Morning Session: Discussion among Faculty Representatives

Faculty Rep AGENDA ITEMS (morning and afternoon sessions):

- **UW-System’s New Personnel System:** updates since Thursday's BOR meeting [http://web.uwsa.edu/personnelsystems/](http://web.uwsa.edu/personnelsystems/)

  At Board of Regents announced that many stakeholders were being involved across the campuses. To some, this was a surprise. The timeline on the system site has stakeholder input, Phase IV, starting in June – is this ideal for faculty input? The language about the personnel system states that the information is to be brought to governance groups for input, but is that really happening? It was mentioned that there is a possibility that Classified Staff might become part of governance. UW Madison faculty, by the nature of working with just the one campus, is involved in the creation of the new personnel system as much as desired. Overall, there are many items being discussed and we do need to be vigilant about watching what is being discussed. Green Bay faculty was informed that the meetings were being considered “closed meetings”. Another campus reported it was allowed to have additional people at one of the group meetings and even sent a substitute to the meeting. Representation was discussed. Since some of the working groups have only one faculty member on the committee, it was seen by the other faculty reps that the one faculty member MUST be a representative of ALL faculty across the state and keep all the other faculty informed. I was cautious to commit our particular faculty members on these System committees to representing and communicating to ALL faculty in the system. I will mention this to the committee reps and encourage them to work with Geoff Peterson (our faculty rep to UW System) to communicate with all the other faculty.

- ** Classified Staff Councils**

  Some campuses have created Classified Staff Councils, but have been very careful not to state that the councils are part of governance as Chapter 36 does not at this time recognize Classified Staff in the governance process.

- **“Paperwork” and Documentation now Required by the new HRS System for faculty search committees**

  In the colleges there seems to be a lot more paperwork involved in the Talent Acquisition Module (TAM) searches. Milwaukee uses AIMS – a program for searches. The impression is the TAM system reduces the clerical side work, but GREATLY increases the paperwork for the local department's recruitment committee. Updates and training will be provided by the UW Service Center. See: [http://www.wisconsin.edu/olit/cio/Minutes/02_12min.htm](http://www.wisconsin.edu/olit/cio/Minutes/02_12min.htm)

- **Update on the Redesigning of Madison’s New Personnel System and Madison faculty perspectives**

  At the Board Meeting yesterday, it appeared Madison is actually “on the ball” and the University Committee at Madison is pleased with the level of faculty input – even though the rest of the faculty at Madison may not be aware of the details of what is happening and are not directly involved in the issues. Madison’s HR group has been deliberate to consider diversity issues in the planning.

- **Merit Systems**

  If a top-heavy system (thru the new HRS) comes into place, what will be the effect on compensation/merit processes? At the BoR meeting, the use of performance reviews was mentioned many times. This is part of the possible flexibilities. It has not been very clear about where the sources come from. It is very murky. Many reps reported that even though they have identified money pools, they were told nothing could be done. Some heard “if and when” you are given money, then “maybe” you can do something. Some campuses are hearing “don’t” move forward with extra pay plans at this time, but maybe you can do something next biennium. Regardless, OSER must approve any plan. Madison has been operating under the impression it can go ahead with merit plans funded differently, but the Madison Chancellor says “no” at this time. We really haven’t been given any flexibility to do anything at this time. Apparently a memo from DOA came out that was interpreted as squelching the idea of supplemental pay plans at this time.

- **Online administration of Student Evaluations of Instruction**

  Anyone having success doing student evaluations online? One campus reported a 10 day to 2-week window to complete the surveys. Completion rate has been similar to the in-class completion rates. Another campus has a committee looking into this – especially since there are online courses. Variety of ideas was shared – nothing used is “ideal” at this time.

- **Joint Session of Faculty Reps and Academic Staff Reps in May meeting**

  Would be very beneficial for the two groups to get together and share perspectives with one another – especially at this time. This meeting would be without System Administration. It would be nice to meet and discuss the future and the role of Academic Staff on our campuses.

**11:00 – 12:30 JOINT SESSION: Academic Staff/Faculty Reps and UW System**

- **Update on Program Planning & Review Working Group** (Stephen Kolison)

  System-wide group looking at all policies and processes involved in reviewing degree programs – working since January – to present recommendations to System and the Board. Currently, ready to go with the planning phase – streamlined to about a 2-month process and not a lot of System involvement after that 2-months. The entitlement
process is also streamlined and about a 5-month process; about 5-7 page document – NOT a large involved document. Committee is under major discussion on the breakdown of the responsibilities of the campus, UW System, and the Regents. The overall impression of the committee work (by a faculty member on that working group) was that it has been a good working group and has good representation across the system. To get a maximum benefit from this new document that will be produced at the System Level, it is recommended that each campus take a look at each set of internal campus processes to streamline it further. Also – that each campus take the changes through the faculty governance process. Also requesting that the Provosts have discussions and support the changes in both the campus process and the system streamlined process. Question: Are the Regents on board with these changes? Still trying to figure out the details of the responsibilities of the Board. For example, the 5-year campus/Board review of a program currently comes before a Board of Regents that contains a very different membership than the membership of the Board that originally approved the degree. The responsibility for Program Planning comes from Chapter 36 to keep cost down and reduce duplication. In the past, Board delegates to UW System and System to Academic Affairs/Provosts. President Reilly assured Legislature that System’s role will be reduced and focused on ‘array planning’, not ‘quality planning’ which will be the responsibility of each campus. Something for campuses to review should be available at the next Reps meeting. QUESTION: Does the scope include new majors? Response: Some majors that have been around for years go through an expedited process and go straight to entitlement.

- **HR Issues** (Al Crist, Associate VP for HR & Workforce Diversity)
  [http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb/UW_Task_Force/Pages/default.aspx](http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb/UW_Task_Force/Pages/default.aspx)

Things hopefully made clear:
- Not recreating a whole new management system
- Want to be sure governance groups are being involved
- Recommendations are being compiled this month and those drafts will go out to governance groups yet this semester before a preliminary draft is shared with the Board in June
- Then opportunity for more feedback from governance groups before presentation to the Board in December
- Some technical items that need to be completed. Substantive changes in how we recommend pay plans go forward in the future. Want to get away from the 2-step process of going through OSCER and JOCER. The plan that the Board sends forward would include the compensation plans and that overall budget request would be the one going forward for compensation and other things. This is a BIG DEAL, a BIG CHANGE. The Regents have wanted this for a long time and was in the Competitive Workforce Plan accepted by the Board previously. This feature was left out of the last Legislative Budget. We hope it is approved going forward. We can develop these personnel systems, but if the Board does not have the authority to approve these compensation plans, the Board won’t have the authority to do what needs to be done. The idea is that compensation dollars will be part of the authorized block grants awarded to each campus. Hopefully, campuses will have maximum flexibility to decide how to spend the resources at their campus. Pay plan dollars given to a campus are based on a percent of the payroll. Madison only gets more dollars because it has a bigger payroll. Remember, the legislature still has to approve this plan to use block grants. On July 1, 2013 won’t have any authority to allocate discretionary dollars for merit purposes unless statutory changes are made. System is recommending (1) flexibility to use funds however deemed appropriate and (2) authority for the Board to approve compensation plans without going through JOCER and OSCER. System doesn’t want to have a Supplemental Pay Plan in place as that would need to go through JOCER. This year, we don’t know where those dollars would come from. In the future, any Supplemental Pay Plan ‘dollars’ should just be incorporated in the regular compensation plans. No need for an additional Supplemental on top of the compensation plan. Suggest campuses put a process in place to review everyone’s salary on a given cycle – so market adjustments and other adjustments could be addressed (but not all at once for everyone).
- Concern for the timeline – what is going to be expected from the governance groups? Hoping in April to get some drafts out for comments – a high level review. We didn’t want to miss the opportunity for faculty review yet this semester. There should be about a month and a half for review and input to that draft before it is presented in draft form to the Regents in June. REP: Concern for the communication process and how people will be able to understand what is going on and the implications of the changes in order for people to be informed before responding to the drafts. This is a very massive process. There is a lot of suspicion, paranoia, and fear. There isn’t a short cut for talking to people. What rights do reps have for supplementing the communication process proposed by HR director’s on campuses? RESPONSE: As a practical matter, should always coordinate with your campus HR director. REP: What are we expecting for the outcomes of the process and how these outcomes will relate to the processes and procedures we already have on campuses? RESPONSE: If you have not been doing so already, this will give campuses the opportunity to look at how things are processed at your campuses, improve them, and eventually share best practices with other campuses. REP: Part of the scariness is the possible opening of Chapter 36. RESPONSE: We need to open up part of Chapter 36 to address the compensation issues previously discussed. Those changes will take place between now and when the budget will be passed for 2013-2015. Hope is that if other changes need to be made, they will take place at the Regent and campus levels. There is no attempt on System’s part to open up Chapter 36 in any other broader way. REP:
When Chapter 36 is opened up, legislators often have their own opinions and can take the discussions in a different direction. Other REP: They have always been able to do that.
- Optimistic those technical changes will be ready to go by July 2013 – but unsure if the pay plan changes will be approved by then.
- "May multiples" are on target to have the "multiples" distributed across additional pay checks. REP: Given the great news that "May multiples" are progressing, will 12 paychecks be forthcoming? RESPONSE: That concept is on the table and may be discussed after the other changes are implemented.

**Legislative Update (Dave Giroux, Executive Director of Communications and External Relations)**
- Yesterday Posters in the Rotunda. Lots of Legislators met with the students and tried desperately to understand the students’ research projects.
- Couple of Regent openings that are soon to be filled.
- AB 318 – rehired annuitants. The version that has survived and amended includes a waiting period of 75 days. An additional amendment refers to an exemption of those not funded through GPR – but unsure how that affects us. Still not sure if it will make it through.
- AB 382? – Accessibility of instructional materials – to protect the intellectual rights of the publishers, but for faculty to have access to the materials. Once one institution changes the traditional format into an accessible form, the institution can share with the rest of the universities and the technical colleges. On textbook rental systems, students only need to show proof of the rental fee in order to access the instructional materials.
- AB 558 – Read to Lead – provisions within it dealing with the evaluation of teacher prep programs. Not the Bill we would have asked for, but better than it began. Now, the method by which the teachers are evaluated is left to a collaborative process for development. The Department of Public Instruction supports the bill.
- AB 539 - Optional Retirement Plans bill – Bill still out there. It came up again at the Legislature Task Force (including the author of the bill). People working on the bill expressed interest in some type of “hold harmless” language to allow the University to transfer to WRS monies to offset the harm down to WRS by the new employee not contributing to the retirement system. Our current plan is a great recruiting plan. Currently, there is a 5-year vested period.
- Group looking into “Value added cards” – the money left on meal cards when students leave money on their cards. Where does it go? Who is using it?
- Wisconsin State Journal is looking into whether or not we have any agents in China recruiting for us and the tracking of courses taken by students and the degree transcript evaluation process. Some campuses may have multiple contacts with agents to recruit in China (but without yielding any students).
- Voter ID … new injunction for April primaries. Government Accountability Board – (not sure if students informed about this yet) – had argued that student ID’s can be used; along with new ID issued, must issue additional documentation about being enrolled. Another election coming up in June/July – but WHAT does it mean to be enrolled in June/July? System has responded. There are many definitions of what it means to be enrolled. System is NOT in the business of defining voter eligibility requirements. System is providing as much information to the GAB as possible so the GAB can make the determination of what it means to be “enrolled” during the summer timeframe.

1:00 – 1:20 Session with UW System: Mark Nook and Stephen Kolison
- Mark Nook, Interim Senior Vice President
  - HRS – where is it all going?
  - Are the subcommittee meetings open or closed? Don’t know if “legally” they are open or closed, but feeling if one wanted to attend, no one would probably say no. Technically, the meetings are not subject to Open Meeting Laws.
  - Some of the summaries are rather vague.
  - Are you aware of any efforts to bring classified staff into the governance structure? Aware that it was mentioned, but not formerly coming forward. Have not heard anything about former making it part of the structure. That would take a Chapter 36 change. Some campuses have some sort of structure that helps identify classified staff to serve on committees, etc.
  - We are concerned how fast many of the conversations at these subcommittees can quickly percolate and touch on many topics. We are concerned about communications and how well campuses are informed.
  - Is it System’s expectation that any faculty member on a subcommittee will serve as the faculty rep for all faculty sharing across the system to all faculty OR that a campus member on a subcommittee will serve as the campus rep and share to the members on that campus (including the faculty there)? Don’t know.
  - Is this result ‘set in stone’? Don’t know – but HR personnel say this will take some tweaking. The two systems being developed have many similarities, but also many differences. Both of these personnel systems ultimately MUST integrate with HRS. In years to come, we will not have to go to DOA, so we can make changes easier.
  - Does alternate forms of compensation need to be handled for individuals or for larger systems? Definitely won’t be part of the HRS system.
- What about TAM – seems to be increasing the work load for faculty – we have some concerns.
- Please clarify about the compensation packages: Is the goal to give guidelines to each campus and no longer need approval from JOCER and OSCER? Inequity differences can already be handled. Supplemental Pay Plan which Legislators said we can do, but would need to take them through JOCER – but not a good idea to say we have more money around at this time. Is possibility to use block grants, but we do not have that authority at this time. Clearly will not happen during this session. Remember, the task force is just going to put together a “paper” of recommendations. Note – a large group of inexperienced Regents (newly appointed) are on the Board at this prime time where so much is happening. In the past, Regents were often reappointed – but that isn’t going to happen this time.

- New Accountability Reports and Measuring of Faculty Productivity

What about the Faculty Productivity concept? Act 32 Accountability Report. Two accountability reports we are producing this year. One is the system-wide look that has been done in the past – Investing in Wisconsin. The State Legislature, part of Act 32, asked to specifically address certain areas – one of which is faculty productivity and report on faculty workload and student contact hours. Group working with how to collect the data in the same way and how to “pull” the data. One of the questions is to look at our “economic development activity” – how does one define that? Plan to use some antidotes for that. Some of these need to be defined and to define benchmarks! Asked us to report, but didn’t ask to say what that means – are we higher than before – lower than before? We are not going to get these done this year. I (Mark) really like to work with a 5-year trend line and figure out adequate benchmarks. We currently benchmark against each other and that is NOT appropriate. We need to take true peers. We need to take time to think about how we think about these things. As for the faculty productivity, it is broader than just student contact hours and faculty workload. How do we go about pulling data on research and scholarly activity and service activity? How is it meaningful? Looking at telling some of that story rather than setting up a database. How does one describe some of this while making comparison meaningful? (Publications – unpublished works – creative plays – and more). COMMENT: How do we get the legislators to understand that much of our research, creative activity, and service go well beyond the contract and regular workload? We should be able to record, somehow, all of this. Continued: This narrative report will have to work for this year. Then this summer, we will look at what we will need to do next. We had a short time to get all of this together. Question: Who is going to really care about these reports? Response: This is the first time that the Legislature has given us some indication as to what to report – so we are going to be the ones to work out the details of what is included. Some legislators have told us that we have included too much in the past in the accountability reports. This time they just want us to report on a few items and to alert them to ‘key points’ in the report. The list of “40 items” to be included in the Accountability Report is available.

1:20 – Continuation of Morning Session: Discussion among Faculty Reps

- What are campuses doing about defining Overloads? There has always been a $12,000 cap – which was lifted for Madison, but not for the rest of the campuses. The cap will be “lifted” for others effective July 2013. Some campuses are talking about what the term “overload” means and how it is defined.

- Our different approaches to “flexibilities” in readiness for the May meeting with the Legislative Task Force

Peter from Madison said that the hope is that different students and faculty will be able to present at the May Meeting. Be thinking about what one may want to present. Reps will discuss this at the early May meeting. Hopefully the faculty reps will get a chance to speak in front of the Legislative Task Force. Fairly certain the students will get a chance to speak, but not sure if the Reps will get a chance. [A Regent chairs the Task Force. Nick will speak with him and ask for the opportunity for the Reps to speak at the meeting. Another good reason for why Reps should attend the Regent meetings and cultivate various connections.]

- Defined Contributions or Defined Benefits

Harrison gave a brief review of the Employee Trust Fund’s Retirement Board meeting she attended yesterday. Highlights of one presentation can be seen at: http://eftf.wi.gov/boards/agenda-items-2012/eftf20120307/ji/ji-item-3a.pdf