

Minutes

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education
Committee on Academic Staff Issues
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., Monday, September 10, 2018
Room 334, Bascom Hall

Members Present: Denny Hackel, Tim Bendfelt, Terri Liebmann, Peter Johnson, Shane Hubbard, Jason Pinnow, Jennifer Heinritz, Nagesh Adluru, Katie Block, Katie Frisch, Kurt McMillen

Members Absent: Nicholas Griffiths

Guests: Julie Karpelenia

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m.

The minutes of August 13, 2018, were approved. Katie Block will update via email(?).

Subcommittee Reports

Knowledgebase should be up to date by Tim Bendfelt.
Welcome to newest members.

Business

Professional development grants will be announced. Process due in October.

Denny gave an update of ASEC. Grants affecting indirect costs return. Multi-department spending of the indirect costs. Opening edits can give a free reign. Two accounts vs. one account at RSP. Not sure where the conversation is going to end up.

Raising the threshold for job posting duration. Loosing valuable talent? Making the case for or either. Minimum is four weeks. Maximum salary changes require reposting etc. Core point is to avoid loosing out on talent as opposed to Department of Labor requirements. Salary limits for two weeks or four weeks. Salary threshold from ~\$72K to ~\$109K. Delays are usually from committee not PVL posting etc. Really just planning in advance.

\$4M for discretionary funds. Performance management based raises or base building. Faculty block fund for faculty. Performance bonus fund one time payment. Vary by school and college. We are talking about 101 money. This is mainly for units that do not have that much flexibility.

\$100M is going mostly to the new Foxconn engineering building.

New multi-factor authentication.

Update from Shane about Research Professor titles. Last time pessimistic but things are getting more positive. Proposal reviews from academic staff to document whether they were struggling because of the title. Four responded out of two hundred or so. Lot of folks I am certain but hard to prove. Same proposal re-submitted by a faculty flying colors. Core concern is long-term commitment. It shows up in four different ways, no guaranteed pay, why are they faculty, concerns about independent lab space. Twelve to fifteen pieces of written evidence of that. Most of these from NIH and American Cancer Society (ACS) and

not a single from NSF. For one person, huge number of journal articles were required and it took like six years to get the funding.

At the end of August, Megan and Shane spoke with vice provost for faculty and academic affairs at University of Michigan. Research professor most concerned about. Directors will bring in research professors instead of tenure track ones. Collecting more data on whether adding research professor title adversely affected the campus. It is hard to get such data. They had similar title from 1960s and converted all research scientists to research professors in 2003 and then they re-aligned in 2006.

Research professor as an entry level position out of a postdoc. UMich does research investigator step and at the end of three years they decided whether they do a research scientist or a research professor. Adhoc committee wanted a parallel track where the education and service portions would be less. Faculty were a lot softer after the UMich approach of research investigator landing spot. Shane is keen on getting it. Only one of the twenty not having the title series. Went all the way upto the president of the University. Faculty gave far less weight to proposal review pieces since it is hard to parse out the effects. Okay to put it for up or down vote in October. First read at the same time. Sort of testing it out for feedback. See if we need to do more work.

Isabelle Gerard at 2:01 p.m. Introductions. Office was created in 2016. Scientific core resource facilities. How to leverage distributed core resources. UW Madison cores are shared research resources that offer wide range of services, instruments, technology, training. Most applied in biological sciences, less so in physical sciences. Comprehensive in looking at arts and humanities and social sciences. Most cores provide services for generating primary research data. DNA sequencing is the easiest example. Shared microscopy facility. Design and technical work, animal services. They all operated as mom and pop business. Lots of opportunities to provide basic support to all these entities. It took about a year to define list of cores vs. centers etc. Centers are think tanks. Probably 150 or so entities that fall under their definition research core. The directory is up. In a year or so we had 8000 unique users and 25 new users per week/day? Getting resources to improve searchability. DoIT is not a core from their perspective. Libraries also not a core from their perspective. It does not help them to be part of this perspective. Administratively agnostic and not interested in mirroring administrative hierarchies. Orientation to UW 2020 recipients. Research part and infrastructure and equipment part. Required to make it sharable across the highest possible level. Potentially starting new cores or adding big capabilities. Hosted some open house events to make the resources known. Campus wide core open house/showcase on March 5, 2019. Publish montly news letter. Liquid nitrogen question. Liquid helium. Hosting a financial workshop for core managers. Often they are selected based on technical and scientific expertise but they have to also maintain books with strict constraints on funding/expenditures.

Host a grant acknowledgement workshop. Acknowledgement rates for cores tend to be very low. There will be feedback sessions.

Shane asked how are the cores identified? The committee reached out to them first. Most cores support themselves in part with user fee. Some cores are not interested in expanding.

Peter Johnson asked who is on the core advisory committee. Cynthia C. Susan Babcock, Mike Hoffman Carbone, Russel Shwabe, Mike Peterson crop innovation. She has a list. Both faculty and academic staff.

Denny, botany wanted a database for the plants. Working group started with freezer inventory and then went into broader inventory framework. We have the mechanism but need a sponsor. Comparisons to the performance management system so people do not create systems from scratch as opposed to adapting from a baseline system. Shared IT solutions have clear benefit.

At some point request for proposals needs to be written up but it is not clear how. For the inventory example. Networking is the key to get everyone on board.

Jennifer H was on the freezer meeting. She went lab to lab and talked to people to get the list of needs.

Done at 2:23 p.m.

Any questions for Shane. Julie K. brought up the job descriptions point. Dwayne was at the last meeting. They have not gotten any further. They still think that the faculty senate would be an uphill battle. Something else interesting at UMich. Any research professor can get moved into tenure track if the Unit approves it. Does it have to fill a vacant position, the answer is no. By that time they are all a very established researcher. They can add to the education mission. Jamie Thompson was a scientist first. Research Professors will be on the academic staff side not the faculty side. It would take a lot more to get that done.

Position description. Would like to get mailing lists setup so as to be able email districts. If we want to do more we should be able to communicate with the district members we are representing better. Julie K., come up with three talking points after each meeting and those get sent out. Technical discussion on how to create and maintain the lists. It seems creating it the first time should be easy but not sure how to dynamically keep it consistent and up to date. It is easy to pull all academic staff but linking those to different districts could be tedious.

Denny suggested to have more information on the website. Possibly a page for previous members. Tedious to update the lists.

Performance management. Some departments went through with their division and modified. How much those departments worked with our division. Anyone interested in talking with SMPH etc.? Julie K. said we did that.

Perter Johnson suggesting skipping October full meeting. How about preparations for November meeting? Learning about contract negotiations? Move to reconvene in November. Subcommittee meetings in October. Conflict of Interest? List of invitees for December. We do have a room reserved for subcommittees.

Meeting adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Nagesh Adluru