Senate Chair and Faculty Representative Report – by Chair Harrison, May 8, 2012

Senate Chair’s Report

Before leaving, the Chancellor signed off on the approval of the French Proficiency Certificate Program and the changes to the FASRaP regarding Instructional and/or Research Academic Staff (category B), page 84.

Over 100 responses to the request for nominees for the Chancellor Search & Screen committee were submitted with over 80 being completed nominee applications. The Nominating Committees (Faculty, Academic Staff, and University Senate) will meet with the Classified Staff Council and the Senate Executive Committee to narrow the pool and forward 22 faculty names, 4 academic staff names, and 4 classified staff names, as required, to President Reilly on Friday this week.

As a result of various discussion at the May 1 meeting of the Senate Executive Committee, this fall the Senate will be asked to review representation and appointment/election procedures for membership on all committees.

Faculty Representative’s Report for Friday, May 4, 2012

- Given the 'fun' over the last year, many campus governance groups across the system are seeing faculty pulling back from working on governance committees – even the very important committees.

- Al Crist (Associate Vice President for Human Resources, UW System)
  - PAY PLANS: There will not be a new pay plan for 2012-2013. The current state budget authorizes Supplemental pay plans but those would need to be approved by the Regents and OSER.
  - Some institutions are allocating $$$ for equity issues (which is not considered a supplemental pay plan).
  - Campus’ were copied on the letter that noted that the Compensation Advisory Committee was discontinued. Now asking Chancellors and Reps to provide consultation on what should be included in the pay plan request to go forward to the Regents and the legislature; will be talking to Chancellors later this month.
  - QUESTION: what kind of advice is being looked for? Are we to be suggesting how to determine merit? Are we to be suggesting amounts of pay?
    - Response: There is a considerable gap between our median salaries and any other peer you can pick. The reality is that the closing of the gap is not going to be achieved through a pay plan process. There is not enough money available to close the gap. One could chip away, but the gap continues to widen. One could request to try to keep the gap from widening. Others are looking at how to reallocate funding to help raise salaries. When we get to the budget process, we plan to ask for the authority to determine how to recognize employees based on merit. We also want to ask for the authority to reallocate supplemental funds as we need. The fact is – we are not going to get more resources from the state. We are asking for the authority to allow the Board of Regents to have the final authority to run the University without going to JOCER for pay plan approval.
  - We are talking about the 2013-2015 budget time frame for this authority.
PERSONNEL SYSTEMS – recommendations from both work groups (Madison and the balance) are 'out there' and linked to the web sites. Most campuses have had some open forums to review those work group recommendations.

Working over the summer to bring together the recommendations for further review with governance groups this fall (maybe as early as mid-August released back to campuses).

Working with Madison’s development team to get alignment of the two systems wherever it is essential to have alignment (such as benefits paid by the employer). Talking about a continuum of alignment - what needs to be completely aligned and what doesn’t.

One thing nice about having two systems – all the heat is coming to Madison!

QUESTION: Why is there an advantage to a distinct Madison system.

Response: There is a benefit in terms of the quality of what the end result will be. You have the equivalent of two research teams working on the project so the quality should be better. Also – it is political – it really represents a more genuine reflection on the way we do business.

Mark Nook (Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs)

Two things coming out of Act 32 - the accountability reports for example. We are developing those reports in tandem. The two reports were created using the same form, way of reporting, etc. so the legislature won’t see any differences and will hopefully concentrate on the content.

QUESTION for AL Crist - How important is the employee categories alignment?

Response: Very important.

QUESTION – Why is employee categories on the “end” of the system where things must be aligned.

Response: Want to reflect Chapter 36 and be careful with the definitions. We want the Madison and other definitions to align within ourselves.

QUESTION - What is the reasoning for not putting teaching academic staff with faculty?

That is something we decided not to approach now. It is a historical definition in terms of what is faculty. We don’t have a non-tenure track for academic staff as faculty.

There is a “job family” - one that is listed as Instruction & Research. The idea is to help provide career progression and a general recognition of those engaged in similar functions. This doesn't translate into a governance issue – faculty are still faculty; academic staff are still academic staff as DEFINED in governance. While this could change in the future, it won't change due to this (the employee category change) process.

Concern expressed about governance not being listed in the matrix of those involved with compensation.

David Giroux (Executive Director of Communications and External Relations)

Not much to update since legislature is done for now.

Numerous ongoing challenges to Voter ID – so much so that the ID portion will not be in effect for June – but other portions of the law will be in effect. Biggest concern is the 28 day residency requirement – especially since many graduation days fall within that 28 day residency. Will distribute the “ruling” once it is received from the JB.

Two new regents and one new student regent who will take seats at Milwaukee.

Work of Legislative Task Force continues. At their May meeting, continued discussion of governance structures. Good discussion last time about capital building structures and purchasing procurements.

Biennial budget is not just about money - it is also where a lot of heavy duty legislative reform
happens. If any change happens, it will most likely be included in the January 2013 budget present for 2013-2015. Don't want to lose track of legislative changes.

- This time around a single budget request including the operational budget AND the compensation reserve will be combined together. The budget presented will look BIG, but it is actually smaller. It just is a combined BIENNIAL budget and will look huge. We have a lot of work to do to lay the groundwork for this budget. The business leaders, alumni, parents have a great stake in our success or failure and need to be engaged at the appropriate time.

- Competitive Wisconsin, Inc. - UW System was a charter member. Competitive WI did a study on economic development. A number of recommendations made it into the governor’s budget previously. This new BE BOLD study focuses on work force development. We are trying to keep our hand in the process. Each Chancellor has received a letter inviting them to host a number of listening sessions. Man Power Inc from Milwaukee has been hired as a consultant for this process – a very strategic process. Encourage you to show up to help focus not only on technical skills, but also on all college graduates and how we prepare students for the future.

- Trying to take a more strategic look at the way we are developing our message.

- President Kevin Reilly (joined the meeting)
  - Annual Budget – coming up to June Board of Regent’s meeting where will vote on annual budget. In normal years thought of it as mechanical step. This year, there are some things that are different – the on-going recession, group of three recently appointed regents and now three new Regents who will be at the first meeting. This will be the first HARD vote that these new Regents will have to take. Sensing some nervousness that these Regents have. Several weeks ago worked with the Governor's office to be sure this budget number was built into the state budget. Also the upcoming elections make one nervous as well. Also working with student leadership. The national atmosphere also makes this budget vote risky. Point to make – this is part of $250 million base cut and this doesn’t cover the whole (part covered by students, part covered by the part of benefits employees now pay) – this still won't cover all the loss, but was part of the plan to help. Important to state that as far as we know, the Governor is on board. The Regent meeting will be two days after the elections. And, the Presidency and V-P of the Board will be contested in an election.
  - Biennial Budget – we have new performance indicators that now need to be reported: 8 categories and 40 indicators. (Will talk about this in August at that Board meeting).
  - Part of the strategy we are thinking for the 2013-15 budget is that as we look at these indicators, let's make a big deal of these accountability items. We have been doing accountability reports in the past and haven't heard much in return. NOW we have a list of what the legislature wants to hear and we want to commit to establishing baselines and improving on those baselines. To do this, we are requesting some new dollars. Also thinking about asking to tie the levels of tuition to the amount of GPR the state is willing to give. Haven’t really in an explicit way had those discussions in the past. It would be better to quietly have that discussion with the governor, but may be harder to do. Better to have this concept put in the governor’s budget rather than try to have it put in later on.
  - Will need to say what we will reallocate from our own dollars to improve performance through efficiencies. If we go that route, we are thinking of having Chancellors put forward how each institution would respond to the performance indicators for their share of the dollars. If we did this, we could focus on some of the issues the public is focusing on such as access and affordability.
  - Feel it will be good to tie performance indicators to what we are asking from the state. This is how we are thinking of framing it.
o QUESTION: DO you see this list becoming priorities in the future?
  ▪ Response: Yes and no. With any list of performance indicators, it always leaves out a lot. Some make think there are some more important than others. Really should be a direct coupling between the in-state tuition and the state's contribution.
  ▪ The new accountability report from Act 32 will be coming to the Board in August. We have chosen to report on more than what the legislative language requires.

o QUESTION: Any thoughts on how these apply to extension?
  ▪ Some do and some don't.
  ▪ It would be great if one could turn this report back as an accountability report of them (the legislature).

o QUESTION: Will the data from the comprehensives be pulled together or will individual campuses be identified?
  ▪ Response: There will be a system report (with individual campuses), but for this Beta-test report the campuses will be together. Nook responded he was interested in finding real peers for EACH institution and benchmarking each campus' data against that campuses peer.

o QUESTION: IF a student went to one of the colleges and then got the degree at a 4-year, where does that student show up?
  ▪ Able to track within the system. Will show up as success for system – and soon will be able to track that appropriately.

o One more thing – heads up – need to be working on this in the next year.

o Discussions started a month ago in the governor's office about course ware up on line for free. Have been asked why can't we (the system) do this and put courses online for free.

o There are 17000 WI residents enrolled in for-profits in the state. If all were enrolled in the same place that would be the largest comprehensive in the state. Some of the for-profits do well, others are not.

o Self-QUESTION: What are we doing about the problem?
  ▪ We have an obligation to do something for these students. The issue of veterans also is a concern – many are going to for-profits and not getting what they should. We began talking about all of this and a suggestion about bringing Western Governors into the state. Within the last year, Mitch Daniels brought Western G in to Indiana. We have been having this type of conversation. What System has said: we don't think it is a good idea to bring Western G into Wi and let us see what we can do to serve these students instead.
  ▪ The Governor is VERY interested in announcing some initiative in this area within the next week. System is working with the Governor as to what this announcement will be. Your Chancellor has more information about this. Good models are out there – faculty should set standards as to what the students need to meet and set the assessments as to what students need to meet. Trying to put a framework around these types of discussions.
  ▪ Will want to pull a faculty group together from around the system very shortly (if this goes through) to determine how to proceed and how to maintain the quality we want to retain.
  ▪ See NY Times article. There is also an interesting Stanford article written by Sebastian Thrun.
  ▪ Enforcement of rule, that if you have even one online student in another state, you need to be registered in that state, has been postponed until 2014.

o What is the role of faculty governance in this process?
  ▪ Trying to impress upon the governor that this isn't as simple as to get administrators together to determine this.

o Think about what faculty from the institutions would like to work on this. One important
discussion is about assessment and learning outcomes! Also, how does one assess prior learning? Group has been already looking into prior learning assessment – looking at evaluating the learning, not the experience.

- Question: Who would grant this type of degree?
  - Putting this aside at the moment. Many different models exist.

- Fox Valley is offering more compact 7-week 3-credit courses. We have winterims, interims, summer sessions, independent study, etc. We have been doing all of these things, but haven't pieced together a degree. How do we think about adults who never step foot on the campus who want to complete the degree?

- More and more about how do we track success if a person takes credits from various campuses?

- BEFORE you have more conversations with your campus – SIT DOWN with your Chancellor and get on the same page with this! They have some talking points about this. There isn't an announcement out there yet. We don't have any final details about this. This may be an explosive time. Faculty from the institutions WILL be involved in the development of this program – especially in the assessment of these courses. Again – TALK with your Chancellor.

- QUESTION: What does it mean to bring “western governor's university into WI”
  - We are working to convince the governor that UW System can do it better.

- QUESTION: What are your ideas about the Legislative Task Force presentations to be given by our academic staff and faculty representatives?
  - This task force is genuinely looking for things it can do. How can it help you?

- Stephen Kolison (Associate Vice President for Academic and Faculty Programs)
  - Planning Program Review has a new co-chair (from Green Bay)
  - It has a three step process
    - Pre-authorization – system submits notice of intent (to Chanc/Provost) with hope that someone connects with UW System to give heads up and so if any other campus is also planning something similar the connections can be made (2-page document)
    - Authorization – 10 pages or less (if you submit it longer than 10 pages – then seen as you DON'T want the program)
    - Implementation within 5 years
    - Quality Control – Final step – campus given authorization to go ahead
    - Array management: a new way of looking at programs. This will replace the current ACIS-type policy
  - The document should go to Regents in June
    - Institute for Urban Education – 2 proposals received, decision soon
    - Systems Advisory Group on the Liberal Arts (self-governing)
    - Women's study going out as RFP
    - International Studies going out as RFP

- Continuation with just the Faculty Reps in the room
  - How are campuses dealing with the compensation flexibilities?
    - Block grant money coming; campuses would need true flexibilities from Regents
    - Want to be able to use resources that may come to the campus
    - Suggest that the presentation to the Leg. Task Force touch on this topic
    - Regents now have authority to set the salaries for chancellors and Provosts, but not for the faculty/staff
o Termination of Compensation Advisory committee discussed
  ▪ Now that this committee has been removed, where is the input?
  ▪ Sense is that this change is an improvement in the way things will be done

o Academic Teaching Staff Employee categorizations

o Motion from LaCrosse passed by the Faculty Senate:
  • Not so much an agenda item as a request. The Personnel systems working group on Employee Categories determined that instructional academic staff should be grouped with other academic staff for personnel purposes instead of with faculty.
  • UW-L Senate passed the following motion:
  • **Motion that the Faculty Senate at UWL strongly supports the grouping of IAS with faculty for the purposes of personnel systems. Motion approved.**
  • Platteville plans to vote on the same motion this week
  • River Falls sent the motion around as well.

o Brief survey taken among reps regarding how “Faculty Status” is recognized in university governance.
  • Faculty status for IAS is NOT recognized at the full university-level governance in the majority of other campuses. And those that do recognize it at the department level, most of those do not recognize it for personnel voting – only curriculum.

o From Stevens Point Faculty Senate
  • Resolution Regarding Opt Out Proposals to the WI Retirement system
  • Background: Legislation recently proposed in the state Assembly would give the UW Board of Regents the authority to develop an alternative retirement plan that would allow new UW hires to opt out of Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) participation.
    o Whereas the Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) is among the highest rated state retirement systems in the nation; and
    Whereas the long-term security of a defined benefit system like WRS depends primarily on participation by all employees; and
    Whereas allowing employees to opt out of WRS will have a detrimental effect on system solvency; and
    Whereas WRS retirement benefits are portable in the sense that a vested member would keep the accrued benefits if s/he were to change employment to a non-state job; Therefore be it resolved that the UW-Stevens Point Faculty Senate opposes any legislation allowing UW employees to opt out of the WRS.