

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Academic Staff Senate  
Tuesday, 14 July 2015  
2.30p.m. (not later than 4.30 p.m.)  
Lubar Hall S 195

Minutes

**Present:** Azarian, Borders, Daniel, Eilers, Freer, Houston, Kunkel, Merritt, Morgan, Palen, Rice, Schadewald, Schaefer, Scholz, Simms, Stark, Thomas, Walz Chojnacki, Warren, Weigert, Wolf, Zahrt

**Absent:** Aguilar, Daynuah, Dobbs, Duce, Josifovski, Osborne, Reindl, Scherer, Schoenecker

- I. Call to order. The meeting was called to order at 2.30p.m.
- II. Automatic Consent
  - A. Approval of Agenda. The agenda was approved as submitted.
  - B. Approval of Minutes of 9 June 2015. The minutes were approved as submitted.
- III. Guests: Joely Urdan, Tim Danielson, Jasmine Alinder

**Joely Urdan** presented information regarding the governor's veto of the item in the state budget regarding probationary/indefinite appointments. It was confirmed that new contracts would be issued to those probationary staff who received fixed term contracts in anticipation of the change to state statute. Danielson stated that hiring new academic staff will continue as if the vetoed provision never existed; Urdan confirmed. Questions included: whether the replacement probationary contracts will be written without any changes to the total probationary timelines of individuals (answer: yes); should individuals be encouraged to submit files more quickly (answer: unknown, the active budget cycle is over and new legislation would need to be initiated to re-introduce the motion to remove probationary to indefinite appointments); are there provisions for a "re-review" for those whose files received negative recommendations (answer: files with negative recommendations during the expedited process could be resubmitted following the existing policy *ASPPP 107.*). Discussion took place regarding the funding source for appointments and how it has restricted individuals on non-101 funds from eligibility for probationary appointments. In response to this concern, it was pointed out that *ASPPP 104.01* indicates that that funding alone is not the source for determining the type of an appointment an individual holds. Concern was expressed that UWM must be at the table for any study regarding probationary/indefinite appointments by System; Morgan stated that we would be part of the discussion. Probationary appointments, it was noted, are essential for eligibility for H-1 visa status.

**Jasmine Alinder.** Kate Scholz introduced the campus effort in regard to creation of an AAUP chapter. Reading from the mission and membership description, she stated that anyone who works for the university in a professional capacity is eligible for membership. The mission statement, she said, is aligned with the

mission of shared governance at UWM. She emphasized that the AAUP chapter will represent and include, in all work and benefits related to a chapter, a broad coalition of everyone contributing to the mission of UWM. Professor Jasmine Alinder spoke about the initial efforts in the chapter formation and provided background stating that AAUP had been paying attention to what was happening at the UW System, was very willing to help, and has brought national attention to the attack on shared governance; governance is the core of AAUP. The first meeting was held on 1 July, with faculty, academic staff, and some graduate students present; the next meeting will be on Friday 17 July. An email distribution list is being developed, those who are interested in being on that list should contact Professor Alinder at [jalinder@uwm.edu](mailto:jalinder@uwm.edu). Scholz stated that the ASC is also compiling information on AAUP and will be inviting input from the academic staff at large, contacting her with questions was welcomed ([kscholz@uwm.edu](mailto:kscholz@uwm.edu)).

#### IV. Chair's Report.

- Sarah Morgan thanked everyone who was involved in and worked on the expedited review process.
- Discussion took place regarding the status of *Wisc. Stats.* Chapter 36. Questions were asked about where the protections and the status of faculty and academic staff were now housed, were they removed from state statute either entirely or partially, if so, were or will they be moved to BOR policy. It was left as an unknown.
- Morgan spoke briefly about the budget cut and encouraged everyone to attend the budget forum on Thursday 16 July. An explanation of the cut and its impact on the campus would be provided by the Chancellor and the VC for Finance at that meeting.
- Questions were asked about the Budget Task Force (BTF) and its role in vetting proposed cuts and making recommendations and decisions regarding cuts for budget and program needs: what is the role of the committee and what is the division of responsibility between that committee and the decisions being made by the heads of appointing units? Morgan responded that the BTF had only work with the "lapse" proposals. The first assignment was to review and recommend on the actions from the lapse documents; these recommendations have gone to the Chancellor. The second assignment, yet to begin, is to review the 5 and 10% cuts submitted by the Deans/Division Heads as permanent base reductions. Concern was expressed that decisions on program closings/reductions are not all being reviewed by the BTF and that campus level review would not be taking place. It was acknowledged by Morgan that it is possible that program closing/reductions could be made outside the process identified as the charge of the BTF. This led to further discussion regarding the need to inform and educate the academic staff in general about the policies that affect their appointments. It was agreed that knowledge of the policies would empower academic staff by making them aware of their options as decisions regarding programs are made. A question was asked regarding recruitments and hiring during budget cutbacks: as non-

renewals are taking place while recruitments are being conducted, should the ASC be pushing for reassignments of current staff who may be losing their jobs? Morgan answered that conversations are currently underway about possible reassignments; no additional information was provided. It was also confirmed that one strategy for handling budget cuts was to not fill positions that are vacated through retirements/resignations. In previous budget cutting exercises, schools/colleges/divisions were not allowed to fill positions vacated through non-renewal. Documentation of the impact of cuts and position losses due to program closings is needed, a request has been made to HR for a list of those positions that have been cut due to budget or program related decisions. Although the Budget Task Force will make recommendations, the final decision regarding the lapse and any cuts rests with the Chancellor.

V. New Business

- A. Update on Appointments. See above III. Guests
- B. Update on AAUP. See above III. Guests
- C. Plan for Strategy Meeting. The strategic planning meeting will be held on 28 July in Lubar N440. For this first strategic meeting, it will be opened to senators, and chairs of both standing and subcommittees. Topics include those addressed in the discussion during the Chair's Report above.

VI. Committee Reports

- A. Standing Committees. Kristin Roosevelt, Chair of NTASRC, reported on the successful review of 27 files during the "expedited review process." The CBASRC reviewed 12 files.
- B. Senate Subcommittees. None.

VII. Announcements/Other

- A. Discussion took place about a message going to academic staff soliciting information on those who may have received non-renewal notices and asking them to contact the ASC with that information. This would also be an opportunity to offer the ASC as a resource on policies.

*Moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to charge the ASC to solicit information about non-renewals from HR, from appointing offices, and from the academic staff, particularly those who may receive non-renewal notices and to offer the ASC as a resource to those individuals.*

VIII. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 3.45 p.m.