Report of the Faculty Representative  
Friday, November 15, 2013

The faculty representatives met on Friday, November 15th in Madison. There was significant discussion about the disparities across the campuses in terms of equity and pay plans over the last two years.

It appears all of the other rental text campuses are struggling with the question of how to work with e-books and other textbook systems that require students to have some version of a registration code to get access to the e-texts. It looks like we will discuss this again in the future to get more direct comparisons across campuses.

There was also some discussion about how to address issues of non-attending Senate members. It appears most other campuses have policies that either allow for alternates and also have policies that require/allow the Senate chair to call upon departments to appoint new senators if attendance is an issue.

The search for the new system president is moving forward and they hope to announce the finalist list in early January.

There is a new committee being put together to examine the 30-credit transfer process from the technical colleges. There are still some significant issues regarding the content of the courses at the technical colleges.

System also wanted to remind the campuses that how pay plans are distributed is entirely a campus-level issue. So, if a campus wanted to exclude NITR contracts from a pay plan, they would be allowed to do so. They also noted that system is no longer reviewing/approving pay plans.

There was some discussion of the GPR/Tuition allocation model. Essentially we were told that someone came up with a campus tuition allocation model back in the late 1970s and it has NEVER been adjusted or re-examined at anything more than a superficial level. This is, of course, deeply encouraging for future budgets.

UW-System is putting together a remediation task force to examine how the campuses handle remedial work. It appears there is substantial variation from one campus to another in terms of how the placement exam scores are used. Mark Nook provided an example where, using the same distribution of scores, one campus standard was such that 7% of the students needed math remediation, while the standard on a different campus would put 44% of the students in remediation.

There were several minor issues brought up across the meeting, including:

- There are ongoing discussions about expanding the supervisor training outside of the mandatory classified staff training sessions.
- We ONCE AGAIN talked to the system administration about the question of whether or not we can allow faculty to spread out their 9-month salaries over 12 months, and we were ONCE AGAIN told it was “under investigation” by system.