



Minutes: November 9, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

*The Academic Staff Assembly is an elected body that represents UW-Whitewater instructional and non-instructional academic staff. The Assembly has primary responsibility for formulation and review of relevant policies and procedures and shall be represented in the development of all policies and procedures concerning academic staff members, including academic staff personnel matters.*

<b>Priority Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting called to order at 12:33 p.m.</li> <li>• Proposed Consent Item: Review/Approval of October 26, 2022 Minutes – correction to Becky Jones attendance – approved by consent with correction.</li> </ul>
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>Christine Hoover, David Reinhart, Becky Mueller, Jessica Berge (virtual), Brian Schanen, Tatiana Fadeeva, Brenda Johansen (virtual), Jessica Walz, Nicholas French (virtual), Becky Jones, Michael Gorman (virtual), Huckleberry Rahr, Ciera Edwards (virtual), Abbie Windsor (virtual), JP Villavicencio (virtual), Rick Pues</p> <p>Absent: Terry Tumbarello</p>
<b>Actionable Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Emeriti Status Nominations</b> – Christine Hoover presented 3 nominations for emeriti status that were submitted to ASA in 2016 at the time when Emeriti status was put on hold.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Dr. Bert Kreitlow</b> (Dr. Franklin Goza, Dean of the College of Letters &amp; Sciences)- Emeriti status for Dr. Kreitlow was approved by unanimous consent</li> <li>○ <b>Dr. Elizabeth Ogunsola</b> (Dr. Kenny Yarbrough, Associate Vice Chancellor of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Support Programs)- Emeriti status for Dr. Ogunsola was approved by unanimous consent</li> <li>○ <b>Michael Wallace</b> (Dr. Franklin Goza, Dean of the College of Letters &amp; Sciences)- Emeriti status for Mr. Wallace was approved by unanimous consent</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Joint Shared Governance Resolution: Resolution on Shared Governance Processes</b> (Christine Hoover) Christine presents this resolution as a result of a Joint Shared Governance Group priority. This resolution has been approved by FS and USC, is under consideration by WSG, and is being brought to ASA today. Becky Jones moved to bring this resolution to the floor, Huckleberry seconds. Discussion: Brian asks what teeth does this have? Christine notes that the Chancellor and chief of staff welcome this resolution, as there is currently confusion about who should do with resolutions passed by any shared governance groups. Brian notes that with a search on the way for a chancellor, it means that a new person may be taking this over and may disagree. Mike and Christine note that once this resolution has been passed and approved by the current Interim Chancellor, then it is in place no matter who is in the office, which gives us a process to follow no matter what. Christine notes that there have been times in the past where different chancellors have followed different processes around shared governance, so having a basic set of expectations in place is good for everyone. Brian asks whether the bullet point reading “while classes are in session” could be updated to “during spring and fall semester”. Christine notes that the cabinet does meet year-round, and that a commitment to make these invitations will not be affected by the semester. David calls the question and asks for a vote</li> </ul>



Minutes: November 9, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

*The Academic Staff Assembly is an elected body that represents UW-Whitewater instructional and non-instructional academic staff. The Assembly has primary responsibility for formulation and review of relevant policies and procedures and shall be represented in the development of all policies and procedures concerning academic staff members, including academic staff personnel matters.*

by consent. With no objections or abstentions, the resolution passes by consent.

- **Joint Shared Governance Resolution: Guiding Principles for Search Committee Appointments (Michael Gorman & Christine Hoover)**

Christine presents this resolution as a result of a Joint Shared Governance Group priority. This resolution has been approved by FS, USC and WSG, and is being brought to ASA today. Rick moves to bring this resolution to the floor, and Tatiana seconds the motion.

Discussion:

Nathan notes that yesterday, FS adjusted the Chancellor/Provost search part to remove it, and changed "For all other Cabinet searches" to just say "For Cabinet searches". Nathan notes that Chancellor Chenoweth noted concerns about having the proper colleges and diversity represented on the committee. Jessica W notes that a statement was added after "asked to name one or more members of the search committee" saying that the nomination must fall within the constraints of a committee's needs for diversity or representation. Christine notes that the shared governance leaders have discussed the fact that it should not be the responsibility of shared governance to establish stakeholder or diverse representation on committees, but that should rather be the responsibility of the search committee. Discussion continued, focused on the topic of where each piece of responsibility should lie. It was noted that it seems that Faculty Senate made the update because the Interim Chancellor noted that he would not consent to the resolution without the language change. Michael Gorman notes that this clause seems to undo the purpose of the resolution by hypothetically saying that shared governance groups can select their own representatives on search committees, but only if they select those who have been approved. Discussion followed on what would happen if ASA and Faculty Senate were to pass two different versions of a Joint Shared Governance Resolution.

Becky Jones notes that the proposed version does not include a title of "Chief" if that title is not a part of Cabinet, including Chief of Institutional Research or Chief of Police. Discussion followed on where those positions would fall. Brenda notes that since specific job titles are called out within the resolution, then those job titles that are not specifically noted within the resolution would not be covered as a part of a search committee resolution requirement.

Rick accepts the proposal to add the title "Chief" to the second part of the search committee resolution, along with "Associate and Assistant Vice Chancellor." More discussion follows on whether this list will definitely encompass all leadership positions on campus. The position of Controller is brought up. Discussion follows about how to word this to include the desired



Minutes: November 9, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

*The Academic Staff Assembly is an elected body that represents UW-Whitewater instructional and non-instructional academic staff. The Assembly has primary responsibility for formulation and review of relevant policies and procedures and shall be represented in the development of all policies and procedures concerning academic staff members, including academic staff personnel matters.*

	<p>leadership positions, and whether a specific list is better or it is better to create more encompassing language. Further discussion leads to an update to add “and other senior leadership searches” to the end of the line, after “Chief.” Rick consents to that addition to the resolution.</p> <p>Discussion about the last bullet point on the proposed resolution which notes a definition of the allowed candidates (“Candidates should be tenured faculty with the exception that assistant deans may be academic staff in some circumstances”). Members Discussed the fact that this resolution’s intent is to focus on representation on search committees, not to make rules or conditions for candidates. Jessica W moves to strike that bullet point, and Rick consents to the removal from the resolution.</p> <p>Motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> <p><b>Reminder:</b> Next meeting is November 30 at Rock County Campus. Tours of the Rock County campus will be led by academic staff immediately following the ASA meeting, and Christine will be available to meet with anyone who’d like a word at that time.</p>
<b>Chair Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>NetID resolution</b> – waiting for Chancellor update. Christine has this on the agenda of her 1:1 meeting with the Chancellor this Friday, and has asked for an update. This refers to the resolution from spring of 2022 on the topic of the NetID issue.</li> <li>○ <b>Supervisor Evaluations Process</b> – Christine notes that in the spring, the Chancellor and Provost rejected this resolution and sent a response noting that they would continue to gather feedback. Christine will be following up on that and will bring it back.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>University Staff Council (USC) Liaison Update (Jacqui Palcic)</b> – USC recently passed a resolution to make sure that USC members are given the ability to attend and participate in USC meetings and activities, as the current practices don’t seem to be clear.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Resolution Against Pay Plan Use of Performance Evaluation:</b> Brenda Johansen presents a resolution drafted by Terry Tumbarello on removing the requirement for a positive performance evaluation from the Pay plan implementation. Brenda notes that the concern is that, given that pay increases over the past decades have not kept pace with increases in the cost of living, further penalizing someone who may or may not have a positive performance evaluation and lose out on their pay plan is simply punitive rather than allowing for any meritorious pay increases. Brenda moves and Huckleberry seconds the motion to bring this to the floor for discussion. Members ask whether this portion of the pay plan is a system requirement or a campus requirement. It is discussed, as there is confusion over where this specific portion of the requirement arose. Brian notes that the 12/22/2021</li> </ul>



Minutes: November 9, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

*The Academic Staff Assembly is an elected body that represents UW-Whitewater instructional and non-instructional academic staff. The Assembly has primary responsibility for formulation and review of relevant policies and procedures and shall be represented in the development of all policies and procedures concerning academic staff members, including academic staff personnel matters.*

policy notes that the compensation adjustment shall be distributed on the basis of merit on the basis of solid performance. Brenda questions whether “solid performance” is defined within that. Brian notes that it is defined as being based on systematic performance evaluation programs which allow supervisory assessment of solid and meritorious performance in their areas of assigned responsibility. Huckleberry states that even if system has made this a specific part of the pay plan, this is an argument worth having, because this should be a cost of living raise, and right now what is being paid by the university is not high, nor has it kept pace, nor is it attractive to new staff, and this pay plan is not a huge raise or bonus, but a 2% increase. Becky M notes that we may want to clarify with HR what is being required, because a recent training session included information that the pay plan increase will not be requiring a performance evaluation this year, because they are implementing a standardized process that will be rolled out campus-wide, essentially giving employees a “free pass” for this particular year. Christine notes that she believes that this will only effect the method in which evaluations are submitted, and that many were already completed in the fall and simply used the previous system, but will still be counted as a part of this year, and a record of that evaluation will still be required.

Brenda notes that, even if this is a system requirement, the requirement still references a systematic evaluation process, which she does not believe is in place, and that the system policy seems to reference the ability to measure a solid and meritorious performance measure, which does not appear to be in place currently. Becky J asks whether this can be brought up at a system-wide shared governance meeting. Brian asks where it is stated that this pay plan is meant to be a cost of living increase, wondering whether it’s in the policy statement or in the state budget that put this into motion. Becky J notes that all employees should want to be reviewed in order to do a better job, and that this puts pressure on our supervisors to do that yearly review. Brenda notes that this does not actually put that impetus on the supervisors unless the supervisors are actively worried about getting their employees a raise. Becky M notes that supervisors will not receive their own pay plan increase unless they have completed all of their performance evaluations. Brenda notes that this makes the assumption that all supervisors are acting in good faith, and that we cannot always make that assumption, and notes that while there is a consequence for a supervisor failing to complete performance evaluations, that process does not appear to allow for correcting that action for the employees of such a supervisor. Brenda further asks whether our performance evaluations are systemic, fair, and impartial enough that it can be trusted that anything other than a positive performance evaluation is truly a reflection of someone who should not earn a pay raise. Jessica W. notes that there has also been wide variability across departments and colleges



Minutes: November 9, 2022 (12:30-1:45)

*The Academic Staff Assembly is an elected body that represents UW-Whitewater instructional and non-instructional academic staff. The Assembly has primary responsibility for formulation and review of relevant policies and procedures and shall be represented in the development of all policies and procedures concerning academic staff members, including academic staff personnel matters.*

	<p>around the evaluation process for instructional academic staff. Brenda notes that she wants to make it clear she is absolutely in favor of employees being evaluated and being given the opportunity to get feedback from supervisors. She also notes that, without consistent processes across campus, there are some areas which have a strong, systematic and impartial evaluation and feedback process in place, but that other areas do not, and employees from those areas risk losing out on an opportunity for a pay increase based on that. Brian asks about previous 2% pay plan increases, and whether employees have missed out on this opportunity in the past because of this requirement, and wonders whether we as ASA should be writing a policy that forces evaluations instead of tackling it this way.</p> <p>David asks about Terry’s perspective on this resolution, as the original author and as the manager of a large staff. Brenda notes that, during discussions with Terry, he specifically noted that he is advocating for the ability of employees, regardless of their current status on a performance improvement plan, to receive a pay plan increase.</p> <p>Discussion continues around whether the resolution is asking to remove performance evaluations from the pay plan increase altogether, or to just remove the requirement that they be positive. Discussion continues around whether the original intent of the pay plan increase is to provide a cost of living increase or whether it is truly intended to be merit-based.</p> <p>Brian moves to table the resolution. Huckleberry seconds the motion. The motion is tabled by unanimous consent.</p>
<b>Vice-Chair Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Whitewater Student Government</a> (WSG) Liaison Update</li> </ul>
<b>Faculty Senate Liaison Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Faculty Senate</a> Meeting</li> <li>• Faculty Senate Liaison to ASA (Nathan McGovern)</li> </ul>
<b>Other Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting adjourned at 1:49 p.m.</li> </ul>

Respectfully Submitted by

Brenda Johansen, ASA Communications Director