

PEEQ Comments – As of Sept. 25, 2008

Comments from the campus on the PEEQ process and self-study questions, collected from charrettes, the on-line comment form and campus meetings. All comments will be shared with the PEEQ Task Force and used to refine the process and self-study questions. Comments in blue were received between Sept. 17 and 25.

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page #</i>
About the PEEQ Process	1
About the PEEQ Criteria	5
Academic Criteria Questions	6
Administrative & Service Units Questions	16

About the PEEQ Process

- What will the Evaluation Team's report to campus look like? It was suggested that in addition to the color wheel it also include a narrative, explaining the color assignments. Ideally the wheels and narratives will be shared with departments/units before they are posted on the intranet.
- Two missing units of review: Strategic Planning and Administration, Finance & Facilities. Note: Strategic Planning will be part of the Chancellor's self study and AFF was an omission—it will be added as a unit of review. The list has been updated on the PEEQ website.
- Will this process eventually replace the needs for annual reports?
 - Ditto!
- It would seem very important that the individuals evaluating each department or unit have a thorough enough understanding of the workings of that unit to fairly evaluate and judge these questions.
 - For sure!
- I believe the way the evaluation teams will be structured could fail to maximize comprehension of opportunities across disciplines. Care should be exercised in setting up the teams and matching them to departments. It is simply not true that any faculty member can fairly and impartially evaluate any other department. Part of PEEQ's credibility rests in this matching process appearing to be reasonable.
- The questions take up 2 ½ pages of a 10-page report!
- Strong opinion: You are asking questions, the answers to which will require far more than the 10 pages you allow. I know you don't want people to ramble on and on, but I think it's a big mistake to ask a question you say is really important, then instruct your respondents to answer in telegraphic utterances in order to fit within a space limit that is just way too small. That will frustrate smart people to death.
 - I like the limit and think it's a great way to make people think about the response and be concise in their answers—getting to the true *root* of the question.
- If the plan goes through as described last week to chairs - that department rather than major data is used, I don't think the outcome will be useful - and I don't think the faculty will accept the outcome. Departments are largely created based on operating efficiencies from an administrative standpoint. To fail to analyze majors allows for masking of problems such as over staffing and understaffing. Strong majors will carry weak majors.

In addition to the combination issue, there is the issue of using old data. The institutional planner should take the time needed to provide useful UWEC data based on 2008-2009. So what if we don't get data until November - even DEc would be ok if it means using something that makes sense. Why would anyone think that 2006-2007 UWEC facts reflect current reality? Departments have lost or added faculty and majors at a very high rate. The use of old data will result in nonsense answers from PEEQ.

- I'm starting to wonder how much release time you're planning to give chairs and directors in order for them to tackle this project!!
 - How much time do you foresee the Evaluation Teams spending on this project and how are they being compensated? Is this time away from regular duties or additional time? Buyout from contract?
 - Where do we see how the Chancellor and Provost area is evaluated and how does that area prove its worth to any type of student support and service?
 - I'm glad we have a voice, but it feels like too much too fast! How can we do this when we are starting up classes, mentoring students, starting up collaborative research projects with student (a hallmark of our university)? How can I contribute to this in a valuable way this fast and this early? I'm still learning our new goals!
 - I would like to suggest that academic departments/units have an opportunity to read the evaluation team report prior to it being posted on the Intranet. In the event a blatant error/typo has occurred, it would be nice to have the opportunity to correct that error before it goes out to the university at large.
 - Regarding the "Administrative and Service Units and Programs for Review" listing, for units/programs closely tied to academic departments (e.g. College Dean's offices), I would suggest that the evaluation teams include two instructional and one non-instructional individuals.
 - The key will be to get good data. How can we make sure we do that? How can we make sure there is inter-reader reliability if different people read different self-studies?
 - I think the question comments posted on the charrette tables need to be explained more clearly because many people are answering the questions rather than commenting on their usefulness.
 - I hope that the final process will address allocation of space as well as funds. Student services offices have received inadequate space in recent years.
 - There is a great risk of departments "covering their backsides" with the department self studies. The "fox guarding the chickens"!
 - Need to provide direction to units on how well their annual reports meet expectations or not.
 - Concern about timeline seems widespread.
 - My charrette handout packet was incomplete—makes one wonder about those handling such detailed evaluations.
- It appears that much high quality work has gone into providing appropriate evaluation of academic programs in defining PEEQ.

But, looking specifically at administrative and support units: In the Gold Arrow charts, goal 4 and goal 6 are closely related. This process is a good starting point for what can be accomplished in the 1st year, but long-term much more is needed and the wheel does not need reinvention - there is great research and accepted scientific/business

practices for evaluating quality and enhancing it and it's all related to process improvements (TQM, Malcolm Baldrige, ISO 9000 and Six Sigma are all examples and all based on similar processes, science and statistics).

These processes can not only improve quality but also reduce cost and improve employee satisfaction, participation in the institution. While mostly developed for manufacturing, these can also be applied to service organizations. PEEQ has not reached that employee level yet.

My fear is that PEEQ will be substituted for the needed next steps that will document process flow charts and involve real metrics of quality and provide appropriate improvement and stops short of defining quality. My biggest concern is in process mapping to reach Quality Assurance (QA) where it is needed and codified. Our service organizations must provide services in many cases in accordance with strict codes and statutes (FERPA, building codes, ADA, and Title IX are examples). I define QA processes as those that assure compliance with these codes in all completed work and typically involve assuring that appropriately trained and credentialed personnel are responsible for those issues that require QA. Some QA is also codified as is the case of building codes that require third party independent design and review of both design and the constructed project – a step currently being skipped in much of our in-house work.

- I understand the philosophy behind the process but not the timeline. It seems like a lot to absorb and then pull together in a short amount of time. I sensed a great amount of momentum and support for the strategic plan in the spring but am now sensing more panic and concern over timelines than support. Instead of being forward thinking about how they/their units/departments can support the newly definted goals, I'm hearing more people fretting about how they can possibly get through the PEEQ process with all the other commitments they've already made for this year. I understand the need to keep the ball rolling but not if it rolls over the people whose support you need.

This process also makes me question the time and effort I have put into my department's annual reports. Are they not useful in any way? Not reviewed? The fact that I just turned one in this summer yet am now told I need to provide a new "snap shot" of our department tells me they carry little meaning. That's very frustrating and discouraging!

My other big concern is the people on the evaluation teams. How can someone with little or no real understanding of a department evaluate its quality based on a 10-page report. And how can you post a department's color wheel for the campus to see without providing any context for the colors.

Presenters said that blue is not necessarily bad. Yet they also said funding will be dictated by the color chart. I found that part very confusing.

- At the CETL sponsored Assessment program this past August, one idea that emerged was that an effective assessment exercise, i.e one where strengths and weaknesses are accurately self-identified, generally requires that punishment (taking away resources) be unrelated from the exercise itself. Otherwise, assessment activities will tend to focus on aspects done well and neglect aspects that need improvement. Furthermore, it was mentioned that resources should be allocated to programs (areas) that are identified as needing improvement instead of those identified as weak.

Given those ideas, the cynic in me questions the validity of this whole process (in reality, not on paper.) Each department self-assesses in the form of a report, and a select group of people evaluate the reports. I see no reason for each individual departments to honestly identify areas of weakness given the stated stakes. I suppose the committee is designed to evaluate the "honesty" of the reports. But, this check requires the committee leave their individual biases and turf protecting agendas at the door. Frankly, I don't trust some of the individuals on the planning group, who may likely end up on the evaluation committee, to carry out that task objectively.

- The timeline seems awfully short and not likely to be driven by academic considerations. Why the rush?
- Doesn't this all suggest that Quality Enhancement is equal to a function of Mission, Quality Evaluation and Cost? I would suggest a much more complex function.
Also – from charrettes: Document - Admin and Support Units and Programs for Review: Facilities Planning and Management, Housing and Residence Life, Learning and Technology Services, and University Centers and Programs are all way to large for a single PEEQ review. These should be divided into logical programs.
e.g. FPM = Building Maintenance; Construction Operations; Fleet; Central Stores, Mail Services and Central Receiving; Capital Projects; Facilities Planning; Grounds Maintenance; Heating Plant: LTS = ...
- The people appointed to the review teams will be critical to the success of this process. Finding people with the expertise and time to do these reviews will be a huge challenge. The people who are likely most qualified to be on the review teams already have so much going on that I can't imagine they could find the time to do it. This worries me.

About the PEEQ Criteria

- Suggestion for question: Does the unit regularly adapt to changing University needs or does the unit provide the same services today that it provided 10 years ago?
 - Excellent question
 - Yes
 - Great!
 - Wonderful question.
 - Today's needs are quite different. I could write a book on it.
- It would be good to have a sample response for each question posted on the web as a guide for chairs and directors.
- My department had a meeting to review the criteria questions. In general, we thought they were good.
- Where are the questions on research's scholarship contributions to our disciplines community; the world as our measure & motto?
 - Agree
 - Agree
 - Agree
 - Agree
- Where does cost effectiveness fall with regard to overall priorities of PEEQ?
- Some disciplinary study *requires* one-on-one interaction between teacher and students. Not just here at UW-Eau Claire, but disciplinarily throughout higher education in the US.
- I am surprised anyone can comment on the questions since we have not yet seen the list we are to follow.
- Many of the criteria are quite fuzzy and do not really address student outcomes and quality.
- There seems to be an inappropriate and artificial distinction being made between courses in majors versus courses for GE.

I. Academic Criteria

A. Mission Centrality

General comments about the MISSION CENTRALITY criteria overall:

- This section will be okay (especially question 3) as long as evaluators recognize the value of artistic contributions to society/region/state. Are we just talking jobs here or quality of life and creative living?
 - Yes, but given globalization of business and current economic conditions, we'd best rethink the balance between these things.
- The present mission is virtually irrelevant to the Centennial plan. Either we need a new, relevant mission (not enough time to do this) or we should stop referring to "mission centrality" and start referring to "vision centrality" or "centrality to the Centennial Plan."
 - Absolutely cannot proceed without a firm, clear, universally understood mission statement (old or new).
- I have read the mission statement several times - you can find it on our website with a bit of hunting. The statement, as written, says that "we will be all things to all people, regardless of major". So, while the phrase "Mission Centrality" sounds nice, in reality it provides NO GUIDANCE.

What is missing is from the Mission statement is any indication of structure in our vision of our mission or our CENTRAL goals. Professional programs are important, but they build off of, and greatly benefit from, a liberal education approach.

So, rather than get into a long debate about how to rewrite our Mission Statement, this section should be structured, highlighted, or written to indicate that we have ONE CENTRAL MISSION - liberal education. Additional missions grow out of that central one. Other missions have an importance and a place here, but they are not central. These four criteria need to be reworked.

Perhaps you can address this issue by not subdividing the color wheel into four equal partitions, making the liberal education one 1/2 to 3/4.

- For both learning goals and mission alignment, you are asking how folks are accomplishing those things before they've had any *time* to engage in planful course-setting to do so. Even one *semester* or half-year would make a *huge* difference in this regard. Seems like *right now*, you'll just get people's "best guess" of what they might be *about to start doing*. Need time to consolidate the concepts and *plan* for effective alignment. These questions will get better answers a *bit* later.
 - Also a major challenge to much of faculty and staff to "get a grip" on the strategic planning process. Takes three iterations to "get it."
- Why aren't the SWOT analyses being done by the departments??
 - Agreed. This should be at least part of the self study, even if its redone by the evaluation teams.
- This is an important consideration--assuming we all agree on UWEC's mission. Do we?

#1: *“The program’s learning goals and outcomes align with and support the UWEC Liberal Education Learning Goals & Outcomes or graduate program goals.”*

- “Mission” needs to be more broad than just teaching undergraduate and graduate students, given that the University mission is to serve regional needs (i.e., continuing education students)
- What if you don’t have any specific learning goals beyond your College strategic plan? We have annual operational goals.
 - What about an assessment plan for learning goals?
 - Make sure learning goals, experiences and content are based on an approach like Understanding By Design (UBD).
- This question is clear enough -- I assume that if a program has done its work on assessment, then it will have alignment to some extent. So, this should be easy to answer and fairly easy to evaluate.
- All this *just* changed and we’ve hardly had a chance to even absorb the new learning goals and outcomes.
- The “learning goals” could as easily fit a good high school. Universities produce new ideas and creativity as well as distribute ideas and creative activities. I don’t see any role for discovery and scholarship in the “mission centrality.”

#2: *“The program contributes to other programs across campus, in a manner aligned with the UWEC Liberal Education Learning Goals & Outcomes or graduate program goals.”*

- Contributes how? Interdisciplinary teaching? Time spent in classrooms of other departments?
- I don’t grasp the question. Are you asking about GE? Service courses? I think you’ll get shotgun answers to this one.
- This question makes sense at the course level, but I agree with the two previous comments.

#3: *“The program’s graduates meet identifiable regional and state needs.”*

- Can we get some data from Career Services on this question?
 - Yes. Employment data with indicated areas our students are not prepared for, ie global, diversity, etc.
- Need to specify “regional”—Midwest? Chippewa Valley?
- Define “needs”—Who decides what the region and state need? State government agencies? State residents? Need specificity in the definition in order to answer the question.
- Why region? Does this program from time to time produce graduates that prove to be outstanding at a national or international level?
 - Yes
 - Is region necessary at a regional comprehensive university?
 - Yes to both of the above.
- What are the needs? Too vague.
- Again, this **ONLY** works if **ARTISTIC** contributions are valued as much as high-paying, money generating careers, etc.

- I am also concerned that this question may become too job/economy focused and miss the importance of liberal education to a vibrant community,
- Chippewa Valley Technical Institute continues to cut programs that the region needs and is spending money on its 2-year liberal arts program. Where are their Board of Directors and the community voices/leaders? Let us hope we can prevent these types of programmatic cuts by utilizing PEEQ.
- Aren't 3 and 4 the same question?
- Define "region" so that it is clear what we are thinking about. A regional comprehensive university has a region (by definition), but what is ours? Also, who decides on the "needs"? These phrases just mimic the mission statement and are too vague to help with how to answer the question. They will also be hard to evaluate since who decides the region and the need may differ wildly.

#4: "The program supports the cultural, educational, and economic development of the region in a variety of ways, including its outreach and community service programs.

- Do we know what the cultural needs are of our community? In many cases, we provide some graduates of color, but they find it hard to find jobs in this area.
- Specify "region"—Chippewa Valley? Across multiple states?
- Can you show how the program supports cultural/educational and economic?
- In addition to cultural, what about enrichment of community or diversity of cultures in community?
- I interpret cultural as the arts, while others (see above) read it another way. Needs clarification.

I Academic Criteria

B. Quality

General comments about the QUALITY criteria:

- Person-to-person interactions outside of classes and research—should this be explored?
 - I agree
 - Agree
- [This section needs work.](#)

#1: "The program provides transformative, experiential learning opportunities and a high degree of student/faculty interaction."

- Give examples of "high degree of student/faculty interaction."
 - Curriculum/syllabus?
- How is this measured and quantified?
- "Transformative"—how will you know if or when a program has met this?
- What does a "transformative" experience look like? Is that just a really good lecture based class where students learn a lot? Or does it have to have immersion "in the field?" Are my students transformed if I say they learned the material at a sufficient deep level?

- Does interaction from time to time continue beyond UWEC professionally or in a mentoring capacity?
- Interaction can be useful or useless. The interaction effective or ...
- How do we *know* an experience is “transformative”? The second half of the questions is okay—straightforward. But everybody’s going to claim they provide transformative experiences—you still won’t know if that’s true. I don’t think the first half of this question will yield *meaningful* responses.
 - Assessment component needed
- I like this. It is open-ended, but that lets each unit/dept define it.
- Define: 1) “transformative”—hardest to define; 2) “experiential”—moderately hard to define; 3) “high degree of student/faculty interaction”—least hard to define.
- Question suggests that transformative, experiential learning only occurs in academic programs.
- Our faculty/staff are simply fantastic in doing this, despite often heavy loads. I will look forward to input on this question. Interaction is critical. Great question.
- Quality of the program can be negatively affected by poor facilities. Facilities certain can affect the curriculum and faculty performance/happiness. This certainly would give those of us stuck in 1960's buildings an opportunity to indicate how quality is affected by classroom size and lack of modern research areas.
- *Is the criterion really just "provides?" Are all opportunities equally transformative and experiential?*

#2: *“The curriculum is modern and well-developed, and appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline as judged by reviews, accreditations, external awards, etc.*

- As a recent older-than-average UWEC grad and now an LTE at UWEC, I have absolute high regard for the quality of expertise and content of what the English Department has to offer. ☺
- Describe how the curriculum has evolved over time to remain “modern” vs stagnant.
- Interesting point (modern vs stagnant)
 - An important point!
- This is a great question. It’s crystal clear and will generate meaningful responses.
- This interacts with cost. Newer disciplines that are more reliant on technology and less well defined take more effort (and cost more) to keep current and well-developed. How can interactions like this be measured and considered?
- I am positive our programs are exemplary and attributable to faculty/staff long-term vision. Except for a few programs, faculty have great collegial relationships and long-term planning. However, I believe “some” smaller programs could be combined to save administrative and other costs. Workloads for DPCs would/should decrease somewhat.

- This one is good because a mechanism of ranking ("as judged by reviews...") is provided

#3: *"The curriculum supports equity in outcomes through a diversity-infused curriculum, and a diversity of approaches and viewpoints."*

- Isn't this two different points? But important.
- Where does diversity of the teaching staff fit?
 - Yes!
 - In terms beyond gender and ethnicity
 - Yes! The breadth of what "diversity" is—experience as well as gender, ethnicity, age, economic, etc.
- I don't understand "equity in outcomes".
 - I agree
- What does question 3 mean? Specifically, we don't understand "equity in outcomes."
- What does diversity mean here?
 - I agree with this comment. The curriculum should also include cultural diversity.
- Question 3 conflates 2 issues -- a curriculum that supports diversity and an environment that supports it. How about 2 questions? If EDI is important, then prove it with sufficient questions.
- What the heck is this question asking? I think it's the "equity in outcomes phrase that obscures the meaning of the question. This is an important issue, so it needs a clear question.
- We all need to contribute to diversity, but areas with higher levels of a diverse population need to do more. It is easy for the Feds to require us to spend many dollars in this area. Cost and availability of diversity are important.

#4: *"The program assessment process is well developed, adequately documented with measurable student learning outcomes, and used to improve the program and student learning."*

- Great question! Clear, concise, measurable.
 - Yes!
- What about cost? Are program changes done, using assessment?
- Add to the question "relevant" and how it's kept relevant".

#5: *"Faculty maintain and demonstrate expertise within their disciplines. Report: a) The % of total program FTE represented by faculty/instructional academic staff who are both terminal degree holders and productive scholars or engaged in ongoing professional development."*

- Are terminal degrees enough in some fields, because of rapid changes?
 - We get so caught up with the Ph.D. The degree isn't the *only* factor providing quality.
 - Does "professional development" include professional practice?

- This is a weak challenge—to document the percent of faculty/staff with degrees and/or engagement in professional development. What about the quality of faculty scholarship? Does it have an impact? If so, how?
- “Productive scholars”—measured by publications? Refereed pubs? Grants? Etc?
 - The term “productive scholar” will be defined differently by discipline. There is considerable potential for “handwaving” here.
- To “faculty maintain” add “or continue to develop” in the first part of the question.
- The metrics proposed here are coarse and crude. If you want to evaluate a unit on its Quality, you are to a large extent asking about the quality of the people involved. No two people contribute in the same ways to a unit. So, your metric that the number of people in the unit who claim to be doing scholarship is worthless - everyone could claim this; it might even be true. The metric does not get at QUALITY of scholarship, any more than the QUALITY of teaching, or service, is measured by QUANTITY.

Since you are asking a unit to evaluate itself on its quality, there MUST be (an admittedly subjective) external evaluation. Such evaluation requires outsiders that are knowledgeable, who understand how comparable programs do at other institutions. Each unit will have to make its case, and those evaluators will need to gauge how they see it faring compared to peer groups.

So, lose the "guidance" about how to evaluate quality by equating it to quantity. Let each unit say where they see their real strengths lie, and expect them to back it up. If they claim that they, as a, say, academic department, excel at teaching, what is the basis for that claim? The evidence should not be confined to numbers (e.g., "number of Excellence in Teaching Awards"). Let the unit provide quantitative and qualitative data. The committee will have to take the text and convert to a color. But quality in teaching goes beyond numbers (like SCH/FTE); if this is the guide, look the information up and don't waste our time.

- What do "productive" and "engaged" mean? Does the quality and quantity of scholarly activity or professional development activities matter? If so, what is/are the metric(s).

b) The percentage of total program FTE represented by faculty/instructional academic staff who are non-terminal degree holders, but are engaged in scholarly activity or ongoing professional development.

- Odd question. Many IAS have contractual responsibilities to *teach* only.
- Some student/faculty collaborative research posters are lame research—not vetted or peer reviewed.

#6: “The faculty demonstrates teaching excellence.”

- Some standard instrument for evaluation may be useful, measured by student evaluations or peer evaluations.
 - No, a standard instrument could be very counterproductive
 - Ouch!
 - “Peer evaluations” can be based on personal rather than educational standards

- Add ongoing post-tenure reviews!
 - Agree!
- Interdisciplinary input?
- Use of instructional technology for millennial students and to provide information literacy for an educated 21st century citizen
 - Within available resources.
- Include more than student evaluations.
 - Students often don't know what they need but what they like.
 - Bad teachers are not often identified. Students be very confused by teaching vs personality.
- Lots of ways to come at this question. The freedom could overwhelm or provide an opportunity....
- How to measure/report this? Crucial to establish a valid, reliable mechanism (not just student perceptions on a survey) that is at least mostly common across campus.
- Is this measurable? Make it measurable.
 - Yes
- How is this criterion supposed to be accurately assessed across departments? I suspect all departments will state they teach excellently. What objective measures exist? Student evals? ratemyprofessor.com?

#7: *“The program contributes to enhancing the university’s image or distinctiveness, through its students, faculty and innovative curriculum.”*

- Shouldn't be just image, but substance.
 - Absolutely!
- By “image” do you mean actual “face time” in the media?
- Is this the awards? Why are we building image and not reputation? Reputation is more important than image!
- Great question.

#8: *“The program is respected and valued by prospective students, current students, alumni, employers, graduate programs, etc.”*

- ...and regional high-school teachers in the subject (who send us good students)
- How do you measure “respected and valued?”
 - Important question because the level will vary depending on how it's measured.
 - Number of our graduates hired/accepted? Some version of this?
- By whose estimation? This is going to be very difficult to evaluate accurately, like trying to look in a mirror and imagine what *others* think of the image that's *so familiar* to the self.
- What about fellow departments/administration?
- Add “community”?
- Add “community members”
- What about community and region? Does this include the Wisconsin Idea?
 - Keep front and central.

- This needs to be assessed on a broader basis than major-specific viewpoints—the business alumnus who supports scholarships in the sciences because of the meaningful education he received.
- Many students don't feel their input matters. Never any feedback. How well our students do after graduating is difficult to assess.

I Academic Criteria

C. Cost

General comments about the COST criteria:

- Develop standard criteria for every faculty, academic staff member in making salary decisions, i.e., # credits taught, research, etc.
- What non-monetary costs will be considered? How will they be measured/represented?
 - This is a good point. Cost occurs in terms of time taken to achieve a certain task, consumption of resources, number of people involved in achieving the desired outcome, etc. Use of SCH seems biased toward a single-dimensional financial view of the instructional process.
- Departments/faculty/staff have no point of reference, i.e., participation in past and current budget processes. Needs to change.

#1: "Comment on the following cost measures for the program, and their comparison to internal and external benchmarks, as provided by Office of Institutional Research."

- What does "comment on" mean? Justify? Explain? We can do better than that. How are the benchmarks selected? Only Delaware Study? What about program-specific benchmarks.
- What are the benchmarks? Can you briefly explain?
- Capstone requirements are similar to grad requirements.
- How will you balance the need to "pay" for quality with the desire to achieve savings?
 - This is a really important question—lots of stars!
 - Indeed, very important!
- Need to share existing budget information with departments, faculty, and staff. As is done in the public business sector in "open book, tell them it all" firms. Then go from there.
- Disciplines that require lab or field work are going to be more costly by their very nature. Therefore, the "comparison to external benchmarks" part is quite important. Are all "student credit hours" created the same?

#2: "Identify program-specific SCH/FTE vs GE/other non-program-specific SCH/FTE, using the spreadsheet provided by the Office of Institutional Research. This exercise involves classifying each course section offered, (and in the process, the SCH and FTE associated with that section) as primarily program-specific or primarily non program-specific. Provide comments or clarification as appropriate."

- What does "SCH" mean? Response: "Student Credit Hours"

- This question is too wordy.
 - I agree—wordy and unclear.
- I don't understand this question at all.
- *Holy Buckets!* Question is unintelligible!
- The spreadsheet will make it clear, right?
- What IS the question?
- "...Primarily program-specific or primarily non-program-specific..." this is the key question.
- In some programs it is totally appropriate for courses to serve both GE students and majors. How do we separate the data out?
- MUCH too wordy -- I can't figure out what is being asked.

#3: "Discuss the importance to the university, in terms of mission centrality, quality and incremental cost, of any majors, emphases, or certificates producing fewer than 12 undergraduate or 9 graduate students per year."

- How about the importance to the region/state? Consider the University mission.
 - Yes
 - Yes—a great comment.
- "Importance to the university" sounds self-serving. Reword?
- You are asking about mission centrality and quality in the cost section?
- Are they offered anywhere else? Where? In Wisconsin? Is the program unique (truly unique) in any way?
- Why restrict only to majors, emphases. We should include minors.
 - Especially since minors are required as part of the university experience (generally).
 - Yes!
- Regional demand for specific majors—albeit with smaller numbers—must be considered. Public health is one of these essential programs.
- Questions 3 and 4 are getting at something, but what? They appear to be leading Why not take a more objective approach like: if there are any programs with fewer than ..., then explain why those programs remain important. Or something like that.

#4: "Discuss the importance to the university, in terms of mission centrality, quality and incremental cost, of any classes offered in sections smaller than 12 students at the undergraduate level, or 9 students at the graduate level."

- Consider also immediate community, city and state.
 - Yes
 - To community, region, society and the world
- How were the numbers 12 and 9 chosen? What fraction of classes would be in these categories?
- How are we evaluating the impact of adjuncts (low cost per class credit hour) on full programs and majors? We need to rethink our sometimes heavy dependence on adjuncts.
 - Not all adjuncts are the same—some are better than others!

- Also consider accreditation standards for various programs,.
 - Definitely!
 - Yes!

I Academic Criteria

D. Opportunity

#1: "Discuss opportunities within your program to align with and contribute to the goals of the UWEC Centennial Plan, if resources could be allocated to these opportunities via

1) purely internally reallocation

2) additional resources through campus reallocation

3) new external revenue generated by the program

- Good. Clear question.

•

#2: "Discuss the impact on the program and the program's ability to contribute to the mission of the university and the vision of the Centennial plan of a 1.0 FTE reduction to your program's teaching resources.

- Question 2 is good, but you'll only get defensive answers like "it can't be done!" How about asking it this way: "Explain how your program would be modified to continue to contribute to"
- Scary question
- Present mission is pretty much disconnected from the Centennial Plan, also vague, general and directionless. For this to work, we need a new mission statement aligned with the Centennial Plan.
- "Opportunity" should be positive. A 1.0 FTE reduction is NOT positive. A question 3 should be "discuss the impact on program of a 1.0 FTE increase to complement the 1.0 FTE reduction.
- I certainly don't see a reduction of 1.0 fte as any type of "opportunity." If you want us to answer this question, how about another question as to how your program could be enhanced by a 1.0 fte addition. This would be an opportunity!

II. Administrative & Service Units Criteria

A. Mission Centrality

#1: *“The purpose (mission), goals, and outcomes of the unit and its services are clearly defined and support the mission of UWEC in general and the goals of the strategic plan in particular.”*

- “Goals of the strategic plan” implies the services of a unit must support all the goals of the strategic plan.
- I am glad that you used the words “in general” because most of the administrative units do not support the UWEC mission directly.
 - They don’t?
 - I don’t agree with this statement.
 - Ditto
 - Ditto
 - Is supporting students central to our mission—I hope so!
- You need to give units a little time to absorb the new strategic plan and get aligned with it. This process is happening right on the heels of the strategic plan going public and now people will be embroiled in PEEQ. Not enough time to get aligned with the Centennial Plan quite yet.
 - Great point!
- Are you asking a question or asking me to respond to a statement??
- Add “one or more of” to “the goals of the strategic plan in particular.
- Service units did not get much input into the goals of the strategic plan.

#2: *“The program or certain functions within the program are required by law, by System mandate or by university policy.”*

- Use “unit” instead of “program.”
- Have them indicate which body made the requirement.
- Define University policy. It is actually a policy or is it a long-standing practice?
 - Ditto
 - Good point!
 - Where are they and who interprets? Interpretation of policies/laws can be (and are) different depending upon who is asked.

#3: *“The unit supports the Eau Claire region in ways appropriate to the mission of the unit and the university.”*

- What?
- “Appropriate”—can you find another word?
 - “Supporting?” “Help to achieve?”
 - Ditto for “supporting”
 - “Align with” rather than appropriate?
 - I like this!
 - “Complementary?”
 - I like this word as apposed to “appropriate”

- Our unit's focus and mission are inherently focused internally. We would have a very hard time answering this question, as it is not our goal to support the EC region.
- Can and should all units seeks to support the region?
- Maybe "impact" on the region?
- Be sure to get assessment of "how well" the support is being provided and what alternatives, such as outsourcing, exist.

#4: "The demand and/or need for this unit and its services are clear; that is, there would be consequences if the function no longer existed. (Indicate key users and how this has changed or will change).

- Great question. Needs to be included.
 - Agreed. Now how to get an unbiased answer?
- Honestly now.... Who is going to say "no" to this? You will get no meaningful information, just turf-defense.
 - Exactly, however some feature or subset of services might not be needed. How will this be identified and eliminated?
- Ask: What would be the consequence if the unit/program/function no longer existed?
- We need the category "unintended consequences" by actions taken. And today, each unit seems to be an entity of its own, with little or no input, regardless how difficult some things are. There is widespread lack of understanding about workloads.

II Administrative and Service Units Criteria

B. Quality

#1: "The quality of the unit and its services and/or programs (including user satisfaction) are assessed regularly and the results indicate that the program is a quality one. Please include the most recent results.

- "quality" should be "valued"
- "quality" – could be "of high value and quality"
- "quality" — What does this mean exactly? Who decides what constitutes "high quality"?
- Instead of "quality" how about "effective"?
 - ditto
- What's the method of evaluation to be used?
- Shouldn't the "unit" be able to compare itself to units at other institutions just like departments?
- What if students aren't satisfied but they're still learning what we want them to? Are they just customers?
- Who does the assessment? Some units interact with the community. Should this be an assessment component?
- The program is a quality one? Well, is it useful, necessary, does it achieve goals? May be better to ask if it is goal-centered and achieves goals in a quality way.
- Why not just ask for a list of all assessments?

- Politics land not performance may drive assessment???

#2: *“The unit regularly assesses its weak areas and addresses them where possible.”*

- Regularly assesses all areas and addresses weaknesses? How do you know which are your weak areas or areas that are degrading?
 - Agree
 - I agree
 - Also agree
 - Definitely!
 - Ditto
- By “assess” do you mean formal or informal assessment?
 - Should be both! Formal assessment isn’t always possible, cost effective, timely, etc. Some data, even informal, is better than no data.
- Instead of “address” what about “corrects” or “improves”?
- Is this a self-assessment or survey of people you serve?
 - Should be both.
- Add “if any” after “assesses its weak areas”
- We have two questions on assessment and zero on the plan. How about something that asks for objectives and how well we are meeting them?
- Regularly—ongoing? Yearly? Could be very time and resource intensive.
- “Address”? Not solving or actually doing, we can address all the time with no action steps. Ask about the action steps and “addressing.”

#3: *“The program has innovative programming and services that support students and staff in a way that is in keeping with the strategic plan. List what you consider the major accomplishments of this program over the last several years.”*

- The word “program” should be “unit” since a unit can provide many programs.
 - Agreed
- Describe what you mean by “list”
- An example might be helpful
- Great suggestions. Describe, not list.
- There are innovative programs and valuable evidence-based programs—perhaps we should have an opportunity to speak to both.
 - Yes, innovative may just be an “in vogue” question.
- You could omit “innovative” and/or ask a separate question on non-innovative programming. Maybe the innovative is more important for students.
- Not sure about this—was criticized for saying “someone will help” you with this. Communication was one way.

#4 *“The unit demonstrates efforts toward equity, diversity and inclusivity through its mission, the quality of its work and resource allocation.”*

- What is meant by “quality of its work”?
 - How about “results” instead of “quality or impact”?
 - Agree

- Aren't we trying to assess quality? This presumes the services of the unit are already "quality" Instead of quality, how about outcomes?
- Who defines "quality" and what does it mean exactly?
- In my opinion, this question is so vague that I don't understand what's being asked. I think in its current form, it will either a) generate "fluff" or b) people zoom in on *one* thing and disregard the other two. The question is unclear.
 - Yes, I'm not sure everyone would agree on what those three terms mean unless they are defined more clearly.
- Reword the question. How about: Describe how the unit demonstrates intention and action to be inclusive, equitable and incorporates diversity in its decision making?
- Equity of compensation—a huge issue regarding LTEs and classified employees doing the same job.
 - Way to tokenize efforts. Can't we get beyond this to the next level?
- What about the equity of classified/academic staff. This is a stupid distraction which is a major problem in the UW System!

#5: *"This program compares well against standard benchmarks."*

- Define "well" Does this just mean above average? What are we measuring to get these results, ie., which benchmarks?
- There may not be clear choices for "standard benchmarks" in some units.
 - Agree
- Units need assistance to define/research standard benchmarks for their area. This data may be hard to find for some units.
 - Excellent point
 - Agreed! Can we get resources to purchase national benchmarking instruments?
 - Yes!
 - Yes, we need access to the costly materials
- How are "standard benchmarks" –or just benchmarks in general—defined?
- Whose standard benchmarks?
- Apples to apples comparisons are extremely difficult.
 - I agree with the above comment. Big concern trying to compare to other campuses where service and quality may vary.
 - I agree.
- Unique programs rarely have standard benchmarks, e.g., FYE "infusion" model does not seem to have any comparison programs.
- It is hard to compare some units to standards as each university deals with some things differently.
- Looks like training/facilitation/support for benchmarking and competitive comparison is required. A major opportunity area in the business world.

#6: *"The unit collaborates with other units and/or departments on campus on a regular basis in ways that benefit its constituencies."*

- Define "regular basis."

- The unit is seen as welcoming to requests for new or changing services as opposed to stuck in a rut and resistant to change or new needs.
- Describe interdisciplinary/collaborative efforts.
- Give examples of constituencies?
- The word “constituencies” is tossed around a lot these days—how do we *define* it? Too vague.
- Does the unit also benefit all students? Every unit should be working not just toward its constituencies, but all students, even the ones it does not directly serve.
- It might be a great time to address the question: Can a service unit also “teach.” Is that role solely reserved for “academics”? Collaboration might be defined as a blend of teaching expertise service/academic.

#7: *“The individuals within this unit have the appropriate credentials and engage in professional development.”*

- How do you ensure that they are retooling to meet a changing environment as opposed to participating in professional development in an area that is a personal area of expertise, but may no longer be vital to the mission?
 - I agree.
 - Perhaps you could ask if there are individual professional development plans that assure that all staff members are contributing to today’s mission and will be able to contribute to the changing mission.
 - I agree.
 - Yes
 - Agree
 - Good!
 - Yes, professional development should relate to Centennial Plan.
- Define “credentials.” Classified staff are not required to have a certain level of education for their jobs, for example.
 - Not always true!
- Perhaps add the word “job-related” or “value adding” before the words “professional development.”
- Who determines “appropriate credentials?” What does that mean?
- *Remove* distinction between classified/academic staff.
- How does funding affect professional development? There are many opportunities but some don’t participate because of lack of university/personal funds.
- How often do they need to engage in professional development and how is that defined?
- Engage in professional development but are also encouraged and supported to develop skills to a higher level. Professional development is only as strong as the supervisor who supports it.
- Add question relating to the fact that not all employees qualify for Professional Development grants (LTEs cannot apply for a ORSP grant, which is the only way my department could afford to send me to something)
 - “How are you limited in your search for professional development

opportunities. Are equally opportunities provided to all employees -- if not, why?"

II Administrative and Service Units Criteria

C. Cost

General comments about Cost criteria:

- Concerns about what comparisons units can make about their costs. Not every unit has access to relevant national standards
- Student Affairs has copies of the CAS standards (recognized for many units in Student Affairs) that can be used.
- It would be helpful to break out the budget information so that subunits within departments/units can be pictured.
- Useful to provide a template for the organization chart needed for the Appendix.
- Where can we show how many units, programs, departments, etc. we support across campus?
- Comparing to other universities will be very difficult because each of UW System school structures the services we provide very differently. There also is a huge difference in the quality of the services they provide. Quality needs to be considered when judging against the cost.

#1: *"The unit provides services that are unique within the university or, if performed elsewhere, do not duplicate the service or services."*

- Unique within the community?
- Question is not clear. You'll get responses all over the map.
 - This is not a very clear question!
- Are you asking if outsourcing is an option?
- Does "elsewhere" refer to *within* the university/campus or elsewhere in the EC community?
- Are they collaborative with other departments or units or could they be?
- Is there ever a time when duplication is justifiable or necessary?
- Add "...or, if *similar services* are performed elsewhere,..."
- I think the question is clear as is with addition of words "similar services are," above.
- Good question.

#2: *"Compared to similar universities or national benchmarks, the program is cost effective."*

- Similar universities? Or do you mean similar units?
 - Or both?
- Difficult to find national benchmarks.
- Difficult to find benchmark information that relates to a particular unit—compare apples to apples.

- Regarding “national benchmarks,” many people don’t know about CAS standards, which would be helpful.
- Does the unit assist other units in using fewer resources? Dollars and/or FTE?
- What about units that share facilities/staff?
- How do you compare? Not all universities are equal, for example, UWEC vs Stout.
 - Amen!
 - Not all offer the same or similar programs within each unit
- Appropriate benchmarks would need to be identified, accessed and interpreted in order for units to answer this question. Can we get help to identify these?
- Add “...Compared to *programs in similar universities...*”
- May be very difficult to find FYI “fusion” model. It is unique and only 7 public universities in the nation have service-learning graduation requirement.
- Does quality matter? Services offered at low cost may equal less quality.
- The model may be unique to UWEC, then how do we compare?

#3: *“The program has made efforts within the last five years to cut costs or operate more efficiently and has examined ways to improve efficiency in the future.”*

- Add “How has...” to the beginning of this question.
 - This would be good to do.
- For those programs that were “required” to contribute to State deficits—does that count?
 - It should count.
- If the program was required to make cuts, has there been a negative impact?
 - Lots of stars for this comment
- What were the results of these costs? Were there unintended negative outcomes? Did students suffer or were the cuts effective? We don’t want cuts at the detriment of students.
 - Agree
- Some nod given to success in obtaining outside funding for existing or new programs.

Cost: Additional Questions

- The "additional questions" listed should be moved to the opportunities section since they can't be evaluated. They are speculative.

#4: *“Would it be more efficient and/or effective if certain functions within the program were performed elsewhere in the university? Could certain functions be consolidated or eliminated? Are there ways in which technology could help your unit be more efficient?”*

- Good questions.
- Service sometimes is better if offices know what others are doing.
- Each unit needs to check for duplication. If some is found then it should be dealt with, either combine or eliminate.
- Additional question: If technology would help, how could resources be distributed to tech providers to support the efficiency?

- Might be better to ask how technology is used now.
- Add “reorganized” to: “could certain functions be consolidated, eliminated or *reorganized*?”
- I would also look at if there is duplication, why is there duplication? And does it benefit the program to do so.
 - And if so, why or why not?
- What would you require in financial and HR resources to do this? Or training?
- Additional LTS support for increased technology?
- How about recognized duplication of services, something our area does that another area does as well?
- The Chancellor’s area could stop sending employees from their area to others where costs are transferred. Then areas are forced to develop job duties previously done, often more efficiently and more cost effective. Management needs to take supervisory responsibilities more seriously.
- Technology could help units. We have made a request for nationally recognized software, which was denied. We are currently working with our third student worker in LTS in three years to develop a similar type of database. LTS is strained. Some students are very talented, while others are still learning. After three years, we still don’t have a new database. It is also unclear who will support it if it is created.
- Need objective assessment of “customer satisfaction” for administrative and support units. Surveys, focus groups—important to understand missions of these groups and support them to avoid pockets of college/department developing duplicate capabilities.

#5: “*What would the consequences be if services within the unit were outsourced?*”

- The word “consequences” conveys something bad or negative. What if this question were reworded? What benefits could be realized if services (some or all) within the unit were outsourced?
- If quality goes down, wouldn’t outlook too?
- This would be a difficult question for people to answer honestly. Nobody wants to lose his or her job!
- What would it cost?
- Outsourcing consequences: people lose employment; unit loses control of quality & cost; unit expends resources if it intends to monitor cost and quality of outsourcing. Unit must continually be engaged to monitor and accept consequences and liability if outsourced service fails. Cost to outsource has potential to increase in cost and unit could end up paying more than initially contracted.
- Outsourcing is anti-American and outsourcing should not even be considered.
 - I agree! Enough out-sourcing. Look how that’s turned out in 21st century America.
- Unit would lose connections of what is done by whom with jobs being outsourced.

- Custodial Services: decreased cleanliness level and intangibles not done, ie, unlock a door, clean up a spill.
 - Decreased cleanliness has already happened to a very noticeable degree
 - Not in Schofield
- Fleet rental pool: Could use enterprise travel costs may increase but would reduce resources needed to operate this auxiliary.
- Our shop has lost 6 FTE over the last 8 years and the people have been stretched to breaking point and get very frustrated with the lack of help. I don't know if we can take any more cuts. When it comes to outsourcing, all these workers have experienced cleaning up after contractors, which adds more cost to the taxpayers. We care to do the best job possible, the outsourcing we find is 100% get in/get out and make as much money as possible!
- This question might be difficult to answer because the answer might vary depending on what company the service would be outsourced to. Some companies might still effectively meet our students' needs while others might fall short.
- Employees often mirror the activities of those above them.
- My experience with current contractors has not been positive. I am thinking of travel contracts where UWEC is one of many clients and contract isn't always meeting our needs. Need to look at outsourcing very carefully. There must be a consequence if the contractor does provide service in a timely manner.
- Obviously a topic of high interest. Suggest the *Good to Great* approach. 1) What are we passionate about? 2) What are we great at doing? 3) What fuels our resource engine? *Good to Great* and *The Social Sectors* provides insight for this.

#6: "What additional uncontrollable costs do you foresee occurring for your program in the next two to five years?"

- What could be done to ameliorate costs?
- Fuel and all materials related, ie de-icer and fertilizer.
- Transportation costs for *everything*.
 - Ditto
- Heating, water, electricity, gas costs. Freight costs for equipment ordered.
- Not always "foreseen"
- PeopleSoft
 - Yes, don't know yet how this will affect us.
- Building codes, Hilltop basement
- Provisions set aside to assist with "uncontrollable costs"
- Minimum wage for students—especially for departments that employ 50+ and 100+ students.
- Criminal background checks and extra HR fee!
 - Agree!
- Travel costs erode budgets

#7: “If your budget were cut by 5% (not including benefits), how would this affect the units’ constituencies?”

- We’ve cut budgets by 5% at least twice before—always affected students.
- Are you asking academic departments the same question?
 - Ditto!
 - Ditto
- We would need to cut services.
- Need to answer this question in terms of “internal customer satisfaction” and achieving over-arching mission.
- Decrease in operational ability.
- Does “benefits” refer specifically to fringe benefits for staff?
 - Benefits includes salaries
- What if the unit was eliminated? Don’t just ask what if it was cut.
- This question may give some people the wrong impression. Are across-the-board cuts planned?
- Pros/cons of across the board cuts... OR cut some programs more? Which programs?
- How would student services suffer? Would students have to travel off campus more?

Appendices:

- Good idea to attach an organizational chart
 - Org charts are a great idea—consider prescribing a format and provide training on how to complete the chart.
 - Provide the electronic template for the org chart
- Where can we show how many units, programs, departments, etc. we support across campus?
- Should position descriptions be included too?
- Would departments served be aware of possibilities so they can be given an opportunity to assess possible changes on their services?
- I don't see the point in Appendix C. Why include a satisfaction survey? Do we really think we'll get anything other than "I'm totally satisfied!"?? What purpose would that serve, and won't it require extra effort to obtain? Given the MASS of questions being asked, this could easily be dropped without too much loss.
- What about measures other than satisfaction? Sometimes students don’t know what they don’t know...even if they don’t like it, it may be useful/good/beneficial for them. What about a focus on student learning?
- Are the units expected to conduct formal satisfaction surveys this fall and, if so, how should they be formatted and conducted?
 - Will the University be deluged with user satisfaction surveys this fall? If so, will the many surveys get adequate responses to provide useful data?
- You ask for survey results for the unit—for the *whole* unit or for every program in the unit?
- Why are LTEs not give comparable compensation to classified employees doing the exact same job?

- How do you justify this when they do the same job? Is it discrimination?
- What will the satisfaction data be used for? Are we going to serve our students as customers?
- Determining satisfaction means first identifying who is our “customer”—this may be students or other administrative units or...
- Budget sheet needs to have subcategories (especially under supplies) i.e., everyone has office supplies, equipment, computers, travel. Putting them all together is not “transparent.”
- In classified staff positions, there should be more standardization. Where 5 or more individuals supposedly perform similar duties. There seem to be few advocates for classified staff and workloads or those with problems have nowhere to go.

II Administrative and Service Units Criteria

D. Opportunity

#1: “What specific plans that would not require additional funding does your unit have for the next two to five years that would improve your program and/or support the strategic plan?”

- Possible consolidation of campus recycling to reduce waste. Collaboration with others who deal with waste stream. Possibly collect compost to reduce landfill material.
 - yes
- Good question.
- Great question
- Good question. More collaboration with other departments would be valuable and not necessarily cost more. Needs to be valued by everyone for it to work, though.
- Outside funding is great, but it often comes with a match (cash or inkind) requirements and it tends to go away. Could ask about sustainability of programs supported by outside funding.

#2: “Are there additional revenue generating possibilities? Do you know of other campuses that fund this function differently?”

- Encourage “out of the box” thinking: sponsorships? Partnerships with non-university entities, etc.
- Is there any easy way to determine what other campuses are doing?
 - Yes, this should be centralized. Administrative/service units should be provided with data as the departments are by IR.
 - Second this
- What are the limited imposed by UW-System? (For example, use of lab fees) or used differently among campuses?
- We need more help from the Foundation to develop these opportunities.
- Do the possibilities support the mission/plan? Are they in the best interests of students?
- Consider where the revenue would be coming from so as to not further burden students with increased costs.

- Yes
- Agreed!
- Yes
- Amen!
- Definitely!!

#3: *“What changes, either in responsibilities or costs do you anticipate affecting your unit as a result of University policies, UW System mandates, laws or other uncontrollable “forces”?”*

- Add federal & state laws.
 - I agree
- The challenge is knowing future mandates and policies.
- System-wide travel policies seem to be forcing higher than readily attained plane fares from other providers.
- Elimination of 15 passenger vans means a possible doubling of travel expenses.
- Losing quality staff because of salary and advancement constraints.

#4: *“What are your peers at other institutions doing that you think we should be doing?”*

- Add “and why?”
- Who is “we”? Is it “your unit”?
- By “institutions” do you mean just other UW ones??
- How do we identify and poll our peers in an appropriate/useful manner?
 - Yes, how can this be done effectively and efficiently?
 - Can this be centralized in the IR office?
 - What ARE peers doing and at what cost?
- Good question! Also what are considered to be the “best practices” in your field?

#5: *“If you could start fresh and totally restructure the program (and/or your department), how would you do it?”*

- Great question.
 - 2nd that!
 - Agreed!
 - Good question
 - Great!
 - Ditto
- What might you outsource?
- Does this question mean "describe the process of restructuring" or "describe the new structure"?
- I like this question.

#6: *“If you were given additional resources, how would you use them to support the strategic plan and make your unit exemplary (or even more exemplary)?”*

- Add additional resources and space
- Great question!
- Or unique?

- Or distinguish your unit?
- More “effective”
- Good question
- Some units do not need additional resources but efficiency.
- For a department/unit that operates out of 3 to 4 different buildings, physical cohesiveness is impossible. Thus having an area that all part of the unit can operate out of would be great.
- Good question

Additional Comments Received

What would you say in today's business world, if you averaged over 30 hours per week on your job, received an hourly wage with possible health care benefits, but were totally denied any sick days, holiday pay, or vacation time? That scenario would not allow you, as an employee, to be sick or to enjoy a holiday or vacation, because of your reduced paycheck that would become a hardship later in the month/year.

This scenario plays out for many people in Wisconsin not in some abstract company -but at Universities all across the state. These employees are labeled "Limited Term Employees" or "LTEs", meaning that their jobs are for a "limited" time period and they therefore don't qualify for sick days, holiday pay, or vacation time. The big problem with that is many of the LTE positions are permanent and by no means "limited". Some LTE positions have been in place for years, with no end in sight.

How does the University system in Wisconsin get by with this injustice? They keep using "Limited Term" even though it has no relevance and they tout the "State Exam" as the answer - meaning if you take the State Exam, you can qualify for a "Classified" position, which gives you ALL the benefits. The problem is that many of the LTEs have taken the State Exam many times, have waited to see what's available, and STILL hope for something to change. In the meantime, they are working side by side with classified personnel and others, who are enjoying their paychecks despite being sick, or taking off a holiday or using vacation time. That makes for a frustrating and plain lousy work environment. The fact that they may like their current job is irrelevant, since it is so overshadowed by the term "LTE" and everything it stands for.

The University of Wisconsin System as a whole should be ashamed of itself! It continues to coast on the backs of many hard working "LTEs", who have given their time and been devoted employees. Madison needs to take the lead in righting this injustice - sooner than later. (They are working on it!) All UW campuses need to address this discriminatory situation! As another year rolls around, LTEs would like a paid vacation too and a new name, because they are NOT LIMITED TERM EMPLOYEES!

Universities of Wisconsin play fair, pay fair!