department. Is there some way to “connect” these disparate processes and their timelines? Campuses and departments may benefit from knowing the other’s processes and make more efficient and equitable distributions. SBC will start examining this issue at its January meeting.

C. SBC Chair Schmid resigned his position as chair after being assigned the associate dean for academic affairs position at UW Rock County. SBC will elect a new chair at the 22 January Senate meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen E. Schmid
Chair (former), Senate Budget Committee
7 January 2015
The committee continues working on a comprehensive review of the merit review policies with special attention being given to how such procedures might inadvertently add to gender bias and other forms of bias. It is our intention to provide a mechanism by which any and all merit review committees can consistently evaluate faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. The FPSC is consulting with other committees, including Senate Budget and the Special Committee on Merit Distribution, to look at potential needs to adjust the formula for distribution of merit raise funds, the potential need to add additional merit ranking levels to express levels of success below those levels eligible for higher percentages of merit raise funds (sub-divisions of the meritorious ranking, and the potential need to specify in policy the standards of performance to achieve each level of merit ranking. We appreciate the need to get this right, and we hope we can achieve revisions by the end of the academic year.

What we have learned thus far is that there is need to create uniformity of consideration of professional development efforts and service efforts across the many campuses and differing departments. Some faculty members are being rated more heavily on PD than service by their departments than by their campuses. This should not occur, as it sends conflicting messages to faculty as to where to focus their work efforts. We have also learned that a few additional departments this year followed the existing policy requirement that criteria for merit rankings be shared with their faculty members, yet this is still not in full compliance across all departments and not shared with the required timeline. We hope this will continue to improve in years ahead.

The committee will continue to gather data from the faculty. A survey will be conducted soon seeking faculty preferences for merit evaluations and policies. We will share our work with the special committee on compensation and merit.

The committee’s work to create a unified policy covering the various forms of grievances and appeals now scattered across policies in the UW Colleges continues. This unified policy will spell out needed differences, as well as common procedures. It will then charge each respective committee to develop its own procedural guidelines. In this process, we have been working with central office personnel and UW System Legal to be sure the unified policy is consistent with state law and with UW System policy. This action will simplify language in the constitution and add details in the senate policies.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Gulotta
Chairperson, Faculty Professional Standards Committee
Since the last SAC report to the Senate in October 2014 the committee has met via Wisline to review new Campus Assessment Plans for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

On October 31, 2014, SAC held a Wisline meeting with all of the CACs (Campus Assessment Coordinators) to discuss the Campus Assessment plans for the 2014-2015 cycle. A summary of plan highlights from each campus had been distributed earlier to the group by Institutional Assessment Coordinator Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier.

The plans involved a variety of campus issues including the following: 1) effectiveness of SOAR programs, 2) evaluation of early-semester grade reporting (week 4-5) and other advising methods, 3) implementing workshops to improve communication about classroom teaching across disciplines, 4) supplemental learning programs for first semester students, 5) placement measures for first year writing program, 6) the concurrent enrollment program, 7) learning if there is a relationship between student engagement and living in a residence hall, and 8) student research experience and 9) student ambassador programs success.

Another topic of the meeting was t assessment of the information literacy of our UW Colleges students literacy using a survey called SAILS (a standardized multiple choice assessment developed at Kent State University). This was implemented in early October and results should be available in early January.

There will be a meeting of SAC together with the DACs (Department Assessment Coordinators) and CACs at UW Waukesha on January 23, 2015. The committee is currently preparing the agenda for this meeting. Discussions will include Fall 2014 Assessment results reporting (DAC), campus assessment projects (CAC), results of the Information Literacy Assessment and assessment cycles.

Submitted by
Kristin Plessel
SAC Chair
January 5, 2014
Background and Rationale

In academic year 2013-2014, SAPC was charged with drafting policy for the approval of department bylaws, clarifying the process, protocol, and authority for the timely approval of such bylaws. The Senate voted to adopt the original Bylaw Approval Policy on April 25, 2014. In that policy, SAPC decided that administrative oversight is solely responsible for ensuring that bylaws and department policies are not in violation of state or federal laws, or UW System or UW Colleges policy. This language was thought to mirror best practices at other UW System institutions. However, the chancellor did not approve the policy as written, raising concerns that limiting bylaw disapproval to legal and/or policy reasons placed the Colleges and/or individual campuses at risk of inadvertent financial/budgetary/personnel consequences. The current revision includes language addressing the chancellor’s specific concerns, adding unreasonable budgetary, personnel, and/or workload obligations as further reasons for administrative nullification of proposed department bylaws.

Proposed revisions are in bold, red, italicized, and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
General Institutional Policy #407
Approval of Departmental Bylaws

I. As part of effective governance, each department or functional equivalent shall have developed and approved a set of bylaws.

II. To ensure that each department has adequate bylaws which conform to Senate policy and to form a consistent governance structure, completed bylaws will be sent to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee for approval.

A. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will not nullify policy that is in compliance with state and federal law, UW System and UW Colleges policy. Specifically, bylaws must not:

A. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee shall nullify bylaws that are not in compliance with state and federal law, UW System and UW Colleges policy. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may nullify bylaws that have budgetary, workload, and personnel implications. Specifically, bylaws must not:

1. Contradict state or federal regulations, UW System, and UW Colleges institutional
policies.

2. Restrict the prerogatives of members and faculty or staff in an illegal manner.

3. **Commit an academic department, a campus, an academic program, or the institution to unreasonable budgetary, personnel or staff/faculty workload obligations without the documented consent of that unit.**

B. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee finds that individual component(s) of the bylaw or policy are problematic, those particular components will be sent back to the department for review and revision. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will provide a written response that includes the specific policy or policies that the bylaw changes violate. In cases where individual components are problematic, the remaining bylaws or changes to existing bylaws will be approved and enforced while the problematic components are reviewed.

III. Timeline for adopting and changing departmental bylaws:

A. Upon adoption of a change to bylaws or policy, the department will send these adoptions to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee within thirty days.

B. Within thirty days, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will review the bylaws for consistency with federal and state regulations, UW System and UW Colleges policies. It will make recommendations for revision if necessary.

1. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee does not act within thirty days, the bylaws will go into effect.

2. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee requires more time for a review, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee must notify the department or functional equivalent within thirty days and must provide a reasonable timeframe that should not exceed ninety days.

[End]
Background and Rationale
Due to a new ruling from the state’s Attorney General’s Office regarding the private personnel status of results from Student Surveys of Instruction, UW System Legal Services has requested we alter language we use in our standard instructions read to students when administering the SSI. We are removing the statement that the results become a “public document” so as to avoid potential confusion that SSI results are a public document subject to open records requests. SSI results are now interpreted to be private documents for personnel decision purposes.

Proposed revisions are in bold, red, italicized, and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Personnel Policy Affecting Faculty and Academic Staff #301.01
Administering the Student Survey of Instruction

Revision Ratified by the Senate, March 15, 1986, p. 12 (corrected by Senate Minutes, May 16-17, 1986, p. 4)
Revision Ratified by the Senate, May 17, 1986, p. 4, 6
Ratified by the Senate, March 15, 1986, p. 7, 10-12 att. 9
Revision ratified by Senate Oct. 8, 1999, p. 5, att. 9
Revision ratified by Senate April 27, 2001, p. 8, att. 8
Revision ratified by Senate May 3, 2002, p.__, att. __
Reorganized and Renumbered March 15, 2002
Amended by the Senate May 2, 2003
Revised by the Senate May 7, 2004
Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate, April 29, 2005
Revised by the Senate, March 3, 2006
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

IV. Procedures
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

A. For Face-to-Face and Blended Instruction

1. Packets of survey forms shall be made available to all scheduled instructors at least three full weeks before the end of the course. (In special circumstances, departments may request or approve of administration earlier in the semester.)

2. In the interest of efficient processing, no later than the fifth week of classes for the semester in which all classes are scheduled to be evaluated, the processing campus shall circulate information guiding campuses, departments, faculty and instructional academic staff to the materials related to the implementation of the Student Survey of Instruction located in IP #301.01.
3. The campus dean shall: i) provide for a secure drop-off point and temporary storage for completed forms; and ii) for transmission of forms to the processing location.

4. Central Office will make an electronic copy of the forms and be responsible for their distribution to respective department chairs. Campuses, after final grades have been submitted, shall distribute results to individual faculty. The original forms, following processing, shall be retained by Central Office for six months. The statistical results shall be maintained in a permanent personnel file for each instructor.

5. The instructor shall inform the students at least two days or one class period before the evaluation is to be done. The instructor must conduct the evaluation during a class period within the final 20% of the semester. The instructor shall not schedule the evaluation the day a major assignment is conducted or returned. The instructor can request review of the course syllabus prior to the evaluation, and in multiple-instructor courses can inform students that only one form will apply to the course and that comments on individual instructors can be written in the spaces provided.

6. Each faculty member shall designate a student from each class to administer the forms and return the forms to the drop off point. The instructor will not be present during the administration of the evaluation, although a colleague may be. At least ten minutes shall be allowed for completion of the forms. Evaluations shall only be completed during the class time in which they are distributed. Under no circumstances shall the instructor collect or handle the completed forms until after final grades have been submitted, nor shall the instructor lobby students by word or deed for higher ratings.

7. The person administering the form shall read the following statement before distributing the forms:

   It is the policy of the University of Wisconsin that students be given the opportunity to evaluate teaching faculty. You are not required to complete the evaluation, but your participation is encouraged. Do not write your name on the form. It will become a public document that your instructor will not have access to this document until the semester is over and your final course grade is recorded. Do not talk with others while completing this form. Please write freely and honestly.

   The information obtained on this form will be considered when making decisions regarding salary, promotion, or tenure. Your instructor will find your evaluations helpful when improving his/her teaching and course content.

   If any item does not apply to you or the course, mark the “not applicable” column. Use a black or blue ball-point pen or thin felt tip pen, marking each box with an X. Please write legibly. You will have at least 10 minutes to complete the evaluation.

8. The only attachments accompanying the student forms will be the instruction sheet and, where applicable, a sheet listing additional questions.
B. For Online Instruction
   Added by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

1. An electronic version of the survey must be a component of all Online courses in which the Student Survey of Instruction is required or requested via IP Policy #301.01.

2. Prior to the start of each semester, the Director of Distance Education Dean of UW Colleges Online and Distance Education shall arrange for each section that is to be evaluated to be linked to an electronic version of the Student Survey of Instruction.

3. The Director of Distance Education Dean of UW Colleges Online and Distance Education, in consultation with the instructor, shall assign a three day period in which the evaluation shall take place. The default period will be the last full three days of instruction. However, an alternate evaluation time will be assigned if the default period would overlap with any day in which a major assessment is conducted or returned. Additionally, an instructor may request an alternate evaluation period, provided that it takes place within the last 20% of the semester and does not overlap with the giving or returning of a major assessment. Evaluations shall only be completed during this three day period.

4. At least one week before the evaluation period is to begin, instructors shall inform students of the evaluation time period via email and by posting the dates on the class News page. The instructor can request review of the course syllabus prior to the evaluation, and in multiple-instructor courses can inform students that only one survey will apply to the course and that comments on individual instructors can be typed in the online forms provided.

5. Under no circumstances shall the instructor be given access to the completed surveys until after final grades have been submitted, nor shall the instructor lobby students by word or deed for higher ratings.

6. The following statement will precede the Student Survey of Instruction:

   It is the policy of the University of Wisconsin that students be given the opportunity to evaluate teaching faculty. You are not required to complete the evaluation, but your participation is encouraged. The survey will be anonymous. It will become a public document that your instructor will not have access to this document until the semester is over and your final course grade is recorded. Do not work with others while completing this survey. Please answer freely and honestly.

   The information obtained on this form will be considered when making decisions regarding salary, promotion, or tenure. Your instructor will find your evaluations helpful when improving his/her teaching and course content.

[End]
Background and Rationale

Continuing Education provides a variety of programs directly related to community interests and workforce development. Some programs can be directly targeted to specific knowledge or skill sets and can occur in a shorter period of classroom instruction than allowed by current non-credit certificate policy. Current policy states that non-credit certificates are based on “continuing education courses, credit courses, or related activities comparable to the requirements for the credit certificate.” This language raises concern that the coupling of non-credit certificate requirements to credit certificate requirements is overly restrictive and inflexible. This prevents Continuing Education from developing non-credit certificates directly targeted to specific community needs. The revisions below introduce more flexibility by decoupling the non-credit certificate requirements from the credit certificate requirements.

Revisions are in red, bold, italics, underlined font and strikethrough.

UW Colleges Senate Policy

Institutional Curricular Policy #103

UW Colleges Certificate Program

I. Definitions

A. A "certificate program" is defined as a designated cluster of interrelated courses or continuing education units from multiple disciplines or perspectives with a theme or focus.

B. A "credit certificate program" consists of a cluster of credit courses that are part of the regular curriculum offered at a UW Colleges campus.

C. A "non-credit certificate program" consists of continuing education course work and may have additional requirements or related activities.

II. Requirements

A. For the "credit certificate":
   1. A minimum of 15 credits.

   2. Up to 3 credits can be transferred into a certificate from institutions outside the UW Colleges.

   3. A grade of C or better for all the credit courses.
B. For the "non-credit certificate":
   1. Continuing education courses, credit courses, or related activities that meet the academic, workforce and/or other community needs addressed by the specific certificate comparable to the requirements for the credit certificate.

III. Implementation
   Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25
   Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

   A. A program can be proposed and offered by a single campus, but there can be only one institutional certificate in each area. Each campus may replicate the certificate cluster once it is approved. Minor revisions in a certificate program may be made due to campus specific options, with approval of the Provost.

   B. The credit certificate program will be available to all students.

   C. Certificate courses should be offered on a regular basis so those students may plan appropriately to complete the program. Delivery of courses with technology should be considered to make availability more widespread.

   D. The assistant campus dean for student affairs will be responsible for certifying the completion of credit certificate programs. The campus outreach program coordinator will be responsible for certifying the completion of non-credit certificate programs.

   E. Upon completion of the credit certificate, a notation of completion will be placed on the student's academic transcript by the Registrar’s Office.

   F. Students completing either certificate will receive a document of recognition.

IV. Approval Process
   Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25

   A. A credit certificate proposal will be prepared by a campus dean in consultation with the campus curriculum committee and the relevant academic chairs. It should then be submitted to the UW Colleges Curriculum Committee for its recommendation to the Provost, who will make the final decision.

   B. A non-credit certificate proposal will be prepared by a campus dean in consultation with the campus outreach program coordinator. It should then be submitted to the UW Colleges Continuing Education Director for his/her recommendation to the Provost, who will make the final decision.

[End]
Attachment 17

UW Colleges Senate
Introduction: January 22, 2015
Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 2.02
(“Senate Membership”)

Rationale:
This amendment to 2.02 reassigns presiding officer status, in accordance with practice, to the chair of the Senate Steering Committee. Under Robert’s Rules of Order, a presiding officer is not allowed a vote so, since, under UW Colleges shared governance, any Steering chair is also a senator, they must be allowed to vote in order to represent their campus.

Proposed amendments are in strikethrough and red, bold, underline and italicized font.

UW Colleges Constitution
Chapter 2 - UW Colleges Governance
===========================================================================

[...]

2.01 Senate Membership

Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14

[...]

The Chancellor shall be the Senate’s presiding officer, without vote. The Chair of Senate Steering shall be the Senate’s presiding officer and, as a senator, retain their vote.

[...]

[End]
Rationale:
The current bylaw states that “the two newly elected student senators” when it should say three. The original intent was to include a previous student senator in the vote. These changes make student participation commensurate with faculty, academic staff, and classified staff voting for annual elections.

Proposed amendments are in strikethrough and red, bold, underline and italicized font.

UW Colleges Senate Bylaws

Established 11/12/94
Revised 3/18/95
Revised 1/11/96
Revised 5/4/96
Revised 3/8/97
Revised 4/23/99
Revised 3/14/03
Revised 5/02/03
Revised 1/21/04
Revised 5/7/04
Revised 4/29/05
Revised 10/19/07
Revised 1/16/08
Revised by the Senate 3-7-08
Revised by the Senate 1-14-09
Revised by the Senate 4-24-09
Revised by the Senate 10-23-09
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 1-13-10
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 3-5-10
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 4-23-10
Revised by the Senate (SIITC) 2010-10-22
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-01-12
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-04-29
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SOPC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2012-01-11
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-01-09
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-02-25
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-24
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-08-28
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-10-24

5.0 Annual Elections
Revised 10-23-2009
Revised 1-13-2010
Revised 4-23-2010
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14

5.2 Only faculty, academic staff, and classified staff senators who have been elected to serve in the coming academic year or their designated alternates are eligible to vote in the annual election. In the case of the student senators the two newly elected student senators and one of the outgoing student senators designated by the Student Governance Council, or their designated alternates, shall vote.
**Rationale:**
*Bylaws 9.2 needed to be updated to include classified staff senators in the mention of faculty senator reapportionment.*

*Proposed amendments are in strikethrough and red, bold, underline and italicized font.*

---

**UW Colleges Senate Bylaws**

| Established 11/12/94 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 1-13-10 |
| Revised 3/18/95 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 3-5-10 |
| Revised 1/11/96 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 4-23-10 |
| Revised 5/4/96 | Revised by the Senate (SIITC) 2010-10-22 |
| Revised 3/8/97 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-01-12 |
| Revised 4/23/99 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-04-29 |
| Revised 3/14/03 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21 |
| Revised 5/02/03 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21 |
| Revised 1/21/04 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2012-01-11 |
| Revised 5/7/04 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-01-09 |
| Revised 4/29/05 | Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25 |
| Revised 10/19/07 | Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15 |
| Revised 1/16/08 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14 |
| Revised by the Senate 3-7-08 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-24 |
| Revised by the Senate 1-14-09 | Revised by the SSC 2014-08-28 |
| Revised by the Senate 4-24-09 | Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-10-24 |
| Revised by the Senate 10-23-09 | |

---

9.0  **Senate Faculty Senator Reapportionment Procedures**

*Added by the Senate March 5, 2010*

---

9.2  The number of faculty Senators will remain at 17 unless the Senate as a whole finds an overwhelming need to change the number. Any reconsideration of the number of faculty Senators should be accompanied by a reconsideration of the number of Academic Staff Senators, the number of Classified Staff Senators, and the number of members on a review of how these members will be distributed on Senate committees.

---

[End]
Dear Senators,

As part of assessing effectiveness and engagement with UW Colleges governance, we have developed the following set of discussion questions. We would like to have you circulate them in a way that works for you and your campus (discussion at Collegium, email discussion) and send collected feedback and impressions to the SSC so a report can be assembled for discussion at the March Senate meeting.

- What are your impressions of governance activity within the UW Colleges, in particular Colleges Senate? What role should Colleges Senate play in our institution? Is it playing that role? How well does Colleges Senate function?
- If you have previously participated in governance, why did you choose to participate? What were your impressions of this experience? Would you participate again? Why or why not?
- If you have chosen not to participate in governance, why?
- How does the presence of Central Office administration (including the chancellor and Office of Academic and Student Affairs’ personnel) at UW Colleges Senate meetings impact your participation in governance?
- What other thoughts would you like to share about the structure and participation in governance, including Central Office administration, deans representation, faculty representation, academic staff representation, classified staff representation, and student representation?

We look forward to hearing more from you and your constituents about how governance is perceived in the institution and how we can work to ensure a positive, inclusive climate.

Thanks!
Attachment 21

UW Colleges Academic Staff Council
Introduction: October 24, 2014
Proposed New Academic Staff Personnel Policy #708
(“Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff”)

UW Colleges Academic Staff Personnel Policy
Academic Staff Personnel Policy #708
Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff

Proposed changes are in red, italicized font with strikethrough.

The primary responsibility of all categories of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) is teaching. University of Wisconsin System Unclassified Personnel Guidelines (#1, Attachment 01 section 4) allows for and identifies activities external to classroom instruction as part of the responsibilities of Instructional Academic Staff. However, Associate Lecturers, Lecturers, or Senior Lecturers teaching a full workload at the UW Colleges are paid at an 80% rate because they are not required to perform scholarship activities, institutional, campus or departmental service without additional compensation. These guidelines do not prohibit offering additional compensation to perform these activities nor do they prohibit an IAS from volunteering to perform these activities. However, without compensation, these activities may not be compulsory.

The following criteria should be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate rank – Associate Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Distinguished Lecturer – when hiring or rehiring Instructional Academic Staff within UW Colleges. Title assignments should take into consideration degree held and demonstrated consistent proficiency in instruction as determined by campus and department standards.

1) A terminal degree should not be seen as a requirement for any Instructional Academic Staff rank, though possession of a terminal degree may be considered when determining rank at hire or rehire. Minimum degree requirements for instruction may vary by academic department but must meet Higher Learning Commission (HLC) standards i.e.: “Instructors... possess an academic degree relevant to what they are teaching and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members possess the same level of degree. When faculty members are employed based on equivalent experience, the institution defines a minimum threshold of experience and an evaluation process that is used in the appointment process.” Faculty and instructors refer to all those an institution employs or assigns to teach students. Faculty is used to refer to the group rather than to each individual instructional staff member, typically to distinguish faculty

2) Any previous advancement in rank will be grandfathered in. For example an IAS member hired as Senior Lecturer before the change in policy will retain that rank regardless of meeting any new standards for the rank.

3) If an IAS member is hired by more than one UW Colleges Campus or the UW Colleges Online Program, she/he will retain the highest rank achieved by the staff member while working at any one campus.

4) The appropriate rank at which IAS are hired is a joint decision by the appropriate department(s) and campus(es).

5) When an IAS is rehired, the default is that they will be rehired at the same rank they were previously hired. If the rehire is to be at a different rank, that request must be specifically initiated by the IAS, the rehiring campus, or the rehiring department. The department will request any necessary materials that are required from the IAS in question in order to perform the review of their rank. Academic departments determine the materials that instructors submit and establish criteria for evaluating effective teaching performance within a discipline.

6) Any advancement in rank will be effective in the term following the final approval of the advancement regardless of contract length. For example, any rank change approved in Fall would be effective upon rehire for the next teaching term, as appropriate.

The following guidelines should be followed when determining the appropriate rank of an IAS at the time of hiring or rehiring. Additional factors may allow for advancement in rank earlier than prescribed in these guidelines. These factors would include, but are not limited to, the following: scholarly work (such as publications) at both academic and non-academic institutions, superior performance evaluations, and service to the institution, campus or department. Note: teaching experience is normally weighted more heavily than other professional experiences.

**Bachelor’s Degree and IAS appointments**
In most cases, a master’s or terminal degree is required for any IAS appointment. However, each department can create written policies for determining when a bachelor’s degree is an acceptable level of qualification for a specific course in their department.

Departments are not required to establish these policies, and in the absence of a departmental policy, a bachelor’s degree is not an acceptable qualification for an IAS appointment.

**Associate Lecturer**
Associate Lecturers independently teach a course(s) based on broad guidelines defining the scope of the subject matter to be taught and the range of topics to be covered. Effective teaching, assessment of student learning, and grading are the primary duties expected of lecturers at this
level. Short-term hires should be hired at the Associate Lecturer level unless there are compelling reasons for higher titling – e.g. degree held or teaching experience – as determined by the campus and department in consultation.

Minimum requirements
Terminal degree or ABD with teaching experience**
Master’s degree with teaching experience**
Bachelor’s degree with significant teaching experience as defined by written departmental policy (see above)**

Lecturer (No-Prefix)
A Lecturer at this level has the experience and academic qualifications needed to develop and teach a course(s) subject to broad guidelines describing the scope of the subject matter to be covered. The direct delivery of instruction is the primary responsibility of this title.

Minimum requirements
Bachelor’s: 3 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience when allowed by written departmental policy**
Master’s: 2 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**
Terminal degree or ABD: 1 year full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**

Senior Lecturer
A Senior Lecturer has extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise in an academic discipline. A lecturer at this level has gained a reputation among his or her peers for demonstrably sustained superior contributions to teaching. At this level the independent selection, organization and development of course content, and instructional materials and pedagogical approaches are expected. The direct delivery of instruction is the primary responsibility of this title.

Minimum requirements
Bachelor’s: 5 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience when allowed by written departmental policy.
Master’s: 4 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**
Terminal degree or ABD: 3 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**

Distinguished Lecturer:
A Distinguished Lecturer performs at a level of proficiency typically requiring extensive experience and advanced knowledge and skills. The expertise of an instructional academic staff member at this level is commonly recognized by his or her peers in the discipline and through a reputation that extends beyond his or her work unit. A Distinguished Lecturer is expected to develop new approaches, methods, or techniques to resolve problems with little or no expert guidance and to cope independently with new, unexpected or complex situations. At this level,
an instructional academic staff member can be expected to guide or train other instructional academic staff or to oversee their work. A candidate nominated for the distinguished prefix is expected to demonstrate exceptional performance and teaching excellence, be recognized beyond the work unit as outstanding, and have a reputation of excellence in the profession that is acknowledged by peers who are external to the institution. For an instructional academic staff member to be recognized as Distinguished he/she will have consistently performed at an exceptional level.

The Distinguished Lecturer title is not expected to be part of the normal progression of an instructional academic staff member. Departments are responsible for establishing Distinguished Lecturer criteria that demonstrate an exceptional level of teaching excellence and achievement in a discipline. This title will be granted by the department and campus in consultation with the Provost and Chancellor rather than by request of the instructional academic staff member, and each issuance of this title will be a unique event.

This title is present to allow a campus or department to perform a short term hire of a distinguished member of a profession or to recognize significant contributions from a long standing member of their instructional academic staff.

*For the purposes of these guidelines “full time” is defined as IAS appointments of 80% or higher per term. (e.g. Teaching at a 40% level for two terms would be the equivalent of teaching at the 80% level for one term; Teaching at a 40% level for two academic years would be the equivalent of teaching at the 80% level for one academic year; and so forth.)*

**Teaching experience includes full responsibility for courses. Teaching, assessment of student learning, and grading are the primary duties expected of lecturers**

[End]
Guys,

This email doesn’t tell me anything I don’t already know, except that administration does not intend to put the actual formulae into policy or anywhere else that they can be accessed. And in my opinion, so long as the actual compensation schedules or formulae are provided only to campus administration via workbooks, faculty and IAS remain far too much in the dark about how much they would earn if they taught in summer or winterim. But having brought the issue to the attention of administration and Senate leadership, I will let this issue lie.

As to the deeper issue of inequity between faculty and IAS compensation in summer and winterim, I have given Colleen the spreadsheet I gave to you, and I will give her time to respond to it.

Dave

From: Godfriaux, Colleen  Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2014 10:36 AM  To: Carlson, Dave  Cc: Verona, Jeffrey; Gorman, Michael; Wildeck, Steve  Subject: RE: Summer pay plans

Hi Dave,

Here is a link to the current administrative policy regarding summer and winter session procedures: http://www.uwc.edu/sites/uwc.edu/files/imce-uploads/employees/admin/policies/summer_and_winterim_program.pdf

Regarding your question:

"Can you tell me whether the determination of summer compensation for IAS is a campus matter or a central matter?"

The determination of summer compensation for IAS is an institutional matter. All IAS compensation is based on the same rate in the summer. Campuses have the authority to decide whether to pay faculty using the "Flat Rate", whereas all faculty receive a common rate or whether to pay faculty using the "Ranked Plan", whereas faculty receive a rate dependent on their rank.

The actual compensation schedules, that change every year, are not included in the policy. Those salary schedules are updated each year by the institutional office (based on pay plan) and provided to campus administration via a summer and winterim workbook.

Please feel free to contact me with any other questions-

Thank you,

Colleen

Colleen Godfriaux
Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
University of Wisconsin Colleges
432 North Lake Street, #517
Madison, WI 53706
608-265-9807
Hi Dave. Thanks for the welcome back.

I’m copying Colleen Godfriaux so that she can respond to your questions. Summer compensation schedules are determined by the institution. The recent shift from compensation by credit to compensation by contact hour occurred while I was on leave, so I think Colleen is best to respond.

Thanks.

Steve

---

Steve,

I haven’t had a chance to tell you in person, but hey, I’m happy that you’re back with us in Colleges and Extension. I’ve been busy doing my “day job” as advisor and tutoring coordinator, and teaching philosophy courses on an overload too, so I’m not doing as much in shared governance as I have in the past. Still, I am trying to serve the Rock campus and keep up with institutional (and System) issues.

Can you tell me whether the determination of summer compensation for IAS is a campus matter or a central matter? Recently, I asked the Academic Staff Council of Senators to look into something that I regard as an inequity: Both IAS and faculty are paid less per credit (or contact hour) when they teach in the summer than when they teach fall or spring, but the percentage of their fall/spring compensation that IAS receive is less than that which faculty receive. I don’t think that the council is going to address this issue; as things have been reported to me, there are other matters for the council to give priority to, and some members of the council believe that it is up to campuses to determine how much IAS are paid per credit for summer teaching.

I thought that the old UWCAP #45 included an actual compensation schedule for IAS and faculty. The recently revised 45 does not. It does not even include guidelines as to how that compensation schedule is to be determined. It refers to the flat rate plan, but I do not know where the flat rate plan or the ranked rate plan reside in policy. If they have been rescinded, and if it is now up to campuses to decide what summer compensation will be for IAS (and faculty), I will pursue the matter at the campus level. But if it is still a central matter, I would appreciate having the opportunity to discuss it with you.

Thanks.

Dave
## Summer Salary for Faculty and IAS

### Summer salary analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base salary</th>
<th>Fall and Spring compensation per CT**</th>
<th>Summer compensation per credit***</th>
<th>Ratio of Summer to Fall and Spring compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$61,289</td>
<td>$2,042.97</td>
<td>$1,966</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$50,244</td>
<td>$1,674.80</td>
<td>$1,618</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$44,550</td>
<td>$1,485.00</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranks</td>
<td>$50,142</td>
<td>$1,671.40</td>
<td>$1,551</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Academic Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full time (&gt;=.70 FTE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>$42,674</td>
<td>$1,422.47</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>$41,603</td>
<td>$1,386.93</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Lecturer</td>
<td>$38,940</td>
<td>$1,298.00</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part time (&lt;.70 FTE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>$39,772</td>
<td>$1,325.73</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>$34,118</td>
<td>$1,137.27</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Lecturer</td>
<td>$34,118</td>
<td>$1,137.27</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS average</td>
<td>$38,538</td>
<td>$1,286</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Annual base salary figures shown for faculty are the mean values reported in the Fall 2012 UW College compression study, although IAS figures more recent than that are available, for the sake of comparison the IAS figures shown are from the UW Colleges 2011-12 hiring template.

** Fall and spring compensation figures for faculty are based on (i) an adjustment to .30 of base salary to reflect instructional portion of workload, and (ii) an assumption of 12 contact hours per semester for full-time, which is in line with the model used in a majority of UW Colleges departments.

*** Summer 2013